

Minutes of the Meeting of Warminster Town Council

on

Monday 19th January 2026 at 7pm

held at the Civic Centre,

Sambourne Road, Warminster, BA12 8LB

Membership:

Cllr Allensby (West)	*	Cllr Keeble (West)	*
Cllr Barnes (East)	*	Cllr J Kirkwood (Broadway)	*
Cllr Carter (West)	*	Cllr S Kirkwood (Broadway)	*
Cllr Cooper (Broadway) Chairman of the Council and Mayor	*	Cllr Lee (Broadway)	*
Cllr Davis (East)	*	Cllr Parks (North)	*
Cllr Hawker (West)	*	Cllr Robbins (East)	A
Cllr Jones (North) Vice Chairman of the Council and Deputy Mayor	A	Cllr Tuisinu (East)	*

Key: * Present A Apologies AB Absent

In attendance:

Officers: Tom Dommett, (Town Clerk and RFO), Judith Halls (Deputy Town Clerk), William Bradley (Communications Officer), Rhianna Cowdy (Town Development Officer)

Attendees:

Unitary Councillors: One

Members of the press: None

Members of the public: 18

Police: None

FC/25/121 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Jones and Robbins.

FC/25/122 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations received under Warminster Town Council's Code of Conduct, issued in accordance with the Localism Act 2011.

FC/25/123 Chairman's Announcements

Cllr Cooper welcomed all the public in attendance and thanked those who expressed an intent to speak on Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Plan. He advised that there would be three minutes per person, and he would advise when they had thirty seconds left so the speaker could sum up their statement. He reminded everyone that this Draft Neighbourhood Plan was a working document, once it was made it would mean that the plan from 2016 would be a spent document.

FC/25/124 Questions

There were no questions submitted in advance by members of the council.

Standing Orders were suspended at 7.04pm for public participation.

FC/25/125 Public Participation

Nicolas Parker, Boreham Road spoke on the Neighbourhood Plan and asked for the site allocation proposals to be dropped. His notes are attached to the minutes.

Tanya Peacock, spoke on the Neighbourhood Plan – her notes are attached to the minutes. Mrs Peacock requested for it to be included in the minutes that she was handing Warminster Town Council a copy of the legal deeds regarding the name of the piece of land in Cannimore Road. (these have been received and filed)

Jeremy Kelton, Bishopstrow spoke on the Neighbourhood Plan – his notes are attached to the minutes.

Nick Tilt, Boreham Road spoke on the Neighbourhood Plan – his notes are attached to the minutes.

Al Wright, Boreham Road spoke on the Neighbourhood Plan – he raised concerns about Flooding in Boreham Road. He said the Environment Agency in 2016 advised that a Strategic Surface Water Management Plan was needed. He said St Georges Playing Field was fenced off, so no longer provided a wildlife corridor. There was a disparity between the flood assessments and what actually happens on the ground. The maps of Warminster cut off at the boundary and miss the context of the heritage setting which are historically significant to Warminster.

Standing Orders were reinstated at 7.22pm.

FC/25/126 Reports from Unitary Authority Members

There were no reports from the Unitary Councillors.

FC/25/127 Draft Neighbourhood Plan

It was agreed to review the Neighbourhood Plan in 2021. The first consultation was held in February-March 2022. Work has continued since then led by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supported by the Town Council and Place Studio – Planning Specialists who have a track record of supporting development of successful Neighbourhood Plans.

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have agreed that the Draft Warminster Neighbourhood Plan 2 and this is ready for Formal Public Consultation, (also known as Regulation 14). This consultation will last 8 weeks and 1 day.

Following the consultation, all the comments and evidence submitted will be analysed

and a response issued with proposed changes to the current draft. This revised draft will be considered by Full Council, most likely in May or June this year, with the intention of submitting it to Wiltshire Council and subsequently an Inspector for examination.

There are a large number of supporting documents which will be made available during the consultation period on the Neighbourhood Plan Website, or sent on request via WeTransfer (or similar) or may be examined as paper copies at the Civic Centre.

Members resolved to approve the draft Neighbourhood Plan 2 for Regulation 14 Public Consultation.

FC/25/128 Regulation 14 Consultation Strategy

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have agreed that the Draft Warminster Neighbourhood Plan 2 is ready for Formal Public Consultation.

A consultation strategy has been recommended by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. The strategy is not meant to be exhaustive, and other consultation and publicity may be undertaken during the Regulation 14 period.

Members resolved to endorse and adopt the Regulation 14 Consultation Strategy.

FC/25/129 Communications

Members requested a media release about the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, Regulation 14 with the mayor, Cllr Cooper and Cllr Keeble appointed as spokespersons.

Meeting closed at 7.40 pm.

Minutes from this meeting will be available to all members of the public either from our website www.warminster.uk.com or by contacting us at Warminster Civic Centre.

Date of next meeting: Monday 23rd March 2026.

My name is **Nicholas Parker**, and I have been a resident of Warminster for **28 years**.

While there is much that is positive in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, the **site selection is a serious mistake**. If left unchanged, it risks the Plan being **rejected by residents**, wasting public money and **damaging the Council's reputation**.

Warminster is already experiencing an **exceptional level of housing development**—including Grovelands, Cley Hill View, Ashley Coombe, Westbury Road and Jubilee Gardens. In that context, the proposed **90 houses at Home Farm and two at the Yew Tree are neither required nor justified**. Their inclusion risks becoming the single issue that causes residents to reject the Plan altogether.

There are clear signs that **supply has outpaced demand**. Homes at Jubilee Gardens are not selling, with councils elsewhere now purchasing them for their own needs. This shows that **Warminster is already meeting its housing requirement**.

The scale of development is **staggering**, yet it is proceeding **without a coherent strategy for infrastructure**—roads, healthcare, schools and drainage. The Neighbourhood Plan is intended to prevent speculative development, yet it will not be adopted until the end of this year, leaving Warminster exposed in the meantime.

Wiltshire Council's *Planning for Warminster* document of **September 2023**, on which this Plan should be based, clearly explains **why housing numbers in Warminster were restricted**. That reasoning remains valid.

The draft inclusion of Home Farm and the Yew Tree **fails to address the reasons these sites were rejected by a Planning Inspector in 2020**. Nothing material has changed since then, and housing need is being met elsewhere.

This decision rests with you. Local feeling about Home Farm has been **seriously underestimated**, and approving this Plan unchanged risks losing both a valued part of Warminster and public confidence in the Neighbourhood Plan itself. *and beautiful*

We have already seen **irreversible damage** to the west of Warminster at Jubilee Gardens and Cley Hill View. *with 600 houses creating deep scars.*
Please do not repeat that mistake in the east, for development that is simply not needed.

I am formally submitting the transcript of my representation from the Full Council meeting on 19/01/26. Please ensure this is recorded in the official minutes and added to the evidence base for the 2026 Neighbourhood Plan Review.

Statement of Representation (as read 19/01/26)

"Good evening. I am Tania Peacock. I am here because Warminster Town Council is at a crossroads between the law and a documented falsehood. You are now formally 'on notice' that the evidence for LGS 1.1 Folly Lane is built on factual errors that cannot be carried into the 2026 Plan.

The Clerk previously stated that if errors were shown, the designation could be removed. I am presenting five fatal evidence failures:

1. The Petition: The Council relies on 729 names as 'support.' However, this petition was originally gathered to object to a separate housing development. To repurpose those signatures to tell a Government Inspector they represent real support for a Local Green Space designation is legally misleading.
2. The Law: This site was never in the original draft plan. The Council bypassed the mandatory 6-week public consultation required to add it, meaning the public never had a legal window to object.
3. The Consent: The previous Examiner was told the landowners agreed. Your own FOI response now admits the Council holds no records of contact with my father. You cannot claim 'agreement' with a resident you never spoke to.
4. The Description: The Council described a private, fenced field as 'Rehobath open space for all by the water.' This was a factual inaccuracy regarding the land's physical state, designed to meet criteria that the land does not fulfill.
5. The Deeds: The Council calls this land 'Rehobath.' I am handing over the Legal Title Deeds today which show the historical and legal identity of this site as Cannimore. Land Registry as 'Land lying North of Cannimore'. The name 'Rehobath' is a nickname for a neighboring private house—it is not the name of this land. By simply 'copying and pasting' a neighbor's house name from the 2016 plan, the Council has failed in its duty of due diligence.

It appears the Council has relied on the narrative of a third party that contradicts the Legal Deeds and the Official FOI record. A planning policy built on a neighbor's house name instead of a Legal Deed is a Material Error of Fact.

Furthermore, your 2023 survey is 'Unsound.' Using data from people walking on a Public Footpath to justify a Green Space on a private field is a mapping error that no Inspector will accept.

Closing: No Independent Examiner will ignore these documented factual errors. If you vote to retain LGS 1.1 'Rehobath' Folly Lane tonight, you are knowingly adopting a flawed evidence base. To protect the integrity of the 2026 Plan and your own reputations, I ask that you remove LGS 1.1 tonight. I request that the minutes specifically record that the Legal Title Deeds have been handed to the Council tonight."

Further more:

Written Historical Evidence: Correcting the Record

The Council's claim that this land holds historical community significance is a fabrication. The following primary historical records prove the site has been private, agricultural meadowland for centuries:

1783 Warminster and Corsley Enclosure Map: The field in question (Lot 134 in later sales) corresponds to map number 108, containing 2 acres, 2 roods, and 15 perches. These parcels were identified as "old enclosures" known collectively as 'Hop Gardens' and were held by William Holder under Lord Weymouth.

1860 Map of the Parishes of Warminster and Upton Scudamore: This survey (Longleat Archives Wiltshire Map 157) identifies the parcel as '1793' and the pond as '1794'. The corresponding survey book identifies the land as a water meadow.

1860 Ownership: The land was coloured pink on the 1860 map, denoting ownership by Lord Bath. The leaseholder and occupier was Timothy Goodman, who held the premises under the 4th Marquess of Bath.

1924 Ordnance Survey Map: The piece of meadowland is identified as Numbers 859 and 859a, stated to contain 4.886 acres.

1947 Sales Catalogue (Lot 134): Particulars confirm the piece of land was "just meadow" with a pond and stream.

Official Identity: HM Land Registry Title WT139808 confirms the legal description is "Land lying North of Cannimore Road, Warminster". There is no legal or historical basis for the name "REHOBATH" on this parcel.

Procedural Notice

By simply "copying and pasting" the 2016 designation, the Council is in breach of NPPF Paragraph 31, which requires policies to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date ROBUST evidence. The Council is now "on notice" that its evidence base for LGS 1.1 is factually non-existent for this land.

I request that the minutes reflect the handover of the Title Deeds and that this evidence be used to remove the LGS 1.1 designation.

The Limit of Community Support vs. Property Rights

I wish to clarify a significant legal misunderstanding within the Council's assessment: Community support does not override a Landowner's property rights.

Planning vs. Popularity: The 729 names on a repurposed petition do not grant the Council the legal authority to misidentify or restrict private land. A Local Green Space designation is a planning tool, not a public "claim" on private assets.

The "Special" Test: Under NPPF Paragraph 106, the land must be "demonstrably special to a local community." The Council's evidence for this "specialness" is based on the name "Rehobath"—a name that Title WT139808 proves does not belong to this land. You cannot claim a field is "special to the community" based on a historical narrative belonging to a different property.

Human Rights Act: Proposing a restrictive planning designation based on "Desktop Research" that contradicts Land Registry Title Deeds is a disproportionate interference with my father's right to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions (Article 1 of the First Protocol of the ECHR).

Kind Regards

Tania Peacock

Edition date : 28 February 1995

A. PROPERTY REGISTER

containing the description of the registered land and the estate comprised in the Title

Entry
No.

COUNTY

DISTRICT

WILTSHIRE

WEST WILTSHIRE

1. (28 February 1995) The Freehold land shown edged with red on the plan of the above Title filed at the Registry and being land lying to the north of Cannimore Road, Warminster.

2. (28 February 1995) The Conveyance dated 1 December 1947 referred to in the Charges Register contains the following provision:-

"IT IS HEREBY AGREED AND DECLARED that the Purchaser or the persons deriving title under him shall not be entitled to any right of light or air which would in any manner diminish or interfere with the free and unrestricted user of any adjoining or neighbouring property now belonging to the Vendor either for building or any other purpose and the assurance hereby made shall not be construed or operate as implying the grant of or granting any such right."

B. PROPRIETORSHIP REGISTER

stating nature of the Title, name, address and description of the proprietor of the land and any entries affecting the right of disposing thereof

Entry
No.

TITLE ABSOLUTE

1. (28 February 1995) Proprietor: PAUL JAMES STRONG of 4 Chapel Street, Warminster, Wilts.

C. CHARGES REGISTER

containing charges, Incumbrances etc. adversely affecting the land and registered dealings therewith

Entry
No.

1. (28 February 1995) By a Conveyance of the land in this title and other land dated 1 December 1947 made between (1) The Most Honourable Henry Frederick Marquis of Bath (Vendor) (2) Alexander Dougal Malcolm and Thomas Budgett Gill (Trustees) and (3) Percy George Davis (Purchaser) the land was conveyed subject as follows:-

"Subject to all easements rights and privileges (whether of a public or private nature) now affecting the same."

2. (28 February 1995) A Conveyance of land adjoining the north-eastern boundary dated 2 July 1986 made between (1) William Francis Aylesbury (Vendor) and (2) The Wessex Water Authority contains the following covenants by the Vendor:-

"The Vendor hereby covenants with the Authority as follows:-

Continued on the next page

implying the grant of or granting any such right

THE Vendor hereby acknowledges the right of the Purchaser to production of the documents mentioned in the First and Second Parts of the Second Schedule hereto and to delivery of copies thereof

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED that the transaction hereby effected does not form part of a larger transaction or of a series of transactions in respect of which the amount or value or the aggregate amount or value of the consideration exceeds Five hundred pounds

I N W I T N E S S whereof the parties hereto have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year first hereinbefore written

THE SCHEDULES above referred to

SCHEDULE I
(PARCELS)

ALL THAT piece of Meadow land situate with entrance from Cannimore Road in the parish of Warminster in the County of Wilts being Numbers 859 and 859a on the 1924 Edition of the Ordnance Survey Map for the said parish and therein stated to contain 4.886 acres or thereabouts

SCHEDULE II

PART I

Date	Parties	Nature and purport
13th August 1930	(1) The Most Honourable Thomas Henry Marquis of Bath K.G. (2) Ulric Oliver Thynne (3) Sir Michael Hugh Shaw Stewart (4) The Most Honourable William Bingham Marquess of Northampton and Arthur Horace Penn	DEED OF DECLARATION whereby the parties of the second and fourth parts were declared to be the Trustees of the Settlement for the purposes of the Settled Land Act 1925
2nd December 1937	(1) The said Thomas Henry Marquis of Bath (2) The said Ulric Oliver Thynne and the said William Bingham Marquess of Northampton (3) The said Arthur Horace Penn (4) The Honourable William George Hervey Jolliffe and Oliver St. Maur Thynne	DEED OF DECLARATION whereby the parties of the third and fourth parts were declared to be the Trustees of the Settlement for the purposes of the said Act
5th October 1944	(1) The said Thomas Henry Marquis of Bath (2) The said Arthur Horace Penn and William George Hervey Jolliffe (3) The said Oliver St. Maur Thynne	DEED OF DECLARATION whereby the parties of the second part were declared to be the Trustees of the Settlement for the purposes of the said Act
27th July 1945	(1) The said Thomas Henry Marquis of Bath (2) The said Arthur Horace Penn and the Right Honourable William George Hervey Jolliffe Baron Hylton (3) Alexander Douglas Malcolm and Thomas Budgett Gill	DEED OF DECLARATION whereby the parties of the third part were declared to be the Trustees of the Settlement for the purposes of the said Act

6:03

4G 45



I attach the sales particulars from the 1947 sales catalogue for Lot 134, which indicates that this piece of land was just meadow, with a pond and stream running through it at that date.

I also attach a detail from Warminster and Corsley Enclosure Map 1783 showing land at Folly Lane (then Broadway), on which it looks like the field in question (Lot 134 in the 1947 sales) corresponds roughly with the field at map number 108 on the Warminster enclosure containing 2a. 2r. 15p. (north of the field allotted to the Vicar of Warminster) possibly with the small enclosure at the south west corner of it too, numbered 117, which according to the enclosure map were held by William Holder under Lord Weymouth (the '(W)' after the tenant's name denotes the land is held under Lord Weymouth). The accompanying award notes that these two parcels, along with the field to the east, numbered 108, were old enclosures at the time of this award exonerated from tithes by money payments, known collectively as 'Hop Gardens' and all held by William Holder under Viscount Weymouth. (see p.106 of the Enclosure Award) The map detail you attached to your last email appears to be taken from another version of the enclosure map, but it doesn't quite cover the piece of land we're talking about (that is located a little way above the top of this detail, bearing in mind this particular detail is orientated with east at the top, which makes it a little more confusing to read).

I should be able to tell you who was renting the land in 1860, as we have a map and survey of Warminster from this date, and may be to confirm whether this individual was still tenant in 1867. I'll get back to you when we've had a chance to investigate this.

With all the best



6:02

4G 45



I attach detail from a 'Map of the Parishes of Warminster and Upton Scudamore in the County of Wilts' 1860. Taken and corrected from the Tithe Map. Surveyed by Thomas Cruse and Charles Fox. (Longleat Archives Wiltshire Map 157) which numbers the parcel of land in question as '1793' with the pond numbered '1794'. The corresponding survey book identifies this piece of land as a water meadow, containing 4 acres and 10 perches, and the pond as a 'Pond at Cannimore' measuring one rood and sixteen perches, the leaseholder and occupier of both (among other lands) being Timothy Goodman, who holds the premises under the 4th Marquess of Bath. (The land coloured pink on the 1860 map denotes ownership by Lord Bath).

I hope that this will be some use

[Show quoted text](#)



Longlea...860.jpg



My name is Jeremy Kelton and I have lived beside the River in Bishopstrow for 14 years

Although Home Farm is labelled Flood Zone 1, in reality it behaves like floodplain. In winter it holds water, it connects **directly** to the River Wylye, and it feeds **groundwater** into the river—which is how chalk streams flood.

Building here would force water **elsewhere**. Hard surfaces increase runoff and groundwater pressure, risks not shown on **national flood maps** but well known in Warminster.

All water from the town flows into the **River Wylye**. In 2024, residents saw the river completely change colour as **phosphate-rich silt** from the WUE entered this **protected** chalk stream.

We have now had two ‘**once-in-a-generation**’ floods in a decade, in 2014 and 2024, and **they are getting significantly worse due to climate change**. In 2024 GEA’s factory in Watery Lane flooded, homes in Bishopstrow were inches from flooding, Park Cottages flooded, and Boreham roundabout became impassable to emergency vehicles and full of sewage coming down **Woodcock Road**.

Approving this without a **full catchment-wide assessment** would pass **flood and pollution** risk onto **existing** homes and a **protected** river.

Name: Nick Tilt, Warminster family & resident since 1963

Address: 202 Boreham Road

This statement refers to the inclusion of Home Farm as a potential site for housing development within the Warminster neighbourhood plan.

There are significant highway safety concerns relating to the proposed location of the access road, required visibility splays and weight of traffic arising from the development of Home Farm.

This development would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to NPPF paragraph 109. Boreham Road is a constrained rural road with blind bends and high vehicle speeds, carrying cars, buses, HGV and military traffic. There have been at least five recorded accidents in recent years within close proximity to the existing Home Farm lane.

The access depends on the creation of a westbound right-turn ghost lane on a carriageway that is already too narrow. This will necessitate carriagey widening into the conservation area, endangering the root systems of seven mature trees and a narrowing of the westbound lane at a bend further increasing risk at the most hazardous point of the road.

Achieving visibility standards would require a 30-metre splayed access cut through an existing 100-metre heritage stone wall, causing further harm to heritage assets which along with the road safety concerns have been key reasons for 3 previous government inspector refusals of earlier planning applications of this site.

The associated road markings and additional street lighting (the area is very dark at night reinforcing its very rural character) would result in a more suburban level of lighting which would fail to sustain or enhance the significance of the Bishopstrow Conservation Area causing clear harm to its setting and character, contrary to NPPF paragraph 135 section (c).

The above concerns relating to the development of Home Farm are not new and have been publicly available information for several years and should have been key considerations against site selection and allocation. On this basis, Home Farm should not have been included in the Warminster neighbourhood plan and any future development applications should, as they have been in the past, be refused.

The scale of highway intervention required to make this access function would itself cause unacceptable highway risk and heritage harm, which is not outweighed by any public benefit.

Notes:

NPPF Paragraph 109 is the **criterion used at decision-making** to assess whether a proposal can be refused on transport grounds.

NPPF paragraph 135 section (c): provides the *decision criteria* against which proposals should be judged — including **character, landscape setting, heritage, safety**, and overall quality.

c) be **sympathetic to local character and history**, including built and landscape settings;