

**Nichola Reay**

---

**From:** Simone Prince [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 22 February 2021 16:14  
**To:** Nichola Reay  
**Subject:** Berkeley Foal Hurst Green complaint

Dear Nichola,

The Foal Hurst Volunteers Steering Group feel action is required from Paddock Wood Town Council with regard to the advertising by Berkeley Homes, concerning their development at 'Mascalls Farm' now apparently called 'Foal Hurst Green'. This message should be directed to whoever is your prime contact at Berkeley Homes and particularly to Hayley Jennings, Head of Marketing, (Hayley.Jennings@berkeleygroup.co.uk)

1/. We feel 'Mascalls Farm Park' or 'Green' would have been a better name for the development, more in keeping with the tradition of the original name of the property 'Mascalls Farm' and the surrounding area.

2/. The website claims that the four acre Foal Hurst Green Nature Reserve included in the development of Foal Hurst Green is adjoining Foal Hurst Wood Nature Reserve. However, this is only true with regard to any wildlife that may move from one area to the other such as dormice, deer, badgers, foxes. It should be pointed out that there is no public access from the Foal Hurst Green Nature Reserve to Foal Hurst Wood Nature Reserve as there are no paths between them. We are keen to keep Foal Hurst Wood to a restricted public access policy, so the phrase should be 'adjacent to' not 'adjoining'. If Berkeley Homes does not change this, it may be necessary to construct a fence between the two reserves which unfortunately could be detrimental to the migration of the wildlife we are trying to conserve (dormice, deer, badgers, foxes).

3/. As another objection to the word 'adjoining', we would also like to point out that because there is no public right of way through Foal Hurst Wood Nature Reserve, that Paddock Wood Town Council reserves the right to close Foal Hurst Wood Nature Reserve to the public, for whatever reason, if they so choose. This means there should be no access between Foal Hurst Green Nature reserve and Foal Hurst Wood Nature Reserve, unless the two reserves should at some point become one. We point out that an eventual amalgamation

is highly desirable so the two reserves can be managed as a single entity. This would be beneficial to the managers and the wildlife residents.

4/. While Paddock Wood Town Council permit the public to walk through Foal Hurst Wood Nature Reserve we are keen to stress to Berkeley Homes that the area remains primarily a nature reserve and as such is reserved for the benefit of nature. It must never be considered to be a dog walking area or playground. Dogs must remain strictly forbidden in the nature reserve with the exception of guide dogs.

5/. Berkeley Homes also mention bird nesting boxes in Foal Hurst Wood Nature Reserve. While there are many different types of nest box for birds and roost boxes for bats we do not want these advertised to the general public as they are usually away from the paths and deliberately out of public view. We try to keep public access confined to the paths as there are many sensitive areas in the reserve and these would be seriously damaged if untold numbers of people wander through looking for wildlife nest boxes. There has been a problem in the past with vandalism of such boxes in Foal Hurst Wood which is why most are now out of sight of the paths.

6/. On a personal note with regard to the bee hives, they are not part of the Foal Hurst Wood Nature Reserve. They are private property placed in the reserve with the permission of the council and the Steering Group and as such Berkeley Homes has no right to broadcast the existence of bee hives in Foal Hurst Wood, in their advertising. It is unfortunate that as Berkeley Homes has seen fit to advertise their presence, I will probably have to seek a new location for the hives away from Foal Hurst Wood Nature Reserve because, being worth several hundred pounds each they are a target for thieves and vandals. There is also the matter of the danger to humans that is presented by the bees' stings and the possible resulting anaphylactic shock, if approached too closely.

Finally, going back to the subject of the development name, the Volunteer's Steering Group hope it is now clear how confusing it might be talking about 'Foal Hurst Wood Nature Reserve' or 'Foal Hurst Green Nature Reserve'. As Foal Hurst Wood Nature Reserve is the longer established of the two, we feel the 'Foal Hurst Green' name should be changed.

If, in the future, members of Berkeley Homes wish to make statements about Foal Hurst Wood Nature Reserve in their sales pitch, we suggest they contact Paddock Wood Town

Council or one of the Steering Group members for advice on whether we feel it is desirable to have the relevant points broadcast to the public at large.

In my experience, human activity and wildlife do not mix well and it is the wildlife that seems to come off worst in almost every case. Therefore, the Steering Group feel it desirable to keep the publicity for Foal Hurst Wood Nature Reserve to a minimum, except for when we are looking for more volunteers.

We would be most grateful if you could pass on our concerns to Berkeley Homes along with your own misgivings. Kindly email me a copy of your letter to them, for the Steering Group's records, thank you.

With best regards,

Peter Prince (Foal Hurst Wood Nature Reserve Steering Group)

## Nichola Reay

---

**From:** Steve Songhurst [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 February 2021 14:47  
**To:** Nichola Reay  
**Subject:** The attractiveness of a nature reserve to sell houses!

Hi Nichola,

I see on the Berkeley Homes website for their new development- foalhurstgreen.co.uk - that the main attraction for living there is that you will be adjoining Foal Hurst Wood (No.2 on their list of reasons) !

Is PWTC aware that Berkeley Homes are using Foal Hurst Wood in a major marketing campaign and has PWTC agreed to this?

Alternatively will PWTC consider requesting additional money from Berkley Homes to be solely used to overcome the extra up keep required to try and alleviate the problems of the additional use of the Foal Hurst Wood and disturbance to wildlife that this new development will cause?

Is PWTC planning to engage with Berkeley Homes to promote sustainable visiting of Foal Hurst Wood, mindful that it is a small and fragile nature reserve, where the needs of the wildlife it supports must be a major consideration, rather than its use as a selling attraction in a house marketing campaign?

Just my own thoughts. PWTC may disagree with my premise and be entirely happy with the use of Foal Hurst Wood to sell houses.

I await the council's reply with interest.

Many thanks

Steve Songhurst

# Properties

Sorry there are no properties matching your criteria at this time.

---

## Why Buy at Foal Hurst Green

Berkeley has created a 4.7 acre nature reserve on the development which connects the 29 acre Foal Hurst Wood. Within the reserve, you will find a number of nesting bird boxes and beehives that encourage wildlife to flourish.



Excellent local schools including  
The Skinners School close by.



#### AGENDA ITEM ES 71

A request has been received from a resident of St Andrews Close to move the rear gate to the Kent Close allotments. (Attached)

At present the rear access is along a footpath to the backs of the properties in St Andrews Close. This is a historical footpath which does not belong to the Town Council. However, it is prone to littering and fly tipping which the Estates staff clear periodically. According to the land registry the land belongs to each of the houses in St Andrew Close. It is assumed that access to the allotments had to be retained when the houses were built.

The request is to move the gate to the front of the properties off the parking area in the corner of St Andrews Close. See attached plan.

Local enquiries have established that whilst the road and footways are owned by KCC, the parking areas belong to the residents. To move the gate to the suggested location would require permission from the individual residents. I understand the parking spaces are allocated to specific properties. Obtaining permission for a right of way could be problematical.

An enquiry to the allotment holders suggested a mixed reaction. At present only 1 plot holder uses the rear access.

Members are asked if they wish this proposal to be pursued.

Agenda E571

Current  
Access Path

suggested  
location

