

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Bid Panel Feedback Sheet Strategic Fund

CIL is for investment in infrastructure which meets local needs. It must be spent in the public interest and the rules around spending it are strict.

Bidders have been made aware of these requirements and several sought additional advice. Bidders who engaged with this process were given the opportunity to amend their bids according to the scoring matrix and officer advice.

This checklist will be provided as feedback to any unsuccessful bidders, so please ensure you fill in the boxes.

Bid Name	Cirencester Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) Implementation
Bidder	Gloucestershire County Council (GCC)
Proposed infrastructure project	Installation of enhanced wayfinding signs and a road crossing on London Road East, Cirencester
Amount of bid	£14,097.32 for wayfinding, £109,731.48 design and delivery of parallel crossing (£124,638.80 total)

Question 1:

Is the project identified in policies SA1, SA2 or SA3 of the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan as an essential or critical project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 1:

This question addresses the STRATEGIC requirement.

The approach in these policies has moved on somewhat, so, if the project is not included in one of these policies but does refer to the overall aims and growth identified in the Local Plan, it may still attract a score of up to 10. Importantly, the project must have a STRATEGIC impact- so it must benefit a large number of residents or meet the needs of residents from more than one settlement.

The policies are:

Policy SA1 STRATEGY DELIVERY - SOUTH COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the South Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

- Romney House Surgery, Tetbury - expansion or relocation; and
- New doctors' surgery in Cirencester.

Flood management

- SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk.

Highways

Junction improvements at:

- A429 / Cherrytree Lane, Cirencester;
- A417 (High Street) / A361 (Thames Street), Lechlade;
- A417 / Whelford Road, between Fairford and Lechlade;
- A429 / A433, between Cirencester and Kemble; and
- A433 (London Road / Long Street) / Hampton Street / New Church Street, Tetbury.

Sport & Recreation

- Re-use of the former Cirencester to Kemble and Tetbury to Kemble railway lines for cycling; and
- Cycling infrastructure in Cirencester, including improvements to Tetbury Road and London Road corridors

Policy SA2 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - MID-COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the Mid-Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Highways Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068), Stow-on-the-Wold

Policy SA3 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - NORTH COTSWOLDS

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the North Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

Expansion or replacement of doctors' surgery in Chipping Campden.

Flood management

Flood alleviation bund and channel to the north-west and south of Moreton-in-Marsh.

Highways

Improvements to A429 (Fosse Way),

Moreton-in-Marsh; Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Oxford Street), Moreton-in-Marsh; and Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Bourton Road), Moreton-in-Marsh.

Education

Expansion of Chipping Campden Secondary School.

Question 1- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project in policies SA1-3?

Yes ☒ **20 points** / **No** ☐

If answer is no-
Is the project strategic? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> capable of a score / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points *a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the strategic test
Does the bid refer to other planning policies which support the need for the scheme? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points
Does the project respond to infrastructure needs identified in other evidence-based studies? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points
Reasons: <i>Policy SA1 specifically refers to Cycling infrastructure in Cirencester, including improvements to Tetbury Road and London Road corridors. The improvements suggested in this bid meet therefore meet the strategic infrastructure requirements of the existing Local Plan and would do so in a sustainable way in line with the modal shift aspirations of both the Council and the County Council.</i> <i>As the project is recognised in the strategic policies of the Local Plan, it automatically garners a full score of 20.</i>
Question 1 total score: 20/20

Question 2:

Is the project identified in the IFS as a CIL spending priority? If not, is there sufficient justification to fund a project that is not on the priority list?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 2:

This question remains in our matrix and needs to be answered, despite the age of the IFS.

The aim of the question is the LEGAL requirement for CIL spending- *Regulation 59 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) requires that CIL is spent to fund infrastructure which supports the development of its area.*

Our IFS list originated in 2016 (it's based on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)). Back then, we identified infrastructure needed to support the housing and employment development in our Local Plan. It is a short list to increase road capacity to deal with the additional traffic from housing. In 2019, we declared a climate emergency and now prefer sustainable travel over private traffic/ road improvements. The list also doesn't address other non-transport related infrastructure needs for healthy and sustainable communities.

The last IFS acknowledged made an important caveat-
"The Council's focus has changed towards sustainable transport and enabling the modal shift away from car use as the main form of transport. Infrastructure projects that alleviate the pressure on these junctions via sustainable means are therefore preferred over projects that directly increase highway capacity as currently listed".

It's therefore important that you understand that not being included on the IFS list should not preclude bids. However, bids MUST show that they address the infrastructure needs arising from growth. We've broken this question down to help you answer it.

The IFS List-

Parish	Project
Kemble	Junction improvements at A429/ A433, between Cirencester and Kemble
Kemble	Re-use of the former railway line for cycling <i>(successful bid 2024)</i>
Lechlade	Junction improvements at A417/ Whelford Road between Fairford and Lechlade
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (Fosseway)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Oxford Street)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Bourton Road)
Stow-on-the-Wold	Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068)
Tetbury	Junction improvements at A433 (London Road/ Long Street) / Hampton Street/ New Church Street

South Cotswolds	SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk
<p>To determine whether the project responds to growth, you should discuss-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does it respond to increased population (or increased in demographic groups such as children, older people or disabled people) by increasing the capacity of quality of existing services, or providing new services? ▪ Has the bid identified where that growth has come from/ evidenced it? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Have they referred to particular development? ○ Have they referred to any infrastructure evidence studies? ▪ Has the bid identified <i>how</i> it will provide that service to our residents- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Will it be open and accessible to the public now and into the future? i.e. is it free or chargeable, if chargeable, where is the revenue going? FYI- Private companies gaining profit are NOT providing infrastructure to the public and cannot be considered for bids. ○ Does it explain how it will meet current and future needs? ○ What outreach/ advertising or other public engagement is planned? 	
<p>Question 2- Panel Feedback</p>	
<p>Is the infrastructure project on the IFS list? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 20 points / No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0 points</p>	
<p>OR- If answer is no-</p>	
<p>Is the project for sustainable transport, walking or cycling? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points</p>	
<p>Does the project respond to growth? Score 3 points (0-5)</p> <p>*a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the legal test</p>	
<p>Reasons:</p> <p>The panel is pleased to have a sustainable pedestrian scheme to consider, which aligns with the spatial strategy and is included in the LCWIP.</p> <p>The panel would like to have seen greater detail to demonstrate why the works met specific local needs.</p>	

Nonetheless, the panel felt the aims of the scheme were clear and from a policy point of view, the scheme would be responding to development in the area, in compliance with the legal test for CIL.

Question 2 total score:
8/20

Question 3:

Have you secured match funding to increase potential outputs from the project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 3:

This question addresses the RESPONSIBILITY requirement.

Community Infrastructure Levy funds are to be used for the public benefit. It is important that we can demonstrate that the investment of public money in the project provides services people need and value for money. Match-funding is one element of this, but sometimes match funding is not available.

You should consider:

Is the cost of the scheme justified? i.e. Is there proof of different quotes? does the cost appear reasonably proportionate? Has the bidder provided any due-diligence information/ enough financial information?

Does the project offer value for money? i.e. is the amount of CIL investment balanced with the urgency, importance and scale of the community's need? Has match-funding been explored as an option?

Does the project secure infrastructure for people now and in the future? i.e. how long will the project serve the public? Is that balanced with the amount of investment? Does the bidder control the land and/or infrastructure asset that will result from the investment so that we can be confident it will remain open to the public?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)

- **Contingency or ‘just in case’ additional funds** (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent).

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

Question 3- Panel Feedback

Has match-funding been secured?

Yes ☐ 10 points / No ☒ 0 points

OR

Has the bid examined all funding possibilities and robustly justified why these have not been pursued?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☒ 0 points

Is the cost of the scheme justified, and does it offer value for money?

Score 2 (0-10 points)

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the responsibility test**

Reasons:

The panel is concerned about the proportionality of the cost of the crossing at £124,638.80. The panel feels that this costing has not been justified and the scheme as currently presented offers poor value for CIL money.

The panel would have liked to consider this bid with additional cost-justification/ a cost review. In particular, the panel would have liked to have seen:

- Examination of alternative or match funding.
- Detail of what projected population size / vehicle movement reduction/ safety implications that this scheme would have an impact on.
- Costed examples of how much a crossing of this type would usually cost.
- Explanation as to why the Traffic Management Cost is the same for pedestrian signs as the parallel crossing.
- Justification as to why a Preliminary Ecology Assessment has been included (in the professional opinion of the ecologists on the panel, this inclusion is unnecessary and unusual).
- Justification as to why the County Council is seeking TRO funding. Similarly query whether the RSA could be covered by in-house staff. Would also like information as to what the engineering fees are. As the panel members understand it, this is within part of the County Council’s day-to-day functions. The panel would like to understand why public money is sought via CIL funding as if this scheme were being carried out on a private basis

rather than as a County Council led LCWIP implementation. The panel specifically wishes to question whether the TRO and Traffic Management are in any way covering County Council staff costs.

- In general, the panel observe that the additional add-ons seem to greatly inflate the costs.

The panel feels that insufficient information and justification is available to determine whether the cost is proportionate and therefore whether this scheme would offer the public good value for money.

Question 3 total score:
2/ 20

Question 4:

Is the project deliverable and what is the time frame? Have you considered alternative options to deliver the outcome of your project? Are enough CIL funds currently available?

~Total possible score: 30

Panel Advice for Question 4:

This group of questions address the ACCOUNTABILITY requirement. If we are investing public money in infrastructure projects, we have to be certain that the project can and will go ahead. This means understanding when and how the project will be delivered, who will be accountable and whether it is properly funded.

You should consider:

Is the project deliverable? I.e. has the bidder provided a project plan? Are there clear roles and responsibilities? Is there a timescale involved? Does the bidder have a track record of delivering similar projects or can then point to similar feasible examples? Does the bid explain how the providers will report progress back to the Council?

Has the bid considered alternative options? Is the bid the best and most effective route for meeting the needs identified? This is particularly important where there are competing bids for similar infrastructure, or where the scheme seeks a large investment into infrastructure which is to meet future needs (are the needs known and is the extent of investment justified?). Aside from the match-funding question, is CIL the best route for this infrastructure- are there other responsible bodies who could provide this infrastructure?

Are enough CIL funds currently available?

This can automatically exclude bids. If there is sufficient funding, but the scheme seeks a large financial investment of CIL- does the bid phase the development so that CIL funding can be drawn down only when required? Does the bid provide for future revenue to maintain the infrastructure into the future (the greater the investment, the longer term the infrastructure maintenance should be secured)?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional funds** (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent). We can allocate money for contingency funding, on the basis that a separate request for the money will need to be made alongside proof of the additional cost/ spend. Contingency costs must be noted.

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

Question 4- Panel Feedback

Is the project deliverable?

Yes ☒ Score 0-10 points 10 / No ☐ 0

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification**

Has the bid considered alternative options?

Yes ☐ Score 0-10 points / No ☒ 0

Are there enough CIL funds available?

Yes ☒ Score 0-10 points 5 / No ☐ 0

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification**

Are there any costs which should not be included? Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, specify-

Contingency funds of 40% on each item:

£2,264.53 on wayfinding

£22,510.05 on parallel crossing.

Additional costs which may be unnecessary, per comments to Question 3 above.

<p>Reasons:</p> <p>The panel recognises that the County Council has a good and well-established record of delivering schemes of this type and therefore opts to give full points in respect of the deliverability of the scheme.</p> <p>The panel recognises that there may be limited alternative options for meeting the need that this scheme would address, however, the panel feels that cost-effective alternatives to the scheme and a better explanation of the necessity of the scheme in its current form should have been provided. Given that this was not addressed at all (and the panel's concerns regarding the overall cost as outlined above), the panel feels unable to award a score in this respect.</p> <p>There are enough CIL funds available for this scheme when considered in isolation, however, the bids received in 2025 exceeds the current balance of CIL in their totality. Balanced with the queries around costing, the panel opts to award a score of 5/10 in respect of this aspect of value for money.</p> <p>The panel also notes as above that contingency fees cannot be paid out up-front and would be removed from any initial transfer of funds should the bid be successful. Evidence would then need to be provided to justify the draw-down of additional funds should the project cost more to implement than anticipated. On the point of value for money, the panel also feels that this scheme would be a relatively small scheme with limited risk associated and as such, would have appreciated further justification for the 40% contingency rate.</p>
<p>Question 4 total score: 15/30</p>

Summary Panel Feedback		
Has the bid been disqualified?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Total score 45/100		
Recommendation for funding?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Any costs to be removed?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If yes, please specify- See question 3 and 4 response above.</p>		

Total recommended for funding (if applicable) 0
--

Overall feedback for bidder:

<p>The panel welcomes this bid, which relates to existing policy and strategic objectives. The panel feels that the infrastructure bid for is one of the types of infrastructure that could be well delivered via CIL (and other match funding/ statutory undertaker functions). In general, the panel would like to recognise this infrastructure as 'a good idea', however, the panel feels that the bid failed to provide the detail needed to justify the scale of cost, particularly given the limited availability of funds.</p>
--

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Bid Panel Feedback Sheet Strategic Fund

CIL is for investment in infrastructure which meets local needs. It must be spent in the public interest and the rules around spending it are strict.

Bidders have been made aware of these requirements and several sought additional advice. Bidders who engaged with this process were given the opportunity to amend their bids according to the scoring matrix and officer advice.

This checklist will be provided as feedback to any unsuccessful bidders, so please ensure you fill in the boxes.

Bid Name	Cycle parking Cotswold National Cycle Network (NCN)
Bidder	Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) and Sustrans (now Walk Wheel Cycle Trust)
Proposed infrastructure project	Cycle parking facilities across network settlement hubs.
Amount of bid	£27,000.00

Question 1:

Is the project identified in policies SA1, SA2 or SA3 of the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan as an essential or critical project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 1:

This question addresses the STRATEGIC requirement.

The approach in these policies has moved on somewhat, so, if the project is not included in one of these policies but does refer to the overall aims and growth identified in the Local Plan, it may still attract a score of up to 10. Importantly, the project must have a STRATEGIC impact- so it must benefit a large number of residents or meet the needs of residents from more than one settlement.

The policies are:

Policy SA1 STRATEGY DELIVERY - SOUTH COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the South Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

- Romney House Surgery, Tetbury - expansion or relocation; and
- New doctors' surgery in Cirencester.

Flood management

- SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk.

Highways

Junction improvements at:

- A429 / Cherrytree Lane, Cirencester;
- A417 (High Street) / A361 (Thames Street), Lechlade;
- A417 / Whelford Road, between Fairford and Lechlade;
- A429 / A433, between Cirencester and Kemble; and
- A433 (London Road / Long Street) / Hampton Street / New Church Street, Tetbury.

Sport & Recreation

- Re-use of the former Cirencester to Kemble and Tetbury to Kemble railway lines for cycling; and
- Cycling infrastructure in Cirencester, including improvements to Tetbury Road and London Road corridors

Policy SA2 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - MID-COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the Mid-Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Highways Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068), Stow-on-the-Wold

Policy SA3 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - NORTH COTSWOLDS

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the North Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

Expansion or replacement of doctors' surgery in Chipping Campden.

Flood management

Flood alleviation bund and channel to the north-west and south of Moreton-in-Marsh.

Highways

Improvements to A429 (Fosse Way),

Moreton-in-Marsh; Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Oxford Street), Moreton-in-Marsh; and Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Bourton Road), Moreton-in-Marsh.

Education

Expansion of Chipping Campden Secondary School.

Question 1- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project in policies SA1-3?

Yes ☒ **20 points** / **No** ☐

If answer is no-
Is the project strategic? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> capable of a score / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points *a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the strategic test
Does the bid refer to other planning policies which support the need for the scheme? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points
Does the project respond to infrastructure needs identified in other evidence-based studies? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points
Reasons: <i>This proposal would provide for cycle parking facilities across the District, in line with the aims of Policies SA1-3. Policy SA1 specifically refers to Cycling infrastructure in Cirencester. Whilst policies SA2-3 refer to road junction improvements, the panel considers that the proposal meets the overall aims of improving connectivity generally, albeit by non-private car means. The improvements suggested in this bid meet therefore meet the strategic infrastructure requirements of the existing Local Plan in a sustainable way in line with the modal shift aspirations of both the Council and the County Council.</i> <i>As the project is recognised in the strategic policies of the Local Plan, it automatically garners a full score of 20.</i>
Question 1 total score: 20/20

Question 2:

Is the project identified in the IFS as a CIL spending priority? If not, is there sufficient justification to fund a project that is not on the priority list?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 2:

This question is outdated but remains in our matrix and needs to be answered.

The real aim of the question is the LEGAL requirement for CIL spending- *Regulation 59 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) requires that CIL is spent to fund infrastructure which supports the development of its area.*

Our IFS list originated in 2016 (it's based on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)). Back then, we identified infrastructure needed to support the housing and employment development in our Local Plan. It is a short list to increase road capacity to deal with the additional traffic from housing. In 2019, we declared a climate emergency and now prefer sustainable travel over private traffic/ road improvements. The list also doesn't address other non-transport related infrastructure needs for healthy and sustainable communities.

The last IFS acknowledged made an important caveat-
"The Council's focus has changed towards sustainable transport and enabling the modal shift away from car use as the main form of transport. Infrastructure projects that alleviate the pressure on these junctions via sustainable means are therefore preferred over projects that directly increase highway capacity as currently listed".

It's therefore important that you understand that not being included on the IFS list should not preclude bids. However, bids MUST show that they address the infrastructure needs arising from growth. We've broken this question down to help you answer it.

The IFS List-

Parish	Project
Kemble	Junction improvements at A429/ A433, between Cirencester and Kemble
Kemble	Re-use of the former railway line for cycling (successful bid 2024)
Lechlade	Junction improvements at A417/ Whelford Road between Fairford and Lechlade
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (Fosseway)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Oxford Street)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Bourton Road)

Stow-on-the-Wold	Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068)
Tetbury	Junction improvements at A433 (London Road/ Long Street) / Hampton Street/ New Church Street
South Cotswolds	SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk

To determine whether the project responds to growth, you should discuss-

- Does it respond to increased population (or increased in demographic groups such as children, older people or disabled people) by increasing the capacity of quality of existing services, or providing new services?
- Has the bid identified where that growth has come from/ evidenced it?
 - Have they referred to particular development?
 - Have they referred to any infrastructure evidence studies?
- Has the bid identified *how* it will provide that service to our residents-
 - Will it be open and accessible to the public now and into the future? i.e. is it free or chargeable, if chargeable, where is the revenue going?
FYI- Private companies gaining profit are NOT providing infrastructure to the public and cannot be considered for bids.
 - Does it explain how it will meet current and future needs?
 - What outreach/ advertising or other public engagement is planned?

Question 2- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project on the IFS list?
 Yes ☐ 20 points / No ☒ 0 points

OR- If answer is no-

Is the project for sustainable transport, walking or cycling?
 Yes ☒ 5 points / No ☐ 0 points

Does the project respond to growth? Score 0-10 points _8_

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the legal test**

Reasons:
 The panel welcomes this sustainable transport cycling scheme, which aligns with the spatial strategy and meets objectives in the LCWIP.

The panel considers the proposal to be a well evidenced response to demonstrated needs. The proposal appears to take a targeted and wide-reaching approach which is focussed on identified growth hubs. The panel particularly notes that the scheme covers most of district.

The panel is pleased to see the scheme is supported by local statistics and detailed evidence and commends the bidders for the quality of this element of the bid.

The panel has no doubts that the scheme would meet the legal test for CIL investment. The car parking specialist members of the panel would like it noted that there is often an assumption that cycle stands and lockers are located within car parks, however, this should be actively discouraged as it reduces the overall number of available spaces and car parks are not the ideal place for bicycle storage. The panel would encourage further liaison with the bidder and car park providers/ the Council's car-parking team regarding the locations of these facilities.

Question 2 total score:
13/ 20

Question 3:

Have you secured match funding to increase potential outputs from the project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 3:

This question addresses the RESPONSIBILITY requirement. Community Infrastructure Levy funds are to be used for the public benefit. It is important that we can demonstrate that the investment of public money in the project provides services people need and value for money. Match-funding is one element of this, but sometimes match funding is not available.

You should consider:

Is the cost of the scheme justified? i.e. Is there proof of different quotes? does the cost appear reasonably proportionate? Has the bidder provided any due-diligence information/ enough financial information?

Does the project offer value for money? i.e. is the amount of CIL investment balanced with the urgency, importance and scale of the community's need? Has match-funding been explored as an option?

Does the project secure infrastructure for people now and in the future? i.e. how long will the project serve the public? Is that balanced with the amount of investment? Does the bidder control the land and/or infrastructure asset that will result from the investment so that we can be confident it will remain open to the public?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional** funds (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent).

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

Question 3- Panel Feedback

Has match-funding been secured?

Yes ☐ 10 points / No ☒ 0 points

OR

Has the bid examined all funding possibilities and robustly justified why these have not been pursued?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☒ 0 points

Is the cost of the scheme justified, and does it offer value for money?

Score 8 (0-10 points)

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the responsibility test**

Reasons:

The cost to benefit of this scheme has been well-evidenced. Whilst detail around match-funding opportunities would have been desirable and should be embedded into future bids from this bidder, the panel nonetheless considers the overall funding ask is reasonable and proportionate to the scheme. As such, the bid garners a robust score from its justification.

The justification of cost did not receive a full score, as the panel would query whether the secure cycle parking would become self-sustaining over time.

Question 3 total score: 8 / 20

Question 4:

Is the project deliverable and what is the time frame? Have you considered alternative options to deliver the outcome of your project? Are enough CIL funds currently available?

~Total possible score: 30

Panel Advice for Question 4:

This group of questions address the ACCOUNTABILITY requirement. If we are investing public money in infrastructure projects, we have to be certain that the project can and will go ahead. This means understanding when and how the project will be delivered, who will be accountable and whether it is properly funded.

You should consider:

Is the project deliverable? I.e. has the bidder provided a project plan? Are there clear roles and responsibilities? Is there a timescale involved? Does the bidder have a track record of delivering similar projects or can then point to similar feasible examples? Does the bid explain how the providers will report progress back to the Council?

Has the bid considered alternative options? Is the bid the best and most effective route for meeting the needs identified? This is particularly important where there are competing bids for similar infrastructure, or where the scheme seeks a large investment into infrastructure which is to meet future needs (are the needs known and is the extent of investment justified?). Aside from the match-funding question, is CIL the best route for this infrastructure- are there other responsible bodies who could provide this infrastructure?

Are enough CIL funds currently available?

This can automatically exclude bids. If there is sufficient funding, but the scheme seeks a large financial investment of CIL- does the bid phase the development so that CIL funding can be drawn down only when required? Does the bid provide for future revenue to maintain the infrastructure into the future (the greater the investment, the longer term the infrastructure maintenance should be secured)?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional** funds (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent). We can allocate money for contingency funding, on the basis that a separate request for the money will need to be made alongside proof of the additional cost/ spend. Contingency costs must be noted.

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

Question 4- Panel Feedback

Is the project deliverable?

Yes ☒ Score 0-10 points 9 / No ☐ 0

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification**

Has the bid considered alternative options?

Yes ☒ Score 0-10 points 5 / No ☐ 0

Are there enough CIL funds available?

Yes ☒ Score 0-10 points 9 / No ☐ 0

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification**

Are there any costs which should not be included? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, specify-

An unclear amount of contingency has been added.

Reasons:

The panel recognises that the County Council has a good and well-established record of delivering schemes of this type and that it has a good working relationship with the Walk, Wheel and Cycle Trust (WWCT). The WWCT also has a good record of facilitating such schemes. The panel opts to give just shy of full points due to the query above regarding locations for the facilities. The panel was satisfied that alternative options had been touched upon within the bid and accordingly awarded a mid-score.

There are enough CIL funds available for this scheme when considered in isolation, however, the bids received in 2025 exceeds the current balance of CIL in their totality. Nonetheless, this scheme has a relatively low and proportionate funding ask, and as such the panel opts to give just shy of full points in this respect.

An unclear amount of contingency has been added, which will need to be identified and separated out. The panel also notes as above that contingency fees cannot be paid out up-front and would be removed from any initial transfer of funds should the bid be successful. Evidence would then need to be provided to justify the draw-down of additional funds should the project cost more to implement than anticipated. The panel would have liked to have seen contingency clearly earmarked and shown as a proportion of the overall costing.

Question 4 total score:
23/30

Summary Panel Feedback

Has the bid been disqualified? Yes ☐ No ☒

Total score 63/100

Recommendation for funding? Yes ☒ No ☐

Any costs to be removed? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, please specify-

Contingency fees must be noted. They can be included as a separate total for a later draw-down.

Total recommended for funding (if applicable) £27,000.00 (contingency arrangements)

Overall feedback for bidder:

The panel would like to thank the bidders for this detailed and well justified bid. The panel feels the bid has been well structured. The panel is pleased to recommend the scheme for funding and looks forward to seeing positive outcomes. The panel would like to invite the bidders to engage with the Council regarding the locations of the facilities.

--

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Bid Panel Feedback Sheet Strategic Fund

CIL is for investment in infrastructure which meets local needs. It must be spent in the public interest and the rules around spending it are strict.

Whilst each bidder has been made aware of these requirements and has been given the opportunity to amend their bids according to the scoring matrix and officer advice.

This checklist will be provided as feedback to any unsuccessful bidders, so please ensure you fill in the boxes.

Bid Name	Car club provision in Cirencester
Bidder	Gloucestershire County Council (GCC)
Proposed infrastructure project	Shared E-vehicle car club
Amount of bid	£56,880.00

Question 1:

Is the project identified in policies SA1, SA2 or SA3 of the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan as an essential or critical project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 1:

This question addresses the STRATEGIC requirement.

The approach in these policies has moved on somewhat, so, if the project is not included in one of these policies but does refer to the overall aims and growth identified in the Local Plan, it may still attract a score of up to 10. Importantly, the project must have a STRATEGIC impact- so it must benefit a large number of residents or meet the needs of residents from more than one settlement.

The policies are:

Policy SA1 STRATEGY DELIVERY - SOUTH COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the South Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

- Romney House Surgery, Tetbury - expansion or relocation; and
- New doctors' surgery in Cirencester.

Flood management

- SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk.

Highways

Junction improvements at:

- A429 / Cherrytree Lane, Cirencester;
- A417 (High Street) / A361 (Thames Street), Lechlade;
- A417 / Whelford Road, between Fairford and Lechlade;
- A429 / A433, between Cirencester and Kemble; and
- A433 (London Road / Long Street) / Hampton Street / New Church Street, Tetbury.

Sport & Recreation

- Re-use of the former Cirencester to Kemble and Tetbury to Kemble railway lines for cycling; and
- Cycling infrastructure in Cirencester, including improvements to Tetbury Road and London Road corridors

Policy SA2 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - MID-COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the Mid-Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Highways Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068), Stow-on-the-Wold

Policy SA3 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - NORTH COTSWOLDS

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the North Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

Expansion or replacement of doctors' surgery in Chipping Campden.

Flood management

Flood alleviation bund and channel to the north-west and south of Moreton-in-Marsh.

Highways

Improvements to A429 (Fosse Way),

Moreton-in-Marsh; Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Oxford Street), Moreton-in-Marsh; and Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Bourton Road), Moreton-in-Marsh.

Education

Expansion of Chipping Campden Secondary School.

Question 1 - Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project in policies SA1-3?

Yes ☐ 20 points / No ☒

If answer is no-

Is the project strategic? Yes ☐ capable of a score / No ☒ 0 points

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the strategic test**

Does the bid refer to other planning policies which support the need for the scheme?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☐ 0 points

Does the project respond to infrastructure needs identified in other evidence-based studies?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☐ 0 points

Reasons:

The scheme is not included in policies SA1-3. The panel acknowledges that car share schemes can reduce ownership of private vehicles and encourage use of sustainable modes of transport, limiting use of private cars/ vehicles. The approach to transport following the declaration of the climate emergencies by the District and County Councils is to prioritise infrastructure schemes which encourage modal shift to reduce the impact on roads. The panel also acknowledges that car share schemes are capable of being strategic in scale and offer.

However, the panel is not persuaded by the detail of the bid that the scheme as currently proposed is strategic in nature, as it appears only to secure the provision of a single EV vehicle, providing a very limited offer in terms of quantity and geographical reach. The panel does not consider this to meet the needs of growth or aims of the policies.

The panel notes that the bid refers to potential up-scaling the EV vehicle share project over time, however, the bid does not make any provision of plan for doing so. The panel is concerned that the investment in the scheme appears to only fund a single vehicle for set period, without providing or planning for succession/ growth towards a strategic impact.

The panel's finding results in the bid being disqualified in its current scheme. The panel is mindful that the bid may come forward again in other bidding periods, and so it has made some limited (not exhaustive) additional comments on the other questions, to assist with any future bids.

Question 1 total score: Disqualification 0 / 20

Question 2:

Is the project identified in the IFS as a CIL spending priority? If not, is there sufficient justification to fund a project that is not on the priority list?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 2:

This question is outdated but remains in our matrix and needs to be answered.

The real aim of the question is the LEGAL requirement for CIL spending- *Regulation 59 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) requires that CIL is spent to fund infrastructure which supports the development of its area.*

Our IFS list originated in 2016 (it's based on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)). Back then, we identified infrastructure needed to support the housing and employment development in our Local Plan. It is a short list to increase road capacity to deal with the additional traffic from housing. In 2019, we declared a climate emergency and now prefer sustainable travel over private traffic/ road improvements. The list also doesn't address other non-transport related infrastructure needs for healthy and sustainable communities.

The last IFS acknowledged made an important caveat-
"The Council's focus has changed towards sustainable transport and enabling the modal shift away from car use as the main form of transport. Infrastructure projects that alleviate the pressure on these junctions via sustainable means are therefore preferred over projects that directly increase highway capacity as currently listed".

It's therefore important that you understand that not being included on the IFS list should not preclude bids. However, bids MUST show that they address the infrastructure needs arising from growth. We've broken this question down to help you answer it.

The IFS List-

Parish	Project
Kemble	Junction improvements at A429/ A433, between Cirencester and Kemble
Kemble	Re-use of the former railway line for cycling (successful bid 2024)
Lechlade	Junction improvements at A417/ Whelford Road between Fairford and Lechlade
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (Fosseway)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Oxford Street)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Bourton Road)
Stow-on-the-Wold	Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068)
Tetbury	Junction improvements at A433 (London Road/ Long Street) / Hampton Street/ New Church Street
South Cotswolds	SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk

To determine whether the project responds to growth, you should discuss-

- Does it respond to increased population (or increased in demographic groups such as children, older people or disabled people) by increasing the capacity of quality of existing services, or providing new services?
- Has the bid identified where that growth has come from/ evidenced it?
 - Have they referred to particular development?
 - Have they referred to any infrastructure evidence studies?
- Has the bid identified *how* it will provide that service to our residents-
 - Will it be open and accessible to the public now and into the future? i.e. is it free or chargeable, if chargeable, where is the revenue going?
 - **FYI- Private companies gaining profit are NOT providing infrastructure to the public and cannot be considered for bids.**
 - Does it explain how it will meet current and future needs?
 - What outreach/ advertising or other public engagement is planned?

Question 2- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project on the IFS list?

Yes ☐ 20 points / No ☒ 0 points

OR- If answer is no-
Is the project for sustainable transport, walking or cycling? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points
Does the project respond to growth? Score 0-10 points _____
*a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the legal test
Reasons: No further comments from panel at this time.
Question 2 total score: n/a

Question 3:

Have you secured match funding to increase potential outputs from the project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 3:

This question addresses the RESPONSIBILITY requirement. Community Infrastructure Levy funds are to be used for the public benefit. It is important that we can demonstrate that the investment of public money in the project provides services people need and value for money. Match-funding is one element of this, but sometimes match funding is not available.

You should consider:

Is the cost of the scheme justified? i.e. Is there proof of different quotes? does the cost appear reasonably proportionate? Has the bidder provided any due-diligence information/ enough financial information?

Does the project offer value for money? i.e. is the amount of CIL investment balanced with the urgency, importance and scale of the community's need? Has match-funding been explored as an option?

Does the project secure infrastructure for people now and in the future? i.e. how long will the project serve the public? Is that balanced with the amount of investment? Does the bidder control the land and/or infrastructure asset that will

result from the investment so that we can be confident it will remain open to the public?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional** funds (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent).

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

Question 3- Panel Feedback

Has match-funding been secured?

Yes ☐ 10 points / No ☒ 0 points

OR

Has the bid examined all funding possibilities and robustly justified why these have not been pursued?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☒ 0 points

Is the cost of the scheme justified, and does it offer value for money?

Score 0-10 points _0_

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the responsibility test**

Reasons:

The panel's finding results in the bid being disqualified in its current scheme.

The panel comments that the value for money is not justified, if over the period of 5 years the bid would simply provide a single car without response to growth. There is no clear strategy for scaling the scheme up.

The panel is concerned that this scheme seems to be a private investment scheme into a for-profit company. In which case, whilst the scheme may be meritorious, it would not be appropriate to use CIL to kick-start a privately owned scheme. The panel would have appreciated reassurance in the financial break down and governance detailing of this bid.

The panel felt the overall costing could have been made clearer in general (i.e. understanding exactly what was being funded).

The bid failed to provide any evaluation of potential match-funding or alternatives, other than GCC officer time, offered in-kind. That in-kind offer was then included in the total costs requested from CIL.

Question 3 total score:
Disqualification 0

Question 4:

Is the project deliverable and what is the time frame? Have you considered alternative options to deliver the outcome of your project? Are enough CIL funds currently available?

~Total possible score: 30

Panel Advice for Question 3:

This group of questions address the ACCOUNTABILITY requirement. If we are investing public money in infrastructure projects, we have to be certain that the project can and will go ahead. This means understanding when and how the project will be delivered, who will be accountable and whether it is properly funded.

You should consider:

Is the project deliverable? I.e. has the bidder provided a project plan? Are there clear roles and responsibilities? Is there a timescale involved? Does the bidder have a track record of delivering similar projects or can then point to similar feasible examples? Does the bid explain how the providers will report progress back to the Council?

Has the bid considered alternative options? Is the bid the best and most effective route for meeting the needs identified? This is particularly important where there are competing bids for similar infrastructure, or where the scheme seeks a large investment into infrastructure which is to meet future needs (are the needs known and is the extent of investment justified?). Aside from the match-funding question, is CIL the best route for this infrastructure- are there other responsible bodies who could provide this infrastructure?

Are enough CIL funds currently available?

This can automatically exclude bids. If there is sufficient funding, but the scheme seeks a large financial investment of CIL- does the bid phase the development so that CIL funding can be drawn down only when required? Does the bid provide for future revenue to maintain the infrastructure into the future (the greater the investment, the longer term the infrastructure maintenance should be secured)?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional funds** (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent). We can allocate money for contingency funding, on the basis that a separate request for the money will need to be made alongside proof of the additional cost/ spend. Contingency costs must be noted.

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response)

Question 4- Panel Feedback

Is the project deliverable?

Yes ☐ Score 0-10 points _____ / No ☐ 0

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification** n/a

Has the bid considered alternative options?

Yes ☐ Score 0-10 points _____ / No ☒ 0

Are there enough CIL funds available?

Yes ☐ Score 0-10 points _____ / No ☐ 0

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification**

Are there any costs which should not be included? Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, specify-

Contingencies

£6,080.00

£3,000.00

£400.00

Costs are not actuals- and are subject to procurement. Agreement to fund would need to be conditional upon costing up to an agreed total.

<p>Reasons:</p> <p>Panel noted project would be sponsored by GCC, which has an excellent track record of delivery, however, the delivery mechanism and relationship with private providers was not clear. Costing for the bid would need to be 'up to' with a draw down agreement, as there were no final costings.</p> <p>The panel also queries about how bays/ parking would be provisioned if the project grew and highlights that this would be potential delivery risk/ future work/ additional cost.</p>
<p>Question 4 total score: n/a</p>

Summary Panel Feedback	
Has the bid been disqualified?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Total score _____	
Recommendation for funding?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Any costs to be removed?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If yes, please specify- Contingency fees must be noted. They can be included as a separate total for a later draw-down.</p>	
Total recommended for funding (if applicable) _____	
<p>Overall feedback for bidder:</p> <p>Whilst the panel could see merit in this bid, it has been excluded from funding from the strategic CIL fund at this time on the basis that it was not strategic in scale/ offer (in the absence of being an identified infrastructure scheme in strategic policy). If the bid had not been excluded, the panel would still have had additional concerns around funding the scheme for public benefit, responsibility and value of money which would need to be addressed before any further bid were made.</p> <p>The project timings for kick-start appeared drawn-out and unclear. The panel questions whether the sufficient collaboration on car parking bay provision has been pursued prior to bidding.</p>	

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Bid Panel Feedback Sheet Strategic Fund

CIL is for investment in infrastructure which meets local needs. It must be spent in the public interest and the rules around spending it are strict.

Whilst each bidder has been made aware of these requirements and has been given the opportunity to amend their bids according to the scoring matrix and officer advice.

This checklist will be provided as feedback to any unsuccessful bidders, so please ensure you fill in the boxes.

Bid Name	Fairford Town Grassroots Growth Project
Bidder	Fairford Town Football Club and Fairford Town Academy
Proposed infrastructure project	3G pitch, fencing, netting, floodlighting and access paths.
Amount of bid	£209,000.00

Question 1:

Is the project identified in policies SA1, SA2 or SA3 of the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan as an essential or critical project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 1:

This question addresses the STRATEGIC requirement.

The approach in these policies has moved on somewhat, so, if the project is not included in one of these policies but does refer to the overall aims and growth identified in the Local Plan, it may still attract a score of up to 10. Importantly, the project must have a STRATEGIC impact- so it must benefit a large number of residents or meet the needs of residents from more than one settlement.

The policies are:

Policy SA1 STRATEGY DELIVERY - SOUTH COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the South Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

- Romney House Surgery, Tetbury - expansion or relocation; and
- New doctors' surgery in Cirencester.

Flood management

- SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk.

Highways

Junction improvements at:

- A429 / Cherrytree Lane, Cirencester;
- A417 (High Street) / A361 (Thames Street), Lechlade;
- A417 / Whelford Road, between Fairford and Lechlade;
- A429 / A433, between Cirencester and Kemble; and
- A433 (London Road / Long Street) / Hampton Street / New Church Street, Tetbury.

Sport & Recreation

- Re-use of the former Cirencester to Kemble and Tetbury to Kemble railway lines for cycling; and
- Cycling infrastructure in Cirencester, including improvements to Tetbury Road and London Road corridors

Policy SA2 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - MID-COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the Mid-Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Highways Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068), Stow-on-the-Wold

Policy SA3 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - NORTH COTSWOLDS

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the North Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

Expansion or replacement of doctors' surgery in Chipping Campden.

Flood management

Flood alleviation bund and channel to the north-west and south of Moreton-in-Marsh.

Highways

Improvements to A429 (Fosse Way),

Moreton-in-Marsh; Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Oxford Street),

Moreton-in-Marsh; and Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Bourton Road),

Moreton-in-Marsh.

Education

Expansion of Chipping Campden Secondary School.

Question 1- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project in policies SA1-3?

Yes ☐ 20 points / No ☒

If answer is no-

Is the project strategic? Yes ☒ capable of a score / No ☐ 0 points

*a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the strategic test
Does the bid refer to other planning policies which support the need for the scheme? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points
Does the project respond to infrastructure needs identified in other evidence-based studies? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points
Reasons: Policies SA1-SA3 are limited in their sports and recreation infrastructure requirements. However, there is clearly evidenced need for additional sports and recreation facilities in the District. The panel commends the bidders on a well evidenced bid, which refers to specific strategic policies and evidence-based documents, including the Playing Pitch Strategy. It is clear the bidders intend to engage with a range of sports providers and local community groups to meet as wide a range of needs as possible, including a community outreach which would extend well beyond Fairford itself.
Question 1 total score: 10/ 20

Question 2: Is the project identified in the IFS as a CIL spending priority? If not, is there sufficient justification to fund a project that is not on the priority list? ~Total possible score: 20
Panel Advice for Question 2: This question is outdated but remains in our matrix and needs to be answered. The real aim of the question is the LEGAL requirement for CIL spending-

Regulation 59 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) requires that CIL is spent to fund infrastructure which supports the development of its area.

Our IFS list originated in 2016 (it's based on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)). Back then, we identified infrastructure needed to support the housing and employment development in our Local Plan. It is a short list to increase road capacity to deal with the additional traffic from housing. In 2019, we declared a climate emergency and now prefer sustainable travel over private traffic/ road improvements. The list also doesn't address other non-transport related infrastructure needs for healthy and sustainable communities.

The last IFS acknowledged made an important caveat-
"The Council's focus has changed towards sustainable transport and enabling the modal shift away from car use as the main form of transport. Infrastructure projects that alleviate the pressure on these junctions via sustainable means are therefore preferred over projects that directly increase highway capacity as currently listed".

It's therefore important that you understand that not being included on the IFS list should not preclude bids. However, bids **MUST** show that they address the infrastructure needs arising from growth. We've broken this question down to help you answer it.

The IFS List-

Parish	Project
Kemble	Junction improvements at A429/ A433, between Cirencester and Kemble
Kemble	Re-use of the former railway line for cycling (successful bid 2024)
Lechlade	Junction improvements at A417/ Whelford Road between Fairford and Lechlade
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (Fosseway)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Oxford Street)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Bourton Road)
Stow-on-the-Wold	Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068)
Tetbury	Junction improvements at A433 (London Road/ Long Street) / Hampton Street/ New Church Street
South Cotswolds	SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk

To determine whether the project responds to growth, you should discuss-

- Does it respond to increased population (or increased in demographic groups such as children, older people or disabled people) by increasing the capacity of quality of existing services, or providing new services?
- Has the bid identified where that growth has come from/ evidenced it?
 - Have they referred to particular development?
 - Have they referred to any infrastructure evidence studies?
- Has the bid identified *how* it will provide that service to our residents-
 - Will it be open and accessible to the public now and into the future? i.e. is it free or chargeable, if chargeable, where is the revenue going?
FYI- Private companies gaining profit are NOT providing infrastructure to the public and cannot be considered for bids.
 - Does it explain how it will meet current and future needs?
 - What outreach/ advertising or other public engagement is planned?

Question 2- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project on the IFS list?

Yes ☐ 20 points / No ☒ 0 points

OR- If answer is no-

Is the project for sustainable transport, walking or cycling?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☒ 0 points

Does the project respond to growth?

Score 6 (0-10 points)

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the legal test**

Reasons:

Although the sports facility proposed would be in Fairford, close to the boundary of the District, the panel is content that the infrastructure provided would reach a wide demographic both within and without the District. The panel considers the bid would be responding to pre-planned and speculative growth. The panel is pleased to see the bid referred to specific examples of growth and a robust evidence base of need.

The score allocated by the panel is reflective of the fact that there is a similar bid for a sports pitch facility at Farmor School in Faringdon, which would offer a larger facility. The panel considers that the alternative scheme could better meet the needs of growth in the District due to its increased offer. The panel nonetheless notes that the Playing pitch strategy identifies a 1.75 pitch undersupply across the District.

Question 2 total score:
6/ 20

Question 3:

Have you secured match funding to increase potential outputs from the project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 3:

This question addresses the RESPONSIBILITY requirement. Community Infrastructure Levy funds are to be used for the public benefit. It is important that we can demonstrate that the investment of public money in the project provides services people need and value for money. Match-funding is one element of this, but sometimes match funding is not available.

You should consider:

Is the cost of the scheme justified? i.e. Is there proof of different quotes? does the cost appear reasonably proportionate? Has the bidder provided any due-diligence information/ enough financial information?

Does the project offer value for money? i.e. is the amount of CIL investment balanced with the urgency, importance and scale of the community's need? Has match-funding been explored as an option?

Does the project secure infrastructure for people now and in the future? i.e. how long will the project serve the public? Is that balanced with the amount of investment? Does the bidder control the land and/or infrastructure asset that will result from the investment so that we can be confident it will remain open to the public?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)

- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional funds** (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent).

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST be removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

Question 3- Panel Feedback

Has match-funding been secured?

Yes ☒ 10 points / No ☐ 0 points

OR

Has the bid examined all funding possibilities and robustly justified why these have not been pursued?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☐ 0 points

Is the cost of the scheme justified, and does it offer value for money?

Score 6 (0-10 points)

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the responsibility test**

Reasons:

The panel is pleased to see that match funding had been explored in detail within the bid. The panel recognises that whilst match-funding was identified that it is not necessarily guaranteed without CIL funding.

The panel feels the bid offers a good cost-to-benefit for the use of public money. However, the panel questions whether the costing projections are realistic or too conservative. For example, the planning expert members of the panel felt the planning costs could be considerably greater for a scheme of this type than those identified due to noise, lighting and ecological survey requirements to support an application.

The panel shared the same comment in respect of another similar bid, although the alternative bid appeared slightly more robust in its costing overall. Understated costs increase the risk to overall project delivery, and so the score given is reflective of this.

Question 3 total score:
16 / 20

Question 4:

Is the project deliverable and what is the time frame? Have you considered alternative options to deliver the outcome of your project? Are enough CIL funds currently available?

~Total possible score: 30

Panel Advice for Question 3:

This group of questions address the ACCOUNTABILITY requirement. If we are investing public money in infrastructure projects, we have to be certain that the project can and will go ahead. This means understanding when and how the project will be delivered, who will be accountable and whether it is properly funded.

You should consider:

Is the project deliverable? I.e. has the bidder provided a project plan? Are there clear roles and responsibilities? Is there a timescale involved? Does the bidder have a track record of delivering similar projects or can then point to similar feasible examples? Does the bid explain how the providers will report progress back to the Council?

Has the bid considered alternative options? Is the bid the best and most effective route for meeting the needs identified? This is particularly important where there are competing bids for similar infrastructure, or where the scheme seeks a large investment into infrastructure which is to meet future needs (are the needs known and is the extent of investment justified?). Aside from the match-funding question, is CIL the best route for this infrastructure- are there other responsible bodies who could provide this infrastructure?

Are enough CIL funds currently available?

This can automatically exclude bids. If there is sufficient funding, but the scheme seeks a large financial investment of CIL- does the bid phase the development so that CIL funding can be drawn down only when required? Does the bid provide for future revenue to maintain the infrastructure into the future (the greater the investment, the longer term the infrastructure maintenance should be secured)?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional** funds (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent). We can allocate money for contingency funding, on the basis that a separate request for the money will need to be

made alongside proof of the additional cost/ spend. Contingency costs must be noted.

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

Question 4- Panel Feedback

Is the project deliverable?

Yes ☒ Score 4 (0-10 points) / No ☐ 0

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification**

Has the bid considered alternative options?

Yes ☒ Score 4 (0-10 points)/ No ☐ 0

Are there enough CIL funds available?

Yes ☒ Score 3 (0-10 points) / No ☐ 0

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification**

Are there any costs which should not be included? Yes ☒ No ☐

**If yes, specify-
Contingencies
£27,000.00**

Costs are not actuals- and are subject to procurement. Agreement to fund would need to be conditional upon costing up to an agreed total.

Reasons:

The project is reliant on several stages and is currently at concept stage. The panel therefore considers the scheme to be relatively high-risk in delivery. The panel notes an alternative bid for a similar sports facility in Faringdon had already engaged with the pre-application planning process, which gives greater confidence in the deliverability of that project in comparison to this. The other scheme also had more realistic costings, which reduces the risk to delivery. The panel acknowledges a plan for intended engagement but feels that the other scheme had already carried out extensive engagement.

There are enough CIL funds available for this bid in isolation, however, there are not enough funds for all bids this year. The panel considers that there is potential

for significant overlap between this bid and another bid (Farmor School). On balance, the panel prefers the other bid and is reluctant to approve both bids without establishing fully that each bid would meet the needs of growth in combination. As such, the panel has awarded a lower score for available funds.

Question 4 total score:
11/ 30

Summary Panel Feedback

Has the bid been disqualified? Yes ☐ No ☒

Total score 43

Recommendation for funding? Yes ☐ No ☒

Any costs to be removed? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, please specify-
Contingency fees must be noted. They can be included as a separate total for a later draw-down.

Total recommended for funding (if applicable) 0

Overall feedback for bidder:

The panel commends the bidders for the work put into this bid. Panel members with expertise in leisure and local football communicated to the panel that Fairford Town Football Club is a well-known and well-organised club. The panel feels the Club and Academy have a compelling bid. Unfortunately, this year is a very competitive year for CIL bids and the panel must prioritise which bids to recommend for funding. Whilst the panel acknowledges there is value to having a pitch available during the day for wider demographics such as walking football groups, it is not convinced at this time that the bid has a sufficiently unique offer.

The panel feels an alternative bid has a greater strategic impact, which is accountable, responsible and further along with public engagement. As such, the panel regrettably does not recommend this bid for funding this year.

The panel would welcome a repeated bid next year (bidding period to commence circa May 2026) after the bidders have had the opportunity to work with the school to ensure the two schemes could co-exist to meet the needs of growth without redundant duplication of offer.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Bid Panel Feedback Sheet Strategic Fund

CIL is for investment in infrastructure which meets local needs. It must be spent in the public interest and the rules around spending it are strict.

Whilst each bidder has been made aware of these requirements and has been given the opportunity to amend their bids according to the scoring matrix and officer advice.

This checklist will be provided as feedback to any unsuccessful bidders, so please ensure you fill in the boxes.

Bid Name	Moreton-in-Marsh Transport Hub
Bidder	Great Western Railway (GWR) and Moreton in Marsh Town Council
Proposed infrastructure project	Improvements to M-i-M railway station to create a transport hub
Amount of bid	£4,066,628.00 total (£3,257,037.00 single phase)

Question 1:

Is the project identified in policies SA1, SA2 or SA3 of the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan as an essential or critical project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 1:

This question addresses the STRATEGIC requirement.

The approach in these policies has moved on somewhat, so, if the project is not included in one of these policies but does refer to the overall aims and growth identified in the Local Plan, it may still attract a score of up to 10. Importantly, the project must have a STRATEGIC impact- so it must benefit a large number of residents or meet the needs of residents from more than one settlement.

The policies are:

Policy SA1 STRATEGY DELIVERY - SOUTH COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the South Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

- Romney House Surgery, Tetbury - expansion or relocation; and
- New doctors' surgery in Cirencester.

Flood management

- SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk.

Highways

Junction improvements at:

- A429 / Cherrytree Lane, Cirencester;
- A417 (High Street) / A361 (Thames Street), Lechlade;
- A417 / Whelford Road, between Fairford and Lechlade;
- A429 / A433, between Cirencester and Kemble; and
- A433 (London Road / Long Street) / Hampton Street / New Church Street, Tetbury.

Sport & Recreation

- Re-use of the former Cirencester to Kemble and Tetbury to Kemble railway lines for cycling; and
- Cycling infrastructure in Cirencester, including improvements to Tetbury Road and London Road corridors

Policy SA2 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - MID-COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the Mid-Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Highways Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068), Stow-on-the-Wold

Policy SA3 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - NORTH COTSWOLDS

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the North Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

Expansion or replacement of doctors' surgery in Chipping Campden.

Flood management

Flood alleviation bund and channel to the north-west and south of Moreton-in-Marsh.

Highways

Improvements to A429 (Fosse Way),

Moreton-in-Marsh; Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Oxford Street),

Moreton-in-Marsh; and Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Bourton Road),

Moreton-in-Marsh.

Education

Expansion of Chipping Campden Secondary School.

Question 1- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project in policies SA1-3?

Yes ☐ 20 points / No ☒

If answer is no-

Is the project strategic? Yes ☒ capable of a score / No ☐ 0 points

<p>*a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the strategic test</p>
<p>Does the bid refer to other planning policies which support the need for the scheme?</p> <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points</p>
<p>Does the project respond to infrastructure needs identified in other evidence-based studies?</p> <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0 points</p>
<p>Reasons:</p> <p><i>Policies SA1-3 do not make provision for rail improvements or transport hubs, however the improvements suggested in this bid could contribute towards the modal shift aspirations of both the Council and the County Council. The panel nonetheless feels the evidence submitted with the bid as to the extent of impact on modal shift arising from the hub is limited.</i></p> <p><i>The panel acknowledges the bid to be strategic in scale and as such has chosen not to automatically exclude the bid. A score of 10 is automatic as a result. However, the panel has significant concerns around the strategic demand for this infrastructure, which is not evidenced in the bid as mentioned above.</i></p> <p><i>The planning experts of the panel highlighted that the bid does not reflect the current strategic policies of the Local Plan, albeit it complies with them to the extent that planning permission is granted for the scheme. Although the bid is strategic in scale, the panel is concerned that making such a large investment in infrastructure prior to a clear spatial strategy under the emerging local plan could undermine the delivery of essential infrastructure necessary to deliver the emerging plan.</i></p> <p><i>The panel notes correspondence both in support of the scheme as a strategic infrastructure project, and against; for the same reasons as discussed by the panel. Whilst the panel understands that there are often mixed views on development proposals, it considers that the mixed views in this case are reflective of the lack of current consensus or direction on future growth which will be provided via the emerging plan.</i></p>
<p>Question 1 total score:</p> <p>10 / 20</p>

Question 2:

Is the project identified in the IFS as a CIL spending priority? If not, is there sufficient justification to fund a project that is not on the priority list?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 2:

This question is outdated but remains in our matrix and needs to be answered.

The real aim of the question is the LEGAL requirement for CIL spending- *Regulation 59 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) requires that CIL is spent to fund infrastructure which supports the development of its area.*

Our IFS list originated in 2016 (it’s based on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)). Back then, we identified infrastructure needed to support the housing and employment development in our Local Plan. It is a short list to increase road capacity to deal with the additional traffic from housing. In 2019, we declared a climate emergency and now prefer sustainable travel over private traffic/ road improvements. The list also doesn’t address other non-transport related infrastructure needs for healthy and sustainable communities.

The last IFS acknowledged made an important caveat-
“The Council’s focus has changed towards sustainable transport and enabling the modal shift away from car use as the main form of transport. Infrastructure projects that alleviate the pressure on these junctions via sustainable means are therefore preferred over projects that directly increase highway capacity as currently listed”.

It’s therefore important that you understand that not being included on the IFS list should not preclude bids. However, bids MUST show that they address the infrastructure needs arising from growth. We’ve broken this question down to help you answer it.

The IFS List-

Parish	Project
Kemble	Junction improvements at A429/ A433, between Cirencester and Kemble
Kemble	Re-use of the former railway line for cycling (successful bid 2024)

Lechlade	Junction improvements at A417/ Whelford Road between Fairford and Lechlade
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (Fosseway)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Oxford Street)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Bourton Road)
Stow-on-the-Wold	Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068)
Tetbury	Junction improvements at A433 (London Road/ Long Street) / Hampton Street/ New Church Street
South Cotswolds	SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk

To determine whether the project responds to growth, you should discuss-

- Does it respond to increased population (or increased in demographic groups such as children, older people or disabled people) by increasing the capacity of quality of existing services, or providing new services?
- Has the bid identified where that growth has come from/ evidenced it?
 - Have they referred to particular development?
 - Have they referred to any infrastructure evidence studies?
- Has the bid identified *how* it will provide that service to our residents-
 - Will it be open and accessible to the public now and into the future? i.e. is it free or chargeable, if chargeable, where is the revenue going?
FYI- Private companies gaining profit are NOT providing infrastructure to the public and cannot be considered for bids.
 - Does it explain how it will meet current and future needs?
 - What outreach/ advertising or other public engagement is planned?

Question 2- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project on the IFS list?

Yes ☐ 20 points / No ☒ 0 points

OR- If answer is no-

Is the project for sustainable transport, walking or cycling?

Yes ☒ 5 points / No ☐ 0 points

Does the project respond to growth?

Score 2 (0-10 points)

*a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the legal test
<p>Reasons:</p> <p>As outlined above, the panel is concerned that the project does not respond to known or anticipated growth, which has yet to be defined through the plan-led process. The panel also query why the bid is not supported with detailed transport modelling. An interchange hub will, to some extent, respond to existing population and will encourage use of sustainable transport facilities. The planning expert members of the panel also highlighted that the scheme now benefits from planning permission. The panel opts to give a score in recognition of that, rather than automatically exclude the scheme.</p>
<p>Question 2 total score: 7/ 20</p>

<p>Question 3:</p> <p>Have you secured match funding to increase potential outputs from the project?</p> <p>~Total possible score: 20</p>
<p>Panel Advice for Question 3:</p> <p>This question addresses the RESPONSIBILITY requirement. Community Infrastructure Levy funds are to be used for the public benefit. It is important that we can demonstrate that the investment of public money in the project provides services people need and value for money. Match-funding is one element of this, but sometimes match funding is not available.</p> <p>You should consider:</p> <p>Is the cost of the scheme justified? i.e. Is there proof of different quotes? does the cost appear reasonably proportionate? Has the bidder provided any due-diligence information/ enough financial information?</p> <p>Does the project offer value for money? i.e. is the amount of CIL investment balanced with the urgency, importance and scale of the community's need? Has match-funding been explored as an option?</p> <p>Does the project secure infrastructure for people now and in the future? i.e. how long will the project serve the public? Is that balanced with the amount of investment? Does the bidder control the land and/or infrastructure asset that will</p>

result from the investment so that we can be confident it will remain open to the public?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional** funds (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent).

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

Question 3- Panel Feedback

Has match-funding been secured?

Yes ☐ 10 points / No ☒ 0 points

OR

Has the bid examined all funding possibilities and robustly justified why these have not been pursued?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☒ 0 points

Is the cost of the scheme justified, and does it offer value for money?

Score 2 (0-10 points)

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the responsibility test**

Reasons:

The panel is not satisfied that sufficient information has been submitted with the bid to break down the costs, justify them, nor explain the funding model for the scheme in the future. The panel is disappointed to see that no match funding from relevant stakeholders has been explored or secured, other than the existing spends made to secure planning permission.

The panel understands that the bidders were advised to phase the cost of £4,066,628.00 and the bidders have responded. The bid now seeks £3,257,037.00 for this year, with the remainder (or other total) to be sought next year. Whilst the scheme is a moderate undertaking of work, the panel does not feel that the costs have been justified, particularly the significant increase in cost (double) to the previous bid for the same work. The panel considers the cost is also disproportionate to the benefit/ growth that the scheme purports to respond to at this time.

The panel is also concerned that the funding would represent a significant proportion of the total CIL receipts collected by the council since the introduction of a CIL charge and expects that a higher threshold of justification is provided.

The panel is not convinced that the benefits of the scheme are proportionate to the cost. That being said, the panel does wish to feedback that a bid demonstrating an understanding car parking demand in Moreton in Marsh would have garnered more support/ weight, particularly if it had addressed parking, interconnectivity, EVC use and settlement networks via public transport.

The carparking experts of the panel highlight that the carpark is currently run by APCOA on behalf of GWR and the resulting revenue go to APCOA with a proportion paid back to GWR. The panel is concerned that the increased revenue arising from the carparking improvements would be passed to a private company (which would not be an appropriate following CIL investment) and that no match-funding from other stakeholders is being explored or secured. Similarly, the panel considers that the revenue may also be passed back to the Department of Transport or GWR, again with those stakeholders offering no match-funding. The future revenue off-set of the cost was not evidenced to the panel.

The panel also points out that the bid includes a unit which would be made available to a small business- again the panel has concerns that there is no provision for those profits to be put back into investment in the public realm.

Question 3 total score:
2/ 20

Question 4:

Is the project deliverable and what is the time frame? Have you considered alternative options to deliver the outcome of your project? Are enough CIL funds currently available?

~Total possible score: 30

Panel Advice for Question 3:

This group of questions address the ACCOUNTABILITY requirement.

If we are investing public money in infrastructure projects, we have to be certain that the project can and will go ahead. This means understanding when and how the project will be delivered, who will be accountable and whether it is properly funded.

You should consider:

Is the project deliverable? I.e. has the bidder provided a project plan? Are there clear roles and responsibilities? Is there a timescale involved? Does the bidder have a track record of delivering similar projects or can then point to similar feasible examples? Does the bid explain how the providers will report progress back to the Council?

Has the bid considered alternative options? Is the bid the best and most effective route for meeting the needs identified? This is particularly important where there are competing bids for similar infrastructure, or where the scheme seeks a large investment into infrastructure which is to meet future needs (are the needs known and is the extent of investment justified?). Aside from the match-funding question, is CIL the best route for this infrastructure- are there other responsible bodies who could provide this infrastructure?

Are enough CIL funds currently available?

This can automatically exclude bids. If there is sufficient funding, but the scheme seeks a large financial investment of CIL- does the bid phase the development so that CIL funding can be drawn down only when required? Does the bid provide for future revenue to maintain the infrastructure into the future (the greater the investment, the longer term the infrastructure maintenance should be secured)?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional** funds (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent). We can allocate money for contingency funding, on the basis that a separate request for the money will need to be made alongside proof of the additional cost/ spend. Contingency costs must be noted.

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

<p>Is the project deliverable?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Score 7 (0-10 points) / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0</p> <p>*a 0 score is an automatic disqualification</p>
<p>Has the bid considered alternative options?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Score 0-10 points _____ / No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0</p>
<p>Are there enough CIL funds available?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Score 0-10 points _____ / No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0</p> <p>*a 0 score is an automatic disqualification</p>
<p>Are there any costs which should not be included? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>If yes, specify- Contingencies and officer time. See Annex A of bid.</p> <p>Costs are not actuals- and are subject to procurement. Agreement to fund would need to be conditional upon costing up to an agreed total.</p>
<p>Reasons:</p> <p>The panel has regard to GWR's proven track record of delivering such schemes and considers a 20% contingency is reasonable (subject to the CIL contingency approach). The panel does consider that such a high-cost scheme is naturally high-risk, so the score reflects this.</p> <p>The panel is not satisfied that the costs have been justified nor that the scheme represents value for money. The increase in cost over the course of a year is a serious basis for such views in the panel. The panel believes that there is potential for better value options for achieving similar benefits, which the bid does not address.</p> <p>There are not sufficient CIL funds for all projects this year. This bid represents the lion's share of not only this year's bids, but the entire total of CIL receipts since CIL became chargeable. The panel is concerned that the scheme is wholly reliant on CIL and phasing to secure additional funding next year, and there is no guarantee that such funding would be available (CIL receipts are not guaranteed). The panel believes this could result in an unviable scheme, and the bid has done little to address this risk.</p>

Question 4 total score: 7/ 30

Summary Panel Feedback	
Has the bid been disqualified?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Total score <u>26</u>	
Recommendation for funding?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Any costs to be removed?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If yes, please specify-</p> <p>Contingency fees must be noted. They can be included as a separate total for a later draw-down.</p>	
Total recommended for funding (if applicable) <u>0</u>	
<p>Overall feedback for bidder:</p> <p>The panel recognises the potential benefits of the scheme and strongly supports schemes for sustainable transport in the district. However, concerns around cost-benefit, cost-justification, lack of match funding and predominantly, not responding to anticipated growth (which has yet to be defined), override these benefits. Regrettably, the panel recommends that funding is not provided this year.</p>	

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Bid Panel Feedback Sheet Strategic Fund

CIL is for investment in infrastructure which meets local needs. It must be spent in the public interest and the rules around spending it are strict.

Whilst each bidder has been made aware of these requirements and has been given the opportunity to amend their bids according to the scoring matrix and officer advice.

This checklist will be provided as feedback to any unsuccessful bidders, so please ensure you fill in the boxes.

Bid Name	Community All-Weather Multipurpose Sports Pitch
Bidder	Farmor's School, Fairford
Proposed infrastructure project	All weather sports pitch
Amount of bid	£723,006.00

Question 1:

Is the project identified in policies SA1, SA2 or SA3 of the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan as an essential or critical project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 1:

This question addresses the STRATEGIC requirement.

The approach in these policies has moved on somewhat, so, if the project is not included in one of these policies but does refer to the overall aims and growth identified in the Local Plan, it may still attract a score of up to 10. Importantly, the project must have a STRATEGIC impact- so it must benefit a large number of residents or meet the needs of residents from more than one settlement.

The policies are:

Policy SA1 STRATEGY DELIVERY - SOUTH COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the South Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

- Romney House Surgery, Tetbury - expansion or relocation; and
- New doctors' surgery in Cirencester.

Flood management

- SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk.

Highways

Junction improvements at:

- A429 / Cherrytree Lane, Cirencester;
- A417 (High Street) / A361 (Thames Street), Lechlade;
- A417 / Whelford Road, between Fairford and Lechlade;
- A429 / A433, between Cirencester and Kemble; and
- A433 (London Road / Long Street) / Hampton Street / New Church Street, Tetbury.

Sport & Recreation

- Re-use of the former Cirencester to Kemble and Tetbury to Kemble railway lines for cycling; and
- Cycling infrastructure in Cirencester, including improvements to Tetbury Road and London Road corridors

Policy SA2 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - MID-COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the Mid-Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Highways Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068), Stow-on-the-Wold

Policy SA3 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - NORTH COTSWOLDS

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the North Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

Expansion or replacement of doctors' surgery in Chipping Campden.

Flood management

Flood alleviation bund and channel to the north-west and south of Moreton-in-Marsh.

Highways

Improvements to A429 (Fosse Way),

Moreton-in-Marsh; Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Oxford Street), Moreton-in-Marsh; and Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Bourton Road), Moreton-in-Marsh.

Education

Expansion of Chipping Campden Secondary School.

Question 1- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project in policies SA1-3?

Yes ☐ **20 points** / **No** ☒

If answer is no-

Is the project strategic? Yes ☒ **capable of a score** / **No** ☐ **0 points**

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the strategic test**

<p>Does the bid refer to other planning policies which support the need for the scheme?</p> <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points</p>
<p>Does the project respond to infrastructure needs identified in other evidence-based studies?</p> <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points</p>
<p>Reasons:</p> <p>Policies SA1-SA3 are limited in their sports and recreation infrastructure requirements. However, there is clearly evidenced need for additional sports and recreation facilities in the District.</p> <p>The panel commends the bidders on a well evidenced bid, which refers to specific strategic policies and evidence-based documents, including the Playing Pitch Strategy. It is clear the bidders have engaged with a range of sports providers and local community groups to meet as wide a range of needs as possible, including a community outreach which would extend well beyond Fairford itself.</p>
<p>Question 1 total score:</p> <p>10 / 20</p>

<p>Question 2:</p> <p>Is the project identified in the IFS as a CIL spending priority? If not, is there sufficient justification to fund a project that is not on the priority list?</p> <p>~Total possible score: 20</p>
<p>Panel Advice for Question 2:</p> <p>This question is outdated but remains in our matrix and needs to be answered.</p> <p>The real aim of the question is the LEGAL requirement for CIL spending- <i>Regulation 59 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) requires that CIL is spent to fund <u>infrastructure</u> which <u>supports the development of its area</u>.</i></p> <p>Our IFS list originated in 2016 (it's based on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)). Back then, we identified infrastructure needed to support the housing and</p>

employment development in our Local Plan. It is a short list to increase road capacity to deal with the additional traffic from housing. In 2019, we declared a climate emergency and now prefer sustainable travel over private traffic/ road improvements. The list also doesn't address other non-transport related infrastructure needs for healthy and sustainable communities.

The last IFS acknowledged made an important caveat-
 "The Council's focus has changed towards sustainable transport and enabling the modal shift away from car use as the main form of transport. Infrastructure projects that alleviate the pressure on these junctions via sustainable means are therefore preferred over projects that directly increase highway capacity as currently listed".

It's therefore important that you understand that not being included on the IFS list should not preclude bids. However, bids **MUST** show that they address the infrastructure needs arising from growth. We've broken this question down to help you answer it.

The IFS List-

Parish	Project
Kemble	Junction improvements at A429/ A433, between Cirencester and Kemble
Kemble	Re-use of the former railway line for cycling <i>(successful bid 2024)</i>
Lechlade	Junction improvements at A417/ Whelford Road between Fairford and Lechlade
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (Fosseway)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Oxford Street)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Bourton Road)
Stow-on-the-Wold	Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068)
Tetbury	Junction improvements at A433 (London Road/ Long Street) / Hampton Street/ New Church Street
South Cotswolds	SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk

To determine whether the project responds to growth, you should discuss-

- Does it respond to increased population (or increased in demographic groups such as children, older people or disabled people) by increasing the capacity of quality of existing services, or providing new services?

- Has the bid identified where that growth has come from/ evidenced it?
 - Have they referred to particular development?
 - Have they referred to any infrastructure evidence studies?
- Has the bid identified *how* it will provide that service to our residents-
 - Will it be open and accessible to the public now and into the future?
i.e. is it free or chargeable, if chargeable, where is the revenue going?
FYI- Private companies gaining profit are NOT providing infrastructure to the public and cannot be considered for bids.
 - Does it explain how it will meet current and future needs?
 - What outreach/ advertising or other public engagement is planned?

Question 2- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project on the IFS list?

Yes ☐ 20 points / No ☒ 0 points

OR- If answer is no-

Is the project for sustainable transport, walking or cycling?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☒ 0 points

Does the project respond to growth?

Score 7 (0-10 points)

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the legal test**

Reasons:

Although the sports facility proposed would be in Fairford, close to the boundary of the District, the panel is content that the infrastructure provided would reach a wide demographic both within and without the District. The panel considers the bid would be responding to pre-planned and speculative growth. The panel is pleased to see the bid referred to specific examples of growth and a robust evidence base of need.

The score allocated by the panel is reflective of the fact that there is a similar bid for a sports pitch facility by Fairford Town Football Club in Faringdon, which would offer a smaller facility. The panel considers that the Farmor School scheme could better meet the needs of growth in the District due to its increased offer, albeit it notes that the school facility would likely have limited general access during school hours. The panel nonetheless notes that the Playing pitch strategy identifies a 1.75 pitch undersupply across the District.

Question 2 total score: 7 / 20

Question 3:

Have you secured match funding to increase potential outputs from the project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 3:

This question addresses the RESPONSIBILITY requirement. Community Infrastructure Levy funds are to be used for the public benefit. It is important that we can demonstrate that the investment of public money in the project provides services people need and value for money. Match-funding is one element of this, but sometimes match funding is not available.

You should consider:

Is the cost of the scheme justified? i.e. Is there proof of different quotes? does the cost appear reasonably proportionate? Has the bidder provided any due-diligence information/ enough financial information?

Does the project offer value for money? i.e. is the amount of CIL investment balanced with the urgency, importance and scale of the community's need? Has match-funding been explored as an option?

Does the project secure infrastructure for people now and in the future? i.e. how long will the project serve the public? Is that balanced with the amount of investment? Does the bidder control the land and/or infrastructure asset that will result from the investment so that we can be confident it will remain open to the public?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional** funds (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent).

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).
Question 3- Panel Feedback
Has match-funding been secured? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points OR Has the bid examined all funding possibilities and robustly justified why these have not been pursued? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points
Is the cost of the scheme justified, and does it offer value for money? Score 7 (0-10 points) *a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the responsibility test
Reasons: The panel considers the scheme offers good value for money based on longevity, revenue for maintenance, and wide offer. The panel questioned whether the costing projections were realistic or too conservative; for example, the planning expert members of the panel felt the planning costs could be greater for a scheme of this type than those identified noise, lighting and ecological survey requirements to support an application. However, the panel considers the costing for this scheme to be more realistic.
Question 3 total score: 17/ 20

Question 4: Is the project deliverable and what is the time frame? Have you considered alternative options to deliver the outcome of your project? Are enough CIL funds currently available? ~Total possible score: 30
Panel Advice for Question 3:

This group of questions address the ACCOUNTABILITY requirement.

If we are investing public money in infrastructure projects, we have to be certain that the project can and will go ahead. This means understanding when and how the project will be delivered, who will be accountable and whether it is properly funded.

You should consider:

Is the project deliverable? I.e. has the bidder provided a project plan? Are there clear roles and responsibilities? Is there a timescale involved? Does the bidder have a track record of delivering similar projects or can then point to similar feasible examples? Does the bid explain how the providers will report progress back to the Council?

Has the bid considered alternative options? Is the bid the best and most effective route for meeting the needs identified? This is particularly important where there are competing bids for similar infrastructure, or where the scheme seeks a large investment into infrastructure which is to meet future needs (are the needs known and is the extent of investment justified?). Aside from the match-funding question, is CIL the best route for this infrastructure- are there other responsible bodies who could provide this infrastructure?

Are enough CIL funds currently available?

This can automatically exclude bids. If there is sufficient funding, but the scheme seeks a large financial investment of CIL- does the bid phase the development so that CIL funding can be drawn down only when required? Does the bid provide for future revenue to maintain the infrastructure into the future (the greater the investment, the longer term the infrastructure maintenance should be secured)?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional** funds (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent). We can allocate money for contingency funding, on the basis that a separate request for the money will need to be made alongside proof of the additional cost/ spend. Contingency costs must be noted.

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

<p>Is the project deliverable?</p> <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Score 5 (0-10 points) / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0</p> <p>*a 0 score is an automatic disqualification</p>
<p>Has the bid considered alternative options?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Score 4 (0-10 points) / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0</p>
<p>Are there enough CIL funds available?</p> <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Score 4 (0-10 points) / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0</p> <p>*a 0 score is an automatic disqualification</p>
<p>Are there any costs which should not be included? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>If yes, specify- Contingency- proportion against whole cost, amount to be calculated.</p>
<p>Reasons:</p> <p>The planning expert members of the panel noted that the school had already engaged with the pre-application planning process and had already carried out extensive engagement. Panel members also noted that there had previously been leisure facilities at Farmor School and felt that the school has a good track record of providing such facilities.</p> <p>The project is reliant on several stages and is currently at concept stage. The panel therefore considers the scheme to be relatively high-risk in delivery. The panel notes that the bidders have already engaged with the pre-application planning process, which gives greater confidence in the deliverability of this project in comparison to the other Faringdon sports bid. This scheme also has more realistic costings, which reduces the risk to delivery. The panel acknowledges the bidders have already carried out extensive engagement.</p> <p>There are enough CIL funds available for this bid in isolation, however, there are not enough funds for all bids this year. The panel considers that there is potential for significant overlap between this bid and another bid (the Football Club). On balance, the panel prefers this bid. The panel is reluctant to approve both bids without establishing fully that each bid would meet the needs of growth in combination. As such, the panel has awarded a score for available funds based on this.</p>

The panel appreciates the effort that the bidder has put into securing match funding. The panel notes that the scheme has a reliance on match funding which may not be guaranteed without CIL funding or other requirements being met, which increases the risk to delivery.

Question 4 total score:
13 / 30

Summary Panel Feedback

Has the bid been disqualified? Yes ☐ No ☒

Total score 47

Recommendation for funding? Yes ☒ No ☐

Any costs to be removed? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, please specify-

Contingency fees must be noted. They can be included as a separate total for a later draw-down.

Caveats re phasing.

Total recommended for funding (if applicable) _____

Overall feedback for bidder:

The panel wishes to thank the bidder for submitting such a complete, well evidenced and compelling bid. The panel is pleased to be able to recommend the scheme for CIL funding.

This recommendation is made subject to the submission of a full project plan and regular reporting (per standard legal agreements). Given the reliance on match funding, the panel would like to phase the funding to protect viability- so the Council would work with the bidder to break down the funding draw-down to mitigate the risk of loss of public monies.

The panel would recommend that the School, as the successful bidder, engages with the Football Club and Academy ahead of the next bidding term to consider whether it could incorporate the football club's needs or establish a collaborative approach if the Club chooses to re-bid.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Bid Panel Feedback Sheet Strategic Fund

CIL is for investment in infrastructure which meets local needs. It must be spent in the public interest and the rules around spending it are strict.

Whilst each bidder has been made aware of these requirements and has been given the opportunity to amend their bids according to the scoring matrix and officer advice.

This checklist will be provided as feedback to any unsuccessful bidders, so please ensure you fill in the boxes.

Bid Name	The Redesdale Hall Phase 2
Bidder	The Redesdale Hall Trust, Moreton-in-Marsh
Proposed infrastructure project	Hall improvements and repairs
Amount of bid	£200,000.00

Question 1:

Is the project identified in policies SA1, SA2 or SA3 of the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan as an essential or critical project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 1:

This question addresses the STRATEGIC requirement.

The approach in these policies has moved on somewhat, so, if the project is not included in one of these policies but does refer to the overall aims and growth identified in the Local Plan, it may still attract a score of up to 10. Importantly, the project must have a STRATEGIC impact- so it must benefit a large number of residents or meet the needs of residents from more than one settlement.

The policies are:

Policy SA1 STRATEGY DELIVERY - SOUTH COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the South Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

- Romney House Surgery, Tetbury - expansion or relocation; and
- New doctors' surgery in Cirencester.

Flood management

- SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk.

Highways

Junction improvements at:

- A429 / Cherrytree Lane, Cirencester;
- A417 (High Street) / A361 (Thames Street), Lechlade;
- A417 / Whelford Road, between Fairford and Lechlade;
- A429 / A433, between Cirencester and Kemble; and
- A433 (London Road / Long Street) / Hampton Street / New Church Street, Tetbury.

Sport & Recreation

- Re-use of the former Cirencester to Kemble and Tetbury to Kemble railway lines for cycling; and
- Cycling infrastructure in Cirencester, including improvements to Tetbury Road and London Road corridors

Policy SA2 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - MID-COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the Mid-Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Highways Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068), Stow-on-the-Wold

Policy SA3 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - NORTH COTSWOLDS

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the North Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

Expansion or replacement of doctors' surgery in Chipping Campden.

Flood management

Flood alleviation bund and channel to the north-west and south of Moreton-in-Marsh.

Highways

Improvements to A429 (Fosse Way),

Moreton-in-Marsh; Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Oxford Street), Moreton-in-Marsh; and Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Bourton Road), Moreton-in-Marsh.

Education

Expansion of Chipping Campden Secondary School.

Question 1- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project in policies SA1-3?

Yes ☐ **20 points** / **No** ☒

If answer is no-

Is the project strategic? Yes ☐ **capable of a score** / **No** ☐ **0 points**

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the strategic test**

Does the bid refer to other planning policies which support the need for the scheme?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☐ 0 points

Does the project respond to infrastructure needs identified in other evidence-based studies?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☐ 0 points

Reasons:

NOTE- scale of investment vs emerging and existing LP.

Question 1 total score:

/ 20

Question 2:

Is the project identified in the IFS as a CIL spending priority? If not, is there sufficient justification to fund a project that is not on the priority list?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 2:

This question is outdated but remains in our matrix and needs to be answered.

The real aim of the question is the LEGAL requirement for CIL spending- *Regulation 59 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) requires that CIL is spent to fund infrastructure which supports the development of its area.*

Our IFS list originated in 2016 (it's based on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)). Back then, we identified infrastructure needed to support the housing and employment development in our Local Plan. It is a short list to increase road capacity to deal with the additional traffic from housing. In 2019, we declared a climate emergency and now prefer sustainable travel over private traffic/ road improvements. The list also doesn't address other non-transport related infrastructure needs for healthy and sustainable communities.

The last IFS acknowledged made an important caveat-
 "The Council's focus has changed towards sustainable transport and enabling the modal shift away from car use as the main form of transport. Infrastructure projects that alleviate the pressure on these junctions via sustainable means are therefore preferred over projects that directly increase highway capacity as currently listed".

It's therefore important that you understand that not being included on the IFS list should not preclude bids. However, bids MUST show that they address the infrastructure needs arising from growth. We've broken this question down to help you answer it.

The IFS List-

Parish	Project
Kemble	Junction improvements at A429/ A433, between Cirencester and Kemble
Kemble	Re-use of the former railway line for cycling (successful bid 2024)
Lechlade	Junction improvements at A417/ Whelford Road between Fairford and Lechlade
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (Fosseway)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Oxford Street)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Bourton Road)
Stow-on-the-Wold	Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068)
Tetbury	Junction improvements at A433 (London Road/ Long Street) / Hampton Street/ New Church Street
South Cotswolds	SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk

To determine whether the project responds to growth, you should discuss-

- Does it respond to increased population (or increased in demographic groups such as children, older people or disabled people) by increasing the capacity of quality of existing services, or providing new services?
- Has the bid identified where that growth has come from/ evidenced it?
 - Have they referred to particular development?
 - Have they referred to any infrastructure evidence studies?
- Has the bid identified *how* it will provide that service to our residents-
 - Will it be open and accessible to the public now and into the future? i.e. is it free or chargeable, if chargeable, where is the revenue going?
 - FYI- Private companies gaining profit are NOT providing infrastructure to the public and cannot be considered for bids.***
 - Does it explain how it will meet current and future needs?
 - What outreach/ advertising or other public engagement is planned?

Question 2- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project on the IFS list?

Yes ☐ 20 points / No ☒ 0 points

OR- If answer is no-

Is the project for sustainable transport, walking or cycling?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☒ 0 points

Does the project respond to growth?

Score 0-10 points _____

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the legal test**

Reasons:

Question 2 total score:
/ 20

Question 3:

Have you secured match funding to increase potential outputs from the project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 3:

This question addresses the RESPONSIBILITY requirement. Community Infrastructure Levy funds are to be used for the public benefit. It is important that we can demonstrate that the investment of public money in the project provides services people need and value for money. Match-funding is one element of this, but sometimes match funding is not available.

You should consider:

Is the cost of the scheme justified? i.e. Is there proof of different quotes? does the cost appear reasonably proportionate? Has the bidder provided any due-diligence information/ enough financial information?

Does the project offer value for money? i.e. is the amount of CIL investment balanced with the urgency, importance and scale of the community's need? Has match-funding been explored as an option?

Does the project secure infrastructure for people now and in the future? i.e. how long will the project serve the public? Is that balanced with the amount of investment? Does the bidder control the land and/or infrastructure asset that will result from the investment so that we can be confident it will remain open to the public?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional** funds (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent).

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

Is the project deliverable and what is the time frame? Have you considered alternative options to deliver the outcome of your project? Are enough CIL funds currently available?

Panel Advice for Question 3:

This group of questions address the ACCOUNTABILITY requirement.

If we are investing public money in infrastructure projects, we have to be certain that the project can and will go ahead. This means understanding when and how the project will be delivered, who will be accountable and whether it is properly funded.

You should consider:

Is the project deliverable? I.e. has the bidder provided a project plan? Are there clear roles and responsibilities? Is there a timescale involved? Does the bidder have a track record of delivering similar projects or can then point to similar feasible examples? Does the bid explain how the providers will report progress back to the Council?

Has the bid considered alternative options? Is the bid the best and most effective route for meeting the needs identified? This is particularly important where there are competing bids for similar infrastructure, or where the scheme seeks a large investment into infrastructure which is to meet future needs (are the needs known and is the extent of investment justified?). Aside from the match-funding question, is CIL the best route for this infrastructure- are there other responsible bodies who could provide this infrastructure?

Are enough CIL funds currently available?

This can automatically exclude bids. If there is sufficient funding, but the scheme seeks a large financial investment of CIL- does the bid phase the development so that CIL funding can be drawn down only when required? Does the bid provide for future revenue to maintain the infrastructure into the future (the greater the investment, the longer term the infrastructure maintenance should be secured)?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional** funds (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent). We can allocate money for contingency funding, on the basis that a separate request for the money will need to be made alongside proof of the additional cost/ spend. Contingency costs must be noted.

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

<p>Is the project deliverable?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Score 0-10 points _____ / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0</p> <p>*a 0 score is an automatic disqualification</p>
<p>Has the bid considered alternative options?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Score 0-10 points _____ / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0</p>
<p>Are there enough CIL funds available?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Score 0-10 points _____ / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0</p> <p>*a 0 score is an automatic disqualification</p>
<p>Are there any costs which should not be included? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>If yes, specify- Contingency- proportion against whole cost, amount to be calculated.</p>
<p>Reasons:</p>
<p>Question 4 total score: / 30</p>

Summary Panel Feedback		
Has the bid been disqualified?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Total score _____		
Recommendation for funding?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Any costs to be removed?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

If yes, please specify-

Contingency fees must be noted. They can be included as a separate total for a later draw-down.

Total recommended for funding (if applicable) _____

Overall feedback for bidder:

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Bid Panel Feedback Sheet Strategic Fund

CIL is for investment in infrastructure which meets local needs. It must be spent in the public interest and the rules around spending it are strict.

Whilst each bidder has been made aware of these requirements and has been given the opportunity to amend their bids according to the scoring matrix and officer advice.

This checklist will be provided as feedback to any unsuccessful bidders, so please ensure you fill in the boxes.

Bid Name	Weston Sub-Edge Village Hall Sole Community Car Park
Bidder	Weston Sub-Edge Village Hall Charity
Proposed infrastructure project	Car park repairs
Amount of bid	£20,000.00

Question 1:

Is the project identified in policies SA1, SA2 or SA3 of the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan as an essential or critical project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 1:

This question addresses the STRATEGIC requirement.

The approach in these policies has moved on somewhat, so, if the project is not included in one of these policies but does refer to the overall aims and growth identified in the Local Plan, it may still attract a score of up to 10. Importantly, the project must have a STRATEGIC impact- so it must benefit a large number of residents or meet the needs of residents from more than one settlement.

The policies are:

Policy SA1 STRATEGY DELIVERY - SOUTH COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the South Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

- Romney House Surgery, Tetbury - expansion or relocation; and
- New doctors' surgery in Cirencester.

Flood management

- SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk.

Highways

Junction improvements at:

- A429 / Cherrytree Lane, Cirencester;
- A417 (High Street) / A361 (Thames Street), Lechlade;
- A417 / Whelford Road, between Fairford and Lechlade;
- A429 / A433, between Cirencester and Kemble; and
- A433 (London Road / Long Street) / Hampton Street / New Church Street, Tetbury.

Sport & Recreation

- Re-use of the former Cirencester to Kemble and Tetbury to Kemble railway lines for cycling; and
- Cycling infrastructure in Cirencester, including improvements to Tetbury Road and London Road corridors

Policy SA2 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - MID-COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the Mid-Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Highways Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068), Stow-on-the-Wold

Policy SA3 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - NORTH COTSWOLDS

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the North Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

Expansion or replacement of doctors' surgery in Chipping Campden.

Flood management

Flood alleviation bund and channel to the north-west and south of Moreton-in-Marsh.

Highways

Improvements to A429 (Fosse Way),

Moreton-in-Marsh; Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Oxford Street), Moreton-in-Marsh; and Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Bourton Road), Moreton-in-Marsh.

Education

Expansion of Chipping Campden Secondary School.

Question 1- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project in policies SA1-3?

Yes ☐ **20 points** / **No** ☒

If answer is no-

Is the project strategic? Yes ☐ **capable of a score** / **No** ☒ **0 points**

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the strategic test**

<p>Does the bid refer to other planning policies which support the need for the scheme?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points</p>
<p>Does the project respond to infrastructure needs identified in other evidence-based studies?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points</p>
<p>Reasons:</p> <p>The panel can see the merits of this scheme and carefully considered its detail. However, this scheme is not within the IDP or strategic policies and the strategic nature of the scheme (greater than local influence, scale of impact) has not been evidenced. The bid is therefore automatically excluded.</p>
<p>Question 1 total score:</p> <p>0 / 20</p>

<p>Question 2:</p> <p>Is the project identified in the IFS as a CIL spending priority? If not, is there sufficient justification to fund a project that is not on the priority list?</p> <p>~Total possible score: 20</p>
<p>Panel Advice for Question 2:</p> <p>This question is outdated but remains in our matrix and needs to be answered.</p> <p>The real aim of the question is the LEGAL requirement for CIL spending- <i>Regulation 59 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) requires that CIL is spent to fund <u>infrastructure which supports the development of its area.</u></i></p> <p>Our IFS list originated in 2016 (it's based on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)). Back then, we identified infrastructure needed to support the housing and employment development in our Local Plan. It is a short list to increase road capacity to deal with the additional traffic from housing. In 2019, we declared a climate emergency and now prefer sustainable travel over private traffic/ road</p>

improvements. The list also doesn't address other non-transport related infrastructure needs for healthy and sustainable communities.

The last IFS acknowledged made an important caveat-
 "The Council's focus has changed towards sustainable transport and enabling the modal shift away from car use as the main form of transport. Infrastructure projects that alleviate the pressure on these junctions via sustainable means are therefore preferred over projects that directly increase highway capacity as currently listed".

It's therefore important that you understand that not being included on the IFS list should not preclude bids. However, bids **MUST** show that they address the infrastructure needs arising from growth. We've broken this question down to help you answer it.

The IFS List-

Parish	Project
Kemble	Junction improvements at A429/ A433, between Cirencester and Kemble
Kemble	Re-use of the former railway line for cycling (successful bid 2024)
Lechlade	Junction improvements at A417/ Whelford Road between Fairford and Lechlade
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (Fosseway)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Oxford Street)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Bourton Road)
Stow-on-the-Wold	Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068)
Tetbury	Junction improvements at A433 (London Road/ Long Street) / Hampton Street/ New Church Street
South Cotswolds	SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk

To determine whether the project responds to growth, you should discuss-

- Does it respond to increased population (or increased in demographic groups such as children, older people or disabled people) by increasing the capacity of quality of existing services, or providing new services?
- Has the bid identified where that growth has come from/ evidenced it?
 - Have they referred to particular development?

- Have they referred to any infrastructure evidence studies?
- Has the bid identified *how* it will provide that service to our residents-
 - Will it be open and accessible to the public now and into the future?
i.e. is it free or chargeable, if chargeable, where is the revenue going?
 - FYI- Private companies gaining profit are NOT providing infrastructure to the public and cannot be considered for bids.***
 - Does it explain how it will meet current and future needs?
 - What outreach/ advertising or other public engagement is planned?

Question 2- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project on the IFS list?

Yes ☐ 20 points / No ☒ 0 points

OR- If answer is no-

Is the project for sustainable transport, walking or cycling?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☒ 0 points

Does the project respond to growth?

Score 0-10 points

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the legal test**

Reasons:

Question 2 total score:

/ 20

Question 3:

Have you secured match funding to increase potential outputs from the project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 3:

This question addresses the RESPONSIBILITY requirement. Community Infrastructure Levy funds are to be used for the public benefit. It is important that we can demonstrate that the investment of public money in the project provides services people need and value for money. Match-funding is one element of this, but sometimes match funding is not available.

You should consider:

Is the cost of the scheme justified? i.e. Is there proof of different quotes? does the cost appear reasonably proportionate? Has the bidder provided any due-diligence information/ enough financial information?

Does the project offer value for money? i.e. is the amount of CIL investment balanced with the urgency, importance and scale of the community's need? Has match-funding been explored as an option?

Does the project secure infrastructure for people now and in the future? i.e. how long will the project serve the public? Is that balanced with the amount of investment? Does the bidder control the land and/or infrastructure asset that will result from the investment so that we can be confident it will remain open to the public?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional funds** (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent).

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

Question 3- Panel Feedback

Has match-funding been secured?

Yes ☐ 10 points / No ☐ 0 points

OR

Has the bid examined all funding possibilities and robustly justified why these have not been pursued?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☐ 0 points

Is the cost of the scheme justified, and does it offer value for money?

Score 0-10 points _____

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the responsibility test**

Reasons:

Question 3 total score:
/ 20

Question 4:

Is the project deliverable and what is the time frame? Have you considered alternative options to deliver the outcome of your project? Are enough CIL funds currently available?

~Total possible score: 30

Panel Advice for Question 3:

This group of questions address the ACCOUNTABILITY requirement.

If we are investing public money in infrastructure projects, we have to be certain that the project can and will go ahead. This means understanding when and how the project will be delivered, who will be accountable and whether it is properly funded.

You should consider:

Is the project deliverable? I.e. has the bidder provided a project plan? Are there clear roles and responsibilities? Is there a timescale involved? Does the bidder have a track record of delivering similar projects or can then point to similar feasible examples? Does the bid explain how the providers will report progress back to the Council?

Has the bid considered alternative options? Is the bid the best and most effective route for meeting the needs identified? This is particularly important where there are competing bids for similar infrastructure, or where the scheme seeks a large investment into infrastructure which is to meet future needs (are the needs known and is the extent of investment justified?). Aside from the match-funding question, is CIL the best route for this infrastructure- are there other responsible bodies who could provide this infrastructure?

Are enough CIL funds currently available?

This can automatically exclude bids. If there is sufficient funding, but the scheme seeks a large financial investment of CIL- does the bid phase the development so that CIL funding can be drawn down only when required? Does the bid provide for future revenue to maintain the infrastructure into the future (the greater the investment, the longer term the infrastructure maintenance should be secured)?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional** funds (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent). We can allocate money for contingency funding, on the basis that a separate request for the money will need to be made alongside proof of the additional cost/ spend. Contingency costs must be noted.

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

<p>Is the project deliverable?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Score 0-10 points _____ / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0</p> <p>*a 0 score is an automatic disqualification</p>
<p>Has the bid considered alternative options?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Score 0-10 points _____ / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0</p>
<p>Are there enough CIL funds available?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Score 0-10 points _____ / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0</p> <p>*a 0 score is an automatic disqualification</p>
<p>Are there any costs which should not be included? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>If yes, specify- Contingency- proportion against whole cost, amount to be calculated.</p>
<p>Reasons:</p>
<p>Question 4 total score: / 30</p>

Summary Panel Feedback		
Has the bid been disqualified?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Total score _____ 0 _____</p>		
Recommendation for funding?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Any costs to be removed?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

If yes, please specify-

Total recommended for funding (if applicable) _____0_____

Overall feedback for bidder:

The panel is familiar with the car park in question and understands the motivations behind this bid. The panel would also like to thank the bidder for the efforts they made in making this bid. However, as outlined above, this scheme is not within the IDP or strategic policies and the strategic nature of the scheme (greater than local influence, scale of impact) has not been evidenced. The bid is therefore automatically excluded.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Bid Panel Feedback Sheet Strategic Fund

CIL is for investment in infrastructure which meets local needs. It must be spent in the public interest and the rules around spending it are strict.

Bidders have been made aware of these requirements and several sought additional advice. Bidders who engaged with this process were given the opportunity to amend their bids according to the scoring matrix and officer advice.

This checklist will be provided as feedback to any unsuccessful bidders, so please ensure you fill in the boxes.

Bid Name	Cycle parking Cotswold National Cycle Network (NCN)
Bidder	Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) and Sustrans (now Walk Wheel Cycle Trust)
Proposed infrastructure project	Cycle parking facilities across network settlement hubs.
Amount of bid	£27,000.00

Question 1:

Is the project identified in policies SA1, SA2 or SA3 of the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan as an essential or critical project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 1:

This question addresses the STRATEGIC requirement.

The approach in these policies has moved on somewhat, so, if the project is not included in one of these policies but does refer to the overall aims and growth identified in the Local Plan, it may still attract a score of up to 10. Importantly, the project must have a STRATEGIC impact- so it must benefit a large number of residents or meet the needs of residents from more than one settlement.

The policies are:

Policy SA1 STRATEGY DELIVERY - SOUTH COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the South Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

- Romney House Surgery, Tetbury - expansion or relocation; and
- New doctors' surgery in Cirencester.

Flood management

- SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk.

Highways

Junction improvements at:

- A429 / Cherrytree Lane, Cirencester;
- A417 (High Street) / A361 (Thames Street), Lechlade;
- A417 / Whelford Road, between Fairford and Lechlade;
- A429 / A433, between Cirencester and Kemble; and
- A433 (London Road / Long Street) / Hampton Street / New Church Street, Tetbury.

Sport & Recreation

- Re-use of the former Cirencester to Kemble and Tetbury to Kemble railway lines for cycling; and
- Cycling infrastructure in Cirencester, including improvements to Tetbury Road and London Road corridors

Policy SA2 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - MID-COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the Mid-Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Highways Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068), Stow-on-the-Wold

Policy SA3 STRATEGIC DELIVERY - NORTH COTSWOLDS

Within the context of Policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the North Cotswolds Sub-Area are:

Healthcare

Expansion or replacement of doctors' surgery in Chipping Campden.

Flood management

Flood alleviation bund and channel to the north-west and south of Moreton-in-Marsh.

Highways

Improvements to A429 (Fosse Way),

Moreton-in-Marsh; Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Oxford Street), Moreton-in-Marsh; and Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Bourton Road), Moreton-in-Marsh.

Education

Expansion of Chipping Campden Secondary School.

Question 1- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project in policies SA1-3?

Yes ☒ **20 points** / **No** ☐

If answer is no-
Is the project strategic? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> capable of a score / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points *a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the strategic test
Does the bid refer to other planning policies which support the need for the scheme? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points
Does the project respond to infrastructure needs identified in other evidence-based studies? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 5 points / No <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points
Reasons: <i>This proposal would provide for cycle parking facilities across the District, in line with the aims of Policies SA1-3. Policy SA1 specifically refers to Cycling infrastructure in Cirencester. Whilst policies SA2-3 refer to road junction improvements, the panel considers that the proposal meets the overall aims of improving connectivity generally, albeit by non-private car means. The improvements suggested in this bid meet therefore meet the strategic infrastructure requirements of the existing Local Plan in a sustainable way in line with the modal shift aspirations of both the Council and the County Council.</i> <i>As the project is recognised in the strategic policies of the Local Plan, it automatically garners a full score of 20.</i>
Question 1 total score: 20/20

Question 2:

Is the project identified in the IFS as a CIL spending priority? If not, is there sufficient justification to fund a project that is not on the priority list?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 2:

This question is outdated but remains in our matrix and needs to be answered.

The real aim of the question is the LEGAL requirement for CIL spending- *Regulation 59 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) requires that CIL is spent to fund infrastructure which supports the development of its area.*

Our IFS list originated in 2016 (it's based on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)). Back then, we identified infrastructure needed to support the housing and employment development in our Local Plan. It is a short list to increase road capacity to deal with the additional traffic from housing. In 2019, we declared a climate emergency and now prefer sustainable travel over private traffic/ road improvements. The list also doesn't address other non-transport related infrastructure needs for healthy and sustainable communities.

The last IFS acknowledged made an important caveat-
"The Council's focus has changed towards sustainable transport and enabling the modal shift away from car use as the main form of transport. Infrastructure projects that alleviate the pressure on these junctions via sustainable means are therefore preferred over projects that directly increase highway capacity as currently listed".

It's therefore important that you understand that not being included on the IFS list should not preclude bids. However, bids MUST show that they address the infrastructure needs arising from growth. We've broken this question down to help you answer it.

The IFS List-

Parish	Project
Kemble	Junction improvements at A429/ A433, between Cirencester and Kemble
Kemble	Re-use of the former railway line for cycling (successful bid 2024)
Lechlade	Junction improvements at A417/ Whelford Road between Fairford and Lechlade
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (Fosseway)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Oxford Street)
Moreton-in-Marsh	Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/ A44 (Bourton Road)

Stow-on-the-Wold	Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068)
Tetbury	Junction improvements at A433 (London Road/ Long Street) / Hampton Street/ New Church Street
South Cotswolds	SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk

To determine whether the project responds to growth, you should discuss-

- Does it respond to increased population (or increased in demographic groups such as children, older people or disabled people) by increasing the capacity of quality of existing services, or providing new services?
- Has the bid identified where that growth has come from/ evidenced it?
 - Have they referred to particular development?
 - Have they referred to any infrastructure evidence studies?
- Has the bid identified *how* it will provide that service to our residents-
 - Will it be open and accessible to the public now and into the future? i.e. is it free or chargeable, if chargeable, where is the revenue going?
FYI- Private companies gaining profit are NOT providing infrastructure to the public and cannot be considered for bids.
 - Does it explain how it will meet current and future needs?
 - What outreach/ advertising or other public engagement is planned?

Question 2- Panel Feedback

Is the infrastructure project on the IFS list?
 Yes ☐ 20 points / No ☒ 0 points

OR- If answer is no-

Is the project for sustainable transport, walking or cycling?
 Yes ☒ 5 points / No ☐ 0 points

Does the project respond to growth? **Score 0-10 points _8_**

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the legal test**

Reasons:
 The panel welcomes this sustainable transport cycling scheme, which aligns with the spatial strategy and meets objectives in the LCWIP.

The panel considers the proposal to be a well evidenced response to demonstrated needs. The proposal appears to take a targeted and wide-reaching approach which is focussed on identified growth hubs. The panel particularly notes that the scheme covers most of district.

The panel is pleased to see the scheme is supported by local statistics and detailed evidence and commends the bidders for the quality of this element of the bid.

The panel has no doubts that the scheme would meet the legal test for CIL investment. The car parking specialist members of the panel would like it noted that there is often an assumption that cycle stands and lockers are located within car parks, however, this should be actively discouraged as it reduces the overall number of available spaces and car parks are not the ideal place for bicycle storage. The panel would encourage further liaison with the bidder and car park providers/ the Council's car-parking team regarding the locations of these facilities.

Question 2 total score:
13/ 20

Question 3:

Have you secured match funding to increase potential outputs from the project?

~Total possible score: 20

Panel Advice for Question 3:

This question addresses the RESPONSIBILITY requirement. Community Infrastructure Levy funds are to be used for the public benefit. It is important that we can demonstrate that the investment of public money in the project provides services people need and value for money. Match-funding is one element of this, but sometimes match funding is not available.

You should consider:

Is the cost of the scheme justified? i.e. Is there proof of different quotes? does the cost appear reasonably proportionate? Has the bidder provided any due-diligence information/ enough financial information?

Does the project offer value for money? i.e. is the amount of CIL investment balanced with the urgency, importance and scale of the community's need? Has match-funding been explored as an option?

Does the project secure infrastructure for people now and in the future? i.e. how long will the project serve the public? Is that balanced with the amount of investment? Does the bidder control the land and/or infrastructure asset that will result from the investment so that we can be confident it will remain open to the public?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional** funds (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent).

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

Question 3- Panel Feedback

Has match-funding been secured?

Yes ☐ 10 points / No ☒ 0 points

OR

Has the bid examined all funding possibilities and robustly justified why these have not been pursued?

Yes ☐ 5 points / No ☒ 0 points

Is the cost of the scheme justified, and does it offer value for money?

Score 8 (0-10 points)

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification for failure to meet the responsibility test**

Reasons:

The cost to benefit of this scheme has been well-evidenced. Whilst detail around match-funding opportunities would have been desirable and should be embedded into future bids from this bidder, the panel nonetheless considers the overall funding ask is reasonable and proportionate to the scheme. As such, the bid garners a robust score from its justification.

The justification of cost did not receive a full score, as the panel would query whether the secure cycle parking would become self-sustaining over time.

Question 3 total score: 8 / 20

Question 4:

Is the project deliverable and what is the time frame? Have you considered alternative options to deliver the outcome of your project? Are enough CIL funds currently available?

~Total possible score: 30

Panel Advice for Question 4:

This group of questions address the ACCOUNTABILITY requirement. If we are investing public money in infrastructure projects, we have to be certain that the project can and will go ahead. This means understanding when and how the project will be delivered, who will be accountable and whether it is properly funded.

You should consider:

Is the project deliverable? I.e. has the bidder provided a project plan? Are there clear roles and responsibilities? Is there a timescale involved? Does the bidder have a track record of delivering similar projects or can then point to similar feasible examples? Does the bid explain how the providers will report progress back to the Council?

Has the bid considered alternative options? Is the bid the best and most effective route for meeting the needs identified? This is particularly important where there are competing bids for similar infrastructure, or where the scheme seeks a large investment into infrastructure which is to meet future needs (are the needs known and is the extent of investment justified?). Aside from the match-funding question, is CIL the best route for this infrastructure- are there other responsible bodies who could provide this infrastructure?

Are enough CIL funds currently available?

This can automatically exclude bids. If there is sufficient funding, but the scheme seeks a large financial investment of CIL- does the bid phase the development so that CIL funding can be drawn down only when required? Does the bid provide for future revenue to maintain the infrastructure into the future (the greater the investment, the longer term the infrastructure maintenance should be secured)?

Bids should NOT include funding for:

- **Cost of officer time of the bidder** (consultant professional fees for expert advice/ construction are permissible)
- **Contingency or 'just in case' additional** funds (we cannot provide public money which may not be spent). We can allocate money for contingency funding, on the basis that a separate request for the money will need to be made alongside proof of the additional cost/ spend. Contingency costs must be noted.

Bids that include these costs can still pass the responsibility test, BUT these costs MUST removed from the bids (please note this in the response).

Question 4- Panel Feedback

Is the project deliverable?

Yes ☒ Score 0-10 points 9 / No ☐ 0

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification**

Has the bid considered alternative options?

Yes ☒ Score 0-10 points 5 / No ☐ 0

Are there enough CIL funds available?

Yes ☒ Score 0-10 points 9 / No ☐ 0

***a 0 score is an automatic disqualification**

Are there any costs which should not be included? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, specify-

An unclear amount of contingency has been added.

Reasons:

The panel recognises that the County Council has a good and well-established record of delivering schemes of this type and that it has a good working relationship with the Walk, Wheel and Cycle Trust (WWCT). The WWCT also has a good record of facilitating such schemes. The panel opts to give just shy of full points due to the query above regarding locations for the facilities. The panel was satisfied that alternative options had been touched upon within the bid and accordingly awarded a mid-score.

There are enough CIL funds available for this scheme when considered in isolation, however, the bids received in 2025 exceeds the current balance of CIL in their totality. Nonetheless, this scheme has a relatively low and proportionate funding ask, and as such the panel opts to give just shy of full points in this respect.

An unclear amount of contingency has been added, which will need to be identified and separated out. The panel also notes as above that contingency fees cannot be paid out up-front and would be removed from any initial transfer of funds should the bid be successful. Evidence would then need to be provided to justify the draw-down of additional funds should the project cost more to implement than anticipated. The panel would have liked to have seen contingency clearly earmarked and shown as a proportion of the overall costing.

Question 4 total score:
23/30

Summary Panel Feedback

Has the bid been disqualified? Yes ☐ No ☒

Total score 63/100

Recommendation for funding? Yes ☒ No ☐

Any costs to be removed? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, please specify-

Contingency fees must be noted. They can be included as a separate total for a later draw-down.

Total recommended for funding (if applicable) £27,000.00 (contingency arrangements)

Overall feedback for bidder:

The panel would like to thank the bidders for this detailed and well justified bid. The panel feels the bid has been well structured. The panel is pleased to recommend the scheme for funding and looks forward to seeing positive outcomes. The panel would like to invite the bidders to engage with the Council regarding the locations of the facilities.

Annex A – CIL report – Cabinet 8 January 2026

--