



Shackleton Village Residents Association

General Meeting

24th August 2026: Meon Vale Village Hall

The Minutes

The meeting was attended by over 50 residents of Shackleton Village. Steve Gould welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the evacuation procedure in case of an emergency. He then introduced the Residents Association Committee

Members who were present:

- Amy Cox-Newman: Chair
- Steve Gould: Vice-chair
- Penny Stynes: Secretary
- Nicky Richards: Treasurer
- Pete Caldicott
- Jules Williams
- Martin Richards

(Other committee members send their apologies: Dave Cotterell, Rachel Delaney, Martina Greenlee)

Steve explained that the reason for the meeting was to provide Members and other residents with an update of what we have been doing since our inception on 27th April; to discuss ongoing issues and concerns, and to ask Members and other residents to vote on two ongoing issues:

1. In respect of the South Warwickshire Local Plan (SWLP)
2. Giving consent to our MP – Manuela Perteghella - to represent Shackleton Village's interest with Stratford District Council and in Parliament

Steve went on to say that the Residents Association committee operates in sub-groups and he explained what each sub-group does:

- Communications
- Membership
- Finance
- Health & Safety which includes Safeguarding
- Community
- Infrastructure & Open Spaces

Communications: Steve leads the Communications group and he explained that communication with all residents and external bodies has proved something of a challenge. We have several methods of communication:

Firstly, Steve said, we have a **website**. It is functioning but we need to fine-tune it in order for it to become really useful.

www.shackletonvillagera.org

Secondly, and most important at the moment, we have an email address and we would encourage you to contact us using that method.

shackletonvillagera@outlook.com

Thirdly, the RA is in the process of setting up a WhatsApp Community for Members. There have been a few issues with this but hopefully very soon it will become a reliable source of information.

A fourth method of communication is via Facebook. The RA does have its own page, but, sadly, not as many people as we would like have been using it, and so we continue to post on the very popular Fernleigh Park FaceBook Group from time to time. Whilst we encourage people's views and comments, we do not have the capacity to monitor every comment posted on these on pages and therefore your comment may get lost amidst a load of other posts. So, instead, we ask you to use our e-mail if you have a comment or question.

Membership of the RA: the number of members at the beginning of the meeting was 81, including the committee members. Steve invited people to join using forms which were available at the meeting.

Finance: Steve explained that everything the RA does has a cost, whether monetary or in time. To date the bank balance stands at around £250, derived solely from 'goodwill donations'. We have applied for grants from various external bodies, but the process is slow and we cannot be certain that any grant will be awarded.

Health & Safety/Safeguarding: As a community organisation we have to comply with certain standards in respect of Health & Safety/Safeguards, all of these have to be documented and maintained.

Community: Penny Stynes is part of the Community Group and she gave a brief explanation of how funds can be generated, via donations, grants and events. She spoke about events that have already taken place, and some which are planned for the near future. She mentioned that, as the events team is very small, they would welcome help from outside the committee, and asked for people to volunteer.

Forthcoming family friendly events, at all of which everyone is welcome:

- **Litter picking: Sunday 30th August at 2.00pm, meet at the picnic benches by the play area/MUGA.**
- **Coffee Morning: Thursday 10th September, at 12 Vale Close, 10.00am – 12.00noon.**
- **Autumn Equinox Sunset Walk: Tuesday 22nd September, meeting at Hodges Grove/Greenway Link at 6.30pm.**

Infrastructure and Open Spaces: Steve explained that working on this subject has been very challenging & frustrating: he suggested that all residents, buying homes

on Shackleton Village, believed they were buying into a 'Garden Village'; a flagship development; the first of its kind. Part of a national UK Government Initiative that promoted well-designed, green, sustainable communities with strong local identity, that had a self-contained feel, with access to great amenities; not just a housing estate.

Between all residents £250million has been paid to Cala and Bovis (Vistry) which is not an insignificant amount of money! But the money paid over to Cala or Bovis was not just for the bricks and mortar of our homes – rather it was for the whole 'Garden Village' most of which, to date, is sadly lacking.

Steve spoke about Cala and Vistry's responsibility for the ongoing development of the village, for the maintenance of the public open space and future management of village. He said that the Infrastructure group had developed engagement with all stakeholders such as the developers, Stratford District Council, the two local Parish Councils and ward Councillors but this has proved very difficult on occasions. However:

- The group have managed to formalise a process with the Customer Service Teams at Cala and Vistry, and their respective Customer Service Directors, allowing the group to raise issues.
- With Stratford District Council we have struggled to get information; particularly answers to questions around the Planning Agreements such as the Section106 for the development of the village, and why the Landscape Management Plans are not being adhered to. Nor are they being enforced.

Ongoing Development of the Village:

Community Hub and shop: Steve went on to speak about the Community Hub and shop scheduled to be built adjacent to Airfield House. It is understood that Cala has sold the land back to the previous landowner.

The RA has written to Stratford District Council as the Planning Authority stating:

The current condition of the principal gateway area is difficult to reconcile with the design aspirations set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 135, which expects developments to function well, be visually attractive and maintain a high standard of amenity.

Residents remain concerned that this prominent area does not presently reflect the quality, character or sense of arrival associated with the approved vision for the Long Marston New Settlement.

The RA has asked Stratford District Council for clarification regarding on the following:

- Whether detailed planning consent remains in place.
- Whether the approved facilities remain deliverable.
- Any discussions currently taking place between the Council, developers and landowners.
- Whether alternative solutions are being considered.

- Any anticipated delivery programme.

Sports Pavilion: building of the pavilion is scheduled to start 21st September 2026 for a 34-week build. Therefore, it should be finished in May 2027

Sports pitches: There was discussion in the meeting around the need for control of access to the pitches, to prevent anti-social behaviour occurring on the pitches. The question was posed as to who will be responsible for the pitches? And security of the pitches?

Allotments: Steve thinks the provision of the allotments will follow the completion of the pavilion. In answer to a question, Steve says he doesn't yet know how allotments will be leased.

Community Orchard: Very sadly the orchard trees look 'dead', but we cannot access them to be sure. They have not been watered since planting, as far as any of us are aware.

Kiosk and play area carpark: whilst a lot of work has been done on this, some work still needs to be done. Vistry say they are awaiting Cala's completion of "remedial work" before the Heras fencing can come down.

Roads: Tarmacing of Strickland Drive is due to start soon, we are told. It will be comparable to Lancaster Way in style, apparently. Street lights will also be repaired.

Drains: A company called Drains Technology have been on site recently conducting surveys and clearing of drains on the Cala side of Village in readiness for adoption. However, on the Vistry side of the village, residents will be aware that for the last couple of months there have been foul-smelling drains on Strickland Drive at the junction with Barclay Street. On at least two occasions pumping lorries and jetter's were called to investigate and clear the drains. It seems there was a blockage but we don't know what has caused it. There is some indication that it is due to brick rubble within the drains, perhaps exacerbated by residents flushing wet wipes and other items that should not be flushed. We can all help by being careful about this. However, we spoke to the drains technicians who have been on site dealing with this issue and they said they are not convinced the drains network has been constructed as per the Planning Agreements. Furthermore, we have been able to get Vistry to commission a CCTV survey and, where appropriate, jetting/cleaning of the drains network beginning 25th August. Hopefully they will share the results. There was discussion around how the drains interface with Severn Trent drainage provision. A gentleman who works for Severn Trent kindly volunteered to supply the maps showing how this works. There was a conversation about the potential for foul water to enter the surface water attenuation ponds and how this must be dealt with.

Maintenance of the Public Open Spaces: The RA consider Public Open Spaces should be maintained as per the Landscape Management Plan, these documents formed part of the planning agreements that both Cala and Vistry are bound by. A Public Open Spaces Audit was undertaken by volunteers and presented to the inaugural meeting of the Residents Association by Paul Couchman on 27th April. Cala looked at this audit, alongside its own assessment of the public open space and

landscaping areas. As a result, Steve quoted from a letter he had received from Cala on 24th August 2026, saying they will follow the Landscape Management Plan when weather conditions are right for doing so. We had also pointed out that many trees are dying due to lack of water. Cala responded by saying that all trees will be reviewed in September. The RA will continue to challenge both Cala and Vistry on their maintenance of the public open spaces.

Enforcement: The RA are minded to go straight to Stratford District Council seeking clarification from the Planning Authority directly that Cala and Vistry's maintenance of open spaces complies with planning expectations. The question was asked as to whether SDC are enforcing planning conditions? And another question asked, are they competent? A further resident asked if we had considered using Freedom of Information requests in order to get answers, within time limits, from SDC?

Adoption: Steve said that at some point in the future, the RA will seek to get the Public Open Spaces adopted, as in our view they are clearly defined as a Public Open Space for ALL to use not just us as residents.

- Destination Play Area
- Greenway Link
- Sports Pavillion

These are all areas that at some point we could be liable to fund via our service charges if we do not get them adopted. You will have seen the Community Update we issued in respect of the Home Owners Rights Network (HorNet) campaign; this essentially is what this relates to: trying to get these types of areas adopted, so please sign up to this and sign the open letter to the Minister of State for Housing: www.homeownersrights.net

Future Management of the Village: Fernleigh Park Management Company will be responsible for the management of Shackleton Village open spaces and other facilities, once the site is complete. Their management agents are First Port.

The Management Company was set up by Cala and it will have Special Members and Ordinary Members. The Special Members will be appointed by Cala under the Articles of Association, and they will retain control of the Management Company during the Development Phase. Ordinary Members are us; the residents.

Ordinary members have no voting rights – so we are seemingly powerless, but Cala have stated they have no objection to residents becoming Directors once the development is complete and the Land Transfer is ready to proceed. At this point residents will have the opportunity to stand for appointment and will be voted in by all residents. Completion will occur when all legal agreements and the Section 106 obligations have been fully satisfied. This is so no outstanding liabilities are passed onto the Management Company.

The RA are seeking further clarification as to timeline and events that need to be completed in order for 'development to be complete'.

Wider Development: apparently Cala consider Fernleigh Park to be a discreet phase. Should future phases be given planning consent, they are anticipated to be developed as new and distinct phases with their own management arrangements.

Service Charges: Currently Cala is funding the maintenance of communal and open spaces. When we bought our homes we were given an indication of the service charge: £197.52 with the caveat that this could increase subject to inflation. Cala have told us today that this figure still stands and it is based on 400 homes and not 3500 as we thought could be the case. Comments around the room were made to the effect that “The sums don’t add up. There won’t be nearly enough funds to maintain the open spaces.” But as this information is ‘new’ we have to fully evaluate it in the coming days.

There was a 10 minute break.

MP Visit:

On 10th July we wrote to Manuela Perteghella, MP to express our concerns on behalf of all residents of Shackleton Village. We told her that many facilities, the provision of which were conditions of planning permission, were not being supplied; that the drainage was faulty and the drainage ponds were unsafe; and we pointed out that it seems unfair that residents should eventually have to pay for facilities open to the wider public, e.g. the play area and the Greenway Link. We told her that it seems that Stratford District Council are not enforcing the conditions of planning, and were letting the developers get away with it.

On Thursday 20th August the MP visited the Village, and she was shown around by Amy, Steve and Martin of the committee. As a result, Ms Perteghella has agreed to take certain issues forward with us and on our behalf:

- She intends to meet with Graham Nelson (Head of Planning at SDC) to try to discuss the community hub and shop, to find out what is being done to ensure the delivery of that promised infrastructure and why enforcement action appears not to be a consideration.
- She has further requested that we send her an open letter on behalf of the residents of the Village, listing our concerns. She intends to then put the letter before the Secretary of State for Housing.

Attendees were asked to vote via a show of hands to indicate that they agreed to Ms Perteghella acting on our behalf. The vote appeared to be unanimous: 52 hands were counted, and there was seemingly no-one who opposed this course of action.

The South Warwickshire Local Plan (SWLP)

The SWLP is now at Regulation 19 stage: this means that essentially, the Local Plan has now been approved by both Councils (Warwick & Stratford) and we are now in a public consultation period that runs until Tuesday 8th September before ratification/final adoption.

What this means is the plan will go ahead subject to representations being put forward, which challenge whether the plan is legally compliant and sound (i.e., is it positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy). No opinions will be considered – only representations for or against the plan's legal compliance and soundness.

This is what happens next:

- December 2026 the Plan will be submitted to the Secretary of State with supporting documents and all representations received on the final draft.
- The Secretary of State will appoint an independent Planning Inspector/s to conduct an Examination in Public. The Inspector's role is to consider whether the Plan is 'sound' and 'legally compliant'
- In doing this the Inspectors' will consider any representations received on the final draft and hold a public hearing where the main matters, issues and questions raised in the representations can be discussed in person.
- Following the examination the Inspector will publish a report setting out whether the Plan is Sound or Unsound. If found to be sound, the Councils can adopt the Plan.
- Once adopted the Plan will replace the existing suite of documents that make up the current Warwick District Plan and Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy.
- The scope of the examination is set by The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (PCPA) which states that the purpose of the examination is to consider whether the Plan complies with the relevant legal requirements, including the Duty to Cooperate, and is sound.
- The Planning Inspector will consider all representations made within the Consultation period which runs until 23:59pm on Tuesday 8th September 2026
- If passed, the plan will come into force in March 2028 (just prior to the instigation of the Unitary Authority, combining Stratford and Warwick Councils, which will start on 1st April 2028.)

We received a question prior to the meeting, asking if Quinton and Marston Sicca Parish Councils support the SWLP. The answer is that we believe both PCs are still considering their position.

So, the question for all residents of Shackleton Village is having read the details of the SWLP, do you consider the Plan to be legally compliant and sound (i.e., is it positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy)?

How do we respond to the SWLP, in this consultation period? Pete Caldicott of the RA committee has done a lot of work around the SWLP lately and he addressed the meeting. His words here are given in full because they are so clear:

"I want to talk to you tonight about something that affects every single one of us, whether you've lived here two months or four years: the South Warwickshire Local Plan — the SWLP — and specifically what it means for Shackleton Village.

You'll all know by now that the council has published its Regulation 19 version of the Plan. That's the last stage before it goes in front of a government Planning Inspector for examination. And right now, until the 8th of September, we — you, me, every resident — have the right to submit a formal representation. That's our chance to put something on the record that an independent Inspector must consider.

So, the question I want to ask tonight is simple: is this Plan sound? And if it isn't, what do we do about it?

Now, I know what a lot of you are thinking. You're thinking this isn't what we signed up for. We bought a home in a village that was going to have a community hub. A shop. Working drainage. A management company we'd have a real say in. And instead, years later, we've got dead trees non-maintained SUDS No Hub, no shop, and a service charge looming nobody can properly explain how much this will be.

That feeling is completely legitimate. But here's the thing we all need to understand, because it changes how we win this: that feeling on its own, isn't a legal argument the Planning Inspector can act on. The Inspector doesn't examine what any individual buyer was told in a sales office. They examine one thing only — is the Plan document itself sound?

So instead of leading with our frustration, we're need to do something smarter. We're going to turn our frustration into evidence.

There are four legal tests a Local Plan must pass. It must be positively prepared, it must be justified, it has to be effective — meaning genuinely deliverable — and it has to be consistent with national policy.

The one we can hit hardest is "effective." Because here's what the Plan proposes: more growth at Long Marston. More homes. And it proposes to deliver that growth using exactly the same mechanism that was used for Shackleton Village — the same masterplan process, the same Section 106 agreements, the same promise that infrastructure will land "prior to, or alongside" new homes.

We don't have to imagine whether that mechanism works. We have the evidence in front of us, right now, on this site. We are the evidence. Every unmaintained SUDS pond. Every missing community facility. Every unanswered letter to Cala and Bovis. That's not just our grievance — that is direct, first-hand proof that the delivery mechanism this Plan relies on has already failed once, on this exact site, with these exact developers.

And remarkably — the council's own Plan almost admits it. Buried in the justification text of DS.4 paragraph 2.6.17, it says, and I'm paraphrasing here, that large-scale developments "require assistance to help establish and bed them in." That's the council acknowledging the risk. And yet the Plan proposes no stronger enforcement, no new safeguard, to make sure it doesn't happen again to the next set of families who move in.

We should not be asking for sympathy. Or to rewrite the history. We should ask for Three specific, concrete things:

First — that the Inspector treat our experience at Shackleton Village as direct evidence that the Plan's delivery mechanism for Long Marston is not proven to be effective.

Second — that binding phasing and enforcement conditions be attached specifically to the Long Marston allocation, so infrastructure delivery isn't just a promise but a trigger point that has to be met before further homes are occupied.

Third — that before any further land is added at Long Marston, the council demonstrates, on the record, what has actually been enforced against Cala and Bovis for what's already outstanding.

And separately — because this matters too — we keep pursuing the "not what we bought into" issue, but through the right channels: consumer protection, the New Homes Ombudsman, and if required direct legal pressure on the developers. That fight doesn't stop. It just runs on its own track, alongside the planning representation, not instead of it.

This is a genuine opportunity. Once this Plan is adopted, it's very difficult to unpick. But right now, before the 8th of September, we have a real, evidenced, relevant case — and unlike a lot of objections the Inspector will see, ours isn't speculation. It's documented fact, sitting in our own streets.

We have called this meeting tonight to listen to you as residents' and ask if you would like to issue a formal representation as part of the community's Residents Association. There will be residents that oppose the plan and those that agree with the plan. We believe in a democratic vote with the majority deciding how we proceed on behalf of all residents.

If the outcome is to issue a formal representation on behalf of the whole community, then we will back this and with the help of some volunteer residents to join a steering group to finalise our written representation, have it submitted through the council's portal against the specific policies — DS.2, DS.3 and DS.4. Volunteers will help us pull together the evidence log: dates, what was promised, what's missing, and every piece of correspondence we've already sent along with agreeing on the wording of the formal representation. Anyone interested in sitting on the steering group, can you please leave your name and contact details with our "meet & greet team" or email us at shackletonvillagera@outlook.com.

We didn't choose this fight. But we're better placed to influence the outcome more than almost anyone else objecting to this Plan, because we're not arguing from theory. We're arguing from what's outside our front doors."

Steve invited the attending residents to vote, using voting slips and a ballot box provided, for whether they were for or against the SWLP, so the RA can represent them as a group, in addition to everyone submitting their own personal representations to the consultation. 51 votes were received against the SWLP. There were no votes for the SWLP.

The RA was asked if it could supply a template letter or wording for residents to use in their responses. The RA agreed to do this.

What could the SWLP mean for Shackleton Village? Martin Richards was heavily involved in the Open Space Audit. He explained what the SWLP could mean for us:

Instead of a Garden Village, as we were promised this will be a town of at least 10,000 homes. 3,500 homes to be built by 2050. Facilities – shops, schools, etc – to provide a “20 minute neighbourhood” meaning everything residents need should be close at hand. Updates to the road network. The Stratford bypass supersedes the older plans for the proposed Relief Road.

The new community would join Shackleton Village to Long Marston and will sprawl up to Clifford Chambers. Landscaping buffers between the new community and Long Marston will help to preserve Long Marston village, itself. But there are a lot of risks and a lot of pressure points, including:

- Water supplies
- Electricity supplies
- Pressure on rural Roads
- Major long term construction activity
- Irreversible changes to the rural nature of the landscape

Questions and comments from residents:

There were several questions, which included:

- How can we protect Shackleton?
- The plan is ineffective because it relies on the relief road/bypass which has no allocated funding. Will it be built?

Have Stratford and Warwick Councils, in devising the SWLP, consulted with The Gloucestershire Local Plan? The pressures on Mickleton, for example, due to the increase in road traffic on the Campden Road, will be enormous.

The RA will take all these questions forward in the course of their work.

Steve thanked everyone for their attendance and engagement, and reminded everyone, who hadn't already, to vote using the ballot box. The meeting closed.

