

CHAPTER 3: EMPLOYMENT

QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
QUESTION 2A: Do you support or object to the site option?	
<p>E1: Former ThyssenKrup Plant, Bourn Airfield, Bourn</p> <p>Support: 12 Object: 8 Comment: 11</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site needs to be redeveloped regardless of whether Bourn Airfield is approved; the two should not have been linked in assessment. Redevelopment could support increased use of airfield;• Support, but what makes SCDC think business will go here rather than Cambourne?• Could serve Bourn airfield new settlement;• Bourn Parish Council - Needs to be preserved / redeveloped for industrial purposes;• Cambourne Parish Council - supports site as it is still in an area for employment and as such should not be used for housing. It will also provide employment for residents of Cambourne and surrounding villages.• Dry Drayton Parish Council - Do not object to the Site Option;• Haslingfield – support, even if new village is not pursued;• Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – Best use of a brownfield site;• Cambridgeshire County Council – support the opportunity to redevelop this site for higher quality/density employment uses but only if the airfield is selected for a new village development;• Natural England – Only if new village option is selected, otherwise isolated; <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Too isolated unless part of a new settlement proposal;• Poor bicycle access;• Only a consideration with Bourn Airfield, Waterbeach new town a more sustainable option;• Caldecote Parish Council - Should not be considered unless appropriate research has been carried out and the need ascertained that such premises are in fact required in the area. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support the re-development of the industrial site for employment - there are enough people living locally in Bourn, Caldecote, Hardwick and Cambourne to provide employees without its "distance" from Cambridge to be an issue. Do not support Bourn Airfield new village;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be used for employment, not for additional housing; • Plans should not use exaggerate predictions of new jobs in the area; • TKA site has long history of noise pollution and disturbance to residents of Caldecote due to nature of use. Better to have employment use changed, so no noisy activities can be carried out. However, limited transport links; • Specify the types of businesses allowed and encourage farmers/growers in the area e.g. market area to capitalise on the reputation of the bourn market for bringing trade to the area; • Whaddon Parish Council - Further expansion of the Cambourne/Bourn area will lead to increased traffic on the A1198. <p>Comments on Sites Rejected by the Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that sites RE1 (land off London Road, Pampisford) and RE2 (Sawston Park, Pampisford) should be rejected for convenience goods retail. Would have negative impact on Sawston village centre; • Objection to rejection of RE2 - Council is reaching conclusions in relation to retail matters in the absence of an up-to-date, and objective assessment of needs for retail development and in the absence of a full understanding of the likely level of growth at Sawston and the District. • Milton Parish Council – Support rejection of sites at Milton. • New site: Request that an extension to Buckinghamway Business Park is allocated for employment development. Need new employment sites, particularly as some are proposed for housing. Further land should be identified in this location to meet the jobs target for the plan period to 2031; • New Site: Fisher's Lane in Orwell - a modest extension to Volac's existing site would provide additional jobs. • Promoting employment on rejected SHLAA site 274 (adjoining Northstowe site) – SHLAA appraisal not sufficient to reject site. Proposal for 1800 dwellings, and employment land that could deliver 5300 jobs, and bring Northstowe more in line with ecotowns aim of one job per dwelling. Could be delivered alongside main Northstowe site;
<p>Issue 3: Boundary of Established Employment Area at Granta Park</p>	
<p>QUESTION 3: Do you support or object to the revised boundary to the Granta Park Established</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical update to the established employment area boundary to reflect the current built form and extant

<p>employment area boundary?</p> <p>Support: 6 Object: 3 Comment: 1</p>	<p>planning consents that existing on the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be contingent on improved public transport and cycleway provision. • Successful Science Park, makes sense to enlarge it. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Support. • Little Abington Parish Council - supports this proposal if it reflects planning proposals that have already been formally agreed. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wellcome Trust - has outline planning permission for the final Phase 3 of the extension to the Genome Campus known as 'South Field'. Southern boundary of the Established Employment Area in the Countryside designation for the Genome Campus be amended • Site has never built a cycle route to Cambridge; • Natural England – Development of significant area of agricultural land; <p>Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage - Abington Hall is a Grade II* listed building and English Heritage is concerned that its setting must be adequately protected. There may be some scope for expansion of the employment land to the south of the hall but this will need careful masterplanning to ensure that the setting of the hall is not further eroded.
---	--