Dear Chris,

The B&MK Waterway Trust is minded to accept the Proposed Modifications Map for the Core Strategy on the understanding that this is an indicative route only which needs to be refined and detailed. For instance the right angle bend on the route when the waterway leaves Broughton Brook and turns into Eagle Farm North is too sharp and not technically possible. We have previously submitted a revised route to the inspector which David Lock Associates prepared on our behalf. We would prefer that to be used as the basis of the route North of the A421 subject to the points listed below. I attach the original Halcrow drawing (you will need to print it out, or rotate it clockwise twice) which was agreed previously with MKC Planners and we are happy to use this as the basis of the route SOUTH of the A428. Put together these two drawing are similar to the council’s proposed route but again we suggest that this remains indicative only and a detailed designed route needs to come forward as the planning process for the area proceeds.

The original route shows the waterway through the centre of the Eagle Farm Development. The BMK Trust’s agreement to the revision to take the Eagle Farm North section (N of A421) beside the M1 was only ever conditional upon the developer giving an assurance about viable completion of the waterway from Broughton Brook to the borough boundary. We have never seen any such assurance and, indeed, the developers contribution to the debate has indicated they oppose the project. Their original proposal for this section of the waterway was not practicable (navigation requirements) and no evidence was offered how it would be implemented. Nevertheless the Trust remain open to agreeing an alignment beside the Motorway, subject to modifications to meet navigation requirements, provided that the assurance of viable completion of this link is received.

There has never been (contrary to Peter Chambers’ assertion in the DLA submission) a proposal put forward, let alone agreed, to run the waterway beside the M1, where the A421 and M1 run parallel. That line is neither practicable nor affordable, and no workable design has ever been presented. The core strategy, Local Development Framework and other policy documents have shown the reserved line crossing the A421 and passing through fields to the west, to the cattle creep beneath the M1. This has always been the case, and alternatives for this route across the fields are currently being prepared.

The routes shown in the Council’s SLA draft development framework, and the routes presented by Gallaghers for their proposals for Eagle Farm North, have been expressly presented as lying within the SLA and within land controlled (or to be acquired) by Gallaghers. The contrary assertion by Peter Chambers in DLA submission is not true.

The Council’s draft Development framework for the SLA which was published for consultation was not agreed in principle by the Trust (since the associated assurance was never received), no proposed route was shown south of Eagle Farm North and there was never any intention that the route should remain outside the SLA in Eagle Farm South. Again the contrary assertion by Peter Chambers in the DLA submission is not true.

Nick Fenwick, as officer responsible for planning strategy, and the chair of the BMKW Consortium MK Steering Group, will confirm that the discussions around the draft development framework were as follows: The Trust’s agreement to move away from the line in the local plan was only ever conditional on the above assurance from the developer; that the planning authority intend, and has always intended to ensure that implementation of the waterway will be conditionally linked to any planning consents relating to land that could provide the completion of this section between Broughton Brook and the borough boundary; and that the consultation draft was only published for consultation, is not agreed by all parties concerned and does not represent the Council’s agreed position.
The Inspector should re-assert the status of the Bedford to Milton Keynes Waterway project, and the need for all parties to agree on the route to be implemented, and to safeguard that route for implementation.

Yours sincerely,

**Graham Mabbutt**  
Chairman  
Bedford & Milton Keynes Waterway Trust