



Council name	COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL
Name and date of Committee	CABINET – 8 JANUARY 2026
Subject	2025 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS
Wards affected	All
Accountable member	Juliet Layton – Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning Email: Juliet.layton@cotswold.gov.uk
Accountable officer	Helen Martin – Director of Communities and Place Email: helen.martin@cotswold.gov.uk
Report author	Kim Langford-Tejrar – Infrastructure Delivery Lead (Shared) Email: kim.langford-tejrar@westoxon.gov.uk
Summary/Purpose	A multidisciplinary officer panel has reviewed the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding bids received in 2025 and made recommendations as to which bids should receive funding for the 2025 bid period. To ensure impartiality, Council officers were invited via email, the staff portal and staff newsletter to volunteer to take part in the panel, subject to a conflict-of-interest declaration. This report provides summaries of those bids and officer feedback. Its purpose is to ask the Cabinet to agree officer recommendations for funding relevant bids and refuse funding for bids which are not suitable for funding currently. This is the second time since becoming a CIL charging authority in 2019 that the Council has received bids for funding. Upon receipt, a proportion of CIL goes direct to the district's neighbourhoods (parish meetings/councils and town councils) and the remainder goes to the Council's Strategic CIL fund. The bids subject of this report are requesting funding from the Strategic Fund. The amount of CIL funding bids for this year was greater than the amount of available funds in the CIL Strategic Fund. The multidisciplinary officer panel has made its recommendations based on the statutory requirements for CIL spending in the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) and to ensure that CIL is spent:



	• Legally • Responsibly • Strategically • Accountably
Annexes	Annex A – Officer Panel Feedback Forms
Recommendation(s)	That Cabinet resolves to: 1. Agree to allocate funding for the following bids, as set out in Table 4: • Cycle parking Cotswold National Cycle Network (GCC with Walk Wheel Cycle Trust) • Farmor's School 3G Pitch (Farmor's School) • Redesdale Hall Phase 2 (Redesdale Hall Trust) 2. Delegate authority to the Assistant Director Planning Services in consultation with the Cabinet member for Housing and Planning, to progress funding for approved bids in consultation with Legal Services and in line with the existing process.
Corporate priorities	• Delivering Good Services • Responding to the Climate Emergency • Supporting Communities
Key Decision	YES
Exempt	NO
Consultees/ Consultation	The existing process for CIL Strategic Fund funding involves ongoing engagement with the infrastructure providers and stakeholders, to generate bids for funding. Bidders are required to justify their bid based on the existing and potential needs of our communities in line with growth. The bidding period represents a significant internal and external consultation process, as set out in the report. There will be proposed changes and improvements to the bidding system and CIL governance generally, which will be brought before the Cabinet early next year.



1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Council collects funding from development through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). A portion of the levy goes towards a strategic fund (Community Infrastructure Levy Strategic Fund (CIL SF)), which can be used to deliver infrastructure to meet our residents' needs.
- 1.2 To make use of the fund, the Council engages with key stakeholders and advertises opportunities for infrastructure funding from the CIL SF annually. This year (2025) represents the second year in which bids have been submitted from stakeholders since CIL charging began for the Council in 2019.
- 1.3 The deadline for submitting bids this year was extended because a key stakeholder was unable to submit bids by the deadline, and because the amount of funding sought this year exceeds the amount of funding currently available in the CIL SF. The Infrastructure Delivery Team took additional time to engage and advise bidders and to offer additional opportunities for bidders to refine their bids.
- 1.4 Under the current Council CIL SF spending approach, there are no validation or evidential requirements for bids, other than responding to a pre-set scoring system. This has resulted in varied quality and detail in the bids, despite additional advice from officers.
- 1.5 Moreover, the current process puts great emphasis onto large-scale infrastructure projects identified in the current local plan (which is predominantly a list of highway improvements). Therefore, it is necessary to take a flexible approach in considering the current CIL SF bid scoring matrix to ensure the current and future needs of our residents are addressed through CIL SF funding. The Infrastructure Delivery Team proposes to review the governance of CIL in the new year and will be making recommendations to Cabinet on this basis.
- 1.6 In addition to the amount of funding sought exceeding the available CIL SF fund, there are also two bids which have an overlap of infrastructure offer.
- 1.7 A multidisciplinary panel of officers have reviewed all the bids to ensure they are legal, responsible, strategic and accountable, and has made recommendations as to which should receive funding from the CIL SF. Those recommendations, set out in Table 4, are referred to Cabinet for agreement.

2. BACKGROUND

Where does the Community Infrastructure Levy Strategic Fund (CIL SF) come from?



- 2.1 Developers are expected to make contributions towards new or improved infrastructure (such as play areas, public open spaces, healthcare, schools, roads, etc) to meet the community's needs arising from planned growth. Developer contributions are made via Section 106 planning obligations (S106) and/ or CIL. Cotswold District Council has been a CIL charging authority since June 2019.
- 2.2 CIL is charged at a set-rate per square metre of all liable residential and retail development. The charge is indexed annually for inflation and details of the charges are available on the Council's website¹.
- 2.3 Regulation 59 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) requires that charging authorities apply CIL to funding infrastructure to support development in its area, although a charging authority may also apply CIL to infrastructure outside of its area where to do so would support the development of the area.
- 2.4 Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) can adopt CIL charging schedules where they have established a clear need for additional funding and have robustly demonstrated that a CIL charge will not make the planned growth unviable. To establish the clear need for additional funding, the Council must:
 - Identify the infrastructure needs arising from growth in its Local Plan.
 - Use this to produce an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).
 - Review its infrastructure list annually in its Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS).
 - Alongside the IDP, establish the cost of critical and essential infrastructure for delivering the growth in the Local Plan and determine whether there is a funding gap.
- 2.5 A funding gap justifies the CIL charging rate, which must be set at a rate which does not undermine the viability of the Local Plan. As a result, CIL is inextricably linked to the plan-led approach. Understanding of this is important to the context of CIL bids received this year.
- 2.6 Due to the evidential process for justifying a CIL charging schedule, the CIL SF is often focussed towards large, high-cost infrastructure projects. The types of infrastructure which meet the everyday needs of our residents and help to establish or maintain healthy and sustainable communities (such as sports and community facilities) can be overlooked. Neighbourhood CIL (NCIL) paid to the individual neighbourhoods may, in some circumstances, bridge the gaps but it cannot address strategic (beyond local) needs for healthy and sustainable communities. To address this, the Infrastructure Delivery Team will bring forward recommendations for

¹ <https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/planning-and-building/community-infrastructure-levy/calculate-your-cil-charge/>



improvements to CIL governance and procedures for Cabinet consideration in the new year.

What are the rules for spending CIL?

- 2.7 When received, CIL is divided into three 'pots' in accordance with the CIL Regulations. The first 'pot' covers the administration of CIL and amounts to 5% of total receipts. The second 'pot' is a proportion of either 15% capped or 25% uncapped, which is passed directly to the 'neighbourhoods' (town and parish councils/ meetings) for their use towards localised infrastructure needs. The final 'pot' is the remainder, which is the CIL SF.
- 2.8 The CIL SF is intended to contribute towards the 'bigger ticket' strategic type infrastructure which meets the needs of a wider array of residents (in terms of demographics, quantum and/or geographic spread). The CIL SF is intended to enable the growth identified in the Local Plan, and for this reason, the scoring system for bids, which was set out when the Council began CIL charging in 2019, is weighted towards infrastructure which is identified in the IDP, IFS and certain strategic policies of the Local Plan. However, the Council's IDP was produced in 2016 for the current Local Plan, and as a result, the infrastructure items listed in the IDP do not necessarily reflect current infrastructure needs. The Council is producing a new Local Plan at pace, and as part of this process, it will also produce a new IDP and review the CIL charge. The IDP list is set out in the relevant feedback forms.
- 2.9 For this year's bids, a certain degree of flexibility around the inclusion of infrastructure in the 2016 IDP has been necessary, and the overall aims of the existing bid criteria/ scoring have been prioritised over the inclusion in the IDP or existing plan strategic policies. Bids which could refer to other up-to-date evidence-based documents to establish a strategic need/ response to growth have received proportionate scores, even where they have not been within the IDP or policies. This also means that, in rare cases, bids which have not been recommended for funding may have received a reasonable score in comparison to funding recommended bids on the basis of being identified infrastructure within the IDP or policies, but they have not been recommended for funding because they fail to demonstrate compliance with the overall aims of the bid criteria. The overall aims of the existing bid criteria when they were developed, were to ensure CIL SF spending is:
- Legal
 - Responsible
 - Strategic
 - Accountable.



Detailed explanations of these aims are set out in the feedback forms at Annex A of the Cabinet Report.

- 2.10 Any successful bids will be subject to a legal agreement which allows for clawback of unspent funds, phasing of payments and contingencies (to be paid only when evidenced as necessary). These agreements are to mitigate the risk of misappropriation or loss of public monies.
- 2.11 The governance of CIL and engagement around it, including the spending policy and process for CIL SF, are currently being reviewed. New governance recommendations are expected to be brought before Cabinet in the new year. In particular, this will make the bid system:
- Streamlined and easier to access.
 - Set evidentiary, responsibility and accountability standards for bids.
 - Increase transparency and consultation on bids.
 - Track potential infrastructure projects to establish a capital programme.
 - Better respond to current needs, putting infrastructure first as far as possible.
- 2.12 For more information on the Local Plan progression and CIL collection and spending, please see our website www.cotswold.gov.uk/CIL.

3. FUNDING AVAILABLE FROM THE CIL SF FUND

- 3.1 Some CIL SF funding has already been committed for the following successful bids in the 2024 bidding period. A large proportion of these funds has yet to be transferred to bidders due to the current spending procedure, which involves legal agreements.

Table 1- Previous Successful Bids- Allocated Funding

Scheme	Bidder	Amount Allocated (£)
Kemble to Steadings Greenway	Sustrans	180,301.00
Cirencester to Kemble Cycle Link	GCC / Sustrans	100,000.00
Bourton on the Water Interchange	GCC	137,700.00
Footpath in Moreton in Marsh	GCC	146,030.17
Forum Interchange Hub	GCC	66,300.00
Sherbourne Big Nature	National Trust	30,000.00
Total		660,331.17



- 3.2 The above bid funds have been secured and ring-fenced from the total CIL SF fund. 10% of the CIL SF fund is also ring-fenced on net receipts (less neighbourhood CIL) towards infrastructure for Climate and Ecological Emergencies (fund). Bids have also been received for the CEE fund, and these have been assessed according to their own criteria.

Table 2- Available CIL Funds

Totals	Amounts (£)
CIL SF held at end of bidding period	5,502,299.43
Of which Climate and Ecological Emergencies fund (CEE) (10%)	550,229.94
CIL SF total less CEE	4,952,069.49
2024 CIL SF successful bids	630,331.17
2025 CIL SF available (less successful bids)	4,321,738.32
2024 CEE successful bids	30,000.00
2025 CEE fund available (less successful bids)	520,229.94

- 3.3 The amount of funding requested this year has exceeded the total available SF fund. Table 3 below demonstrates this.

Table 3- Bid Totals

Bids	Amounts (£)
1a Cirencester LCWIP wayfinding	14,097.32
1b Cirencester LCWIP parallel crossing	109,731.48
2 Cycle parking CNC	27,700.00
3 Car club in Cirencester	56,880.00
4 Fairford Town Grassroots Growth Project	209,000.00
5 MiM Transport interchange hub	4,066,628.00
6 Farmor's School 3G pitch	723,006.00
7 Redesdale Hall Phase 2	200,000.00
8 Weston Sub Edge car park	20,000.00
2025 CIL SF bid total	5,427,852.80
2025 CIL SF Available	4,321,738.32
2025 CIL SF Deficit	1,106,114.48
9 CEE Grassland regeneration	100,000.00
10 CEE Take a stand cycle parking	25,000
2025 CEE bid total	125,000.00
2025 CEE fund available	520,229.94
2025 CEE left over if all bids CEE bids approved	395,229.94



4. THE SUMMARIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 The detail of the bids including the amount requested, what the bid is for and the panel outcome is set out in the below table. The detailed feedback, including the assessment criteria are in Annex A- Officer Panel Feedback Forms.

Table 4- Bid summary and recommendations

Bid	Bidder	Amount (£)	Bid Summary	Fund(?)	Reasons (summary)
1a Cirencester LCWIP wayfinding	GCC	14,097.32	Installation of enhanced wayfinding signs and a road crossing on London Road East, Cirencester	No	The scheme is within the IDP and policy, however, the bid does not sufficiently address the responsibility requirement for SF CIL. The costing for the scheme has not been justified and there are concerns over some costs included.
1b Cirencester LCWIP parallel crossing	GCC	109,731.48	As above.	No	The scheme is within the IDP and policy, however, the bid does not sufficiently address the responsibility requirement for SF CIL. The costing for the scheme has not been justified (also there are concerns over some costs included).
2 Cycle parking CNC	GCC and WWCT	27,700.00	Cycle parking provision along the route of	Yes	Whilst this scheme is not included in the IDP, which limits its scoring ability, it is a sustainable transport scheme specifically recognised in strategic policies. The panel felt this was an exemplar bid in terms of its



			Cotswold National Cycle Network		approach to strategic reach, legal test, responsibility and accountability. The panel took into the wide-reaching impact of this scheme.
3 Car club in Cirencester	GCC	56,880.00	Establishment of a car club in Cirencester. Purchase a single EV vehicle and acquire parking for it.	No	The scheme is not within the IDP or strategic policies. The strategic impact arising from this scheme would be limited as it is small in scale and does not address scaling up to meet needs of growth. The scheme failed to score on the strategic requirement and was automatically disqualified. The panel also had concerns around use of public money for investment in private enterprise (responsibility and accountability concerns).
4 Fairford Town Grassroots Growth Project	Fairford Town FC and Fairford Football Academy	209,000.00	3G pitch, fencing, netting, floodlighting and access paths.	No	This scheme is not within the IDP or strategic policies, which limits its score. The panel felt this was a well evidenced and carefully thought-out bid, which met the requirements for SF CIL. However, this bid was in competition with another bid for a larger facility in the same place. It was felt that the other bid was better able to serve the needs of the wider community and different demographics. On balance, the other bid appears to be more deliverable and well-costed (responsible and accountable). The panel has invited this bidder to engage with the successful bidder to meet its needs or otherwise bid again in the next bidding period (May 2026) if unmet need can still be evidenced.



5 MiM Transport interchange hub	GWR and MiM TC	4,066,628.00	Improvements to M-i-M Railway Station to create a transport hub (entrance and parking improvements)	No	This scheme is not within the IDP or strategic policies, limiting its ability to score. Sustainable transport is generally supported and encouraged by the Council. The panel opted to consider this scheme as strategic, due to its scale, nature and the fact it has planning permission. An unsuccessful bid was made for this scheme in 2024- refusal to fund was based on the lack of planning permission and questions over response to growth. The 2024 bid was for just over £2mil, the current bid has doubled on cost. The panel has serious concerns around the responsibility of funding this scheme, which calls for a large capital investment predominantly from CIL alone (little to no match funding from key stakeholders) and which does not respond to any current growth strategy. There were additional concerns around some costs included and the potential that some funds would be put towards private enterprise. The panel considers that the scheme could undermine other strategic infrastructure delivery arising through the emerging local plan and IDP (i.e. that it is premature to the IDP), which would have a detrimental impact on residents. Several vociferous consultation responses were received by the panel both in favour and against this scheme- including a disparity of views from the TC itself.
6 Farmor's School 3G pitch	Farmor's School	723,006.00	Community all-weather	Yes	This scheme is not within the IDP or strategic policies, which limits its score. The panel felt this was a well evidenced and carefully thought-out bid, which met the requirements for SF CIL. This bid was in competition with another bid for a smaller facility in the same place. It was felt that this



			multipurpose sports pitch		bid was better able to serve the needs of the wider community and different demographics. This bid appears to be more deliverable and well-costed (responsible and accountable). The panel has invited this bidder to engage with the unsuccessful bidder to meet its needs or assist with evidencing that the other bid would not overlap in offer. It was clear that a commendable amount of work had been put into this bid in terms of public engagement and preparation (including following the pre-application planning process).
7 Redesdale Hall Phase 2	Redesdale Hall Trust	200,000.00	Hall improvements and repairs (phase 2)	Yes	This scheme is not within the IDP or strategic policies, which limits its score. The panel felt that this bid evidenced the strategic nature of the hall, serving a wide range of residents/ groups over a broader geographical area than just M-i-M. The works would improve the qualitative offer of the hall and would be part 2 of an existing project which has been achieved via match-funding. The panel felt this bid was particularly commendable on deliverability and responsibility.
8 Weston Sub Edge car park	Weston Sub Edge PC	20,000.00	Improvements/ resurfacing of hall car park	No	This scheme is not within the IDP or strategic policies, which limits its score. The panel understands based on their local knowledge that this particular car park is used not only to access the community hall, but also nearby community recreation facilities, however, the strategic nature of the scheme had not been sufficiently evidenced for the purposes of SF CIL. The panel could see the merit in the scheme.



9 Grassland restoration	Glos. Wildlife Trust	100,000.00	Launch a project to promote grassland restoration via an engagement officer	No	This is a CEE bid, which has alternative criteria (see feedback form). The panel could see the merit of this scheme; however, the bid details are extremely limited and not evidenced out. Moreover, the panel is aware of similar schemes this may overlap and would like further detail on how this project would interact with that.
10 Take a Stand Cycle Parking	Life Cycle	25,000.00	Provide cycle parking at community venues	No	This bid was made under the CEE fund but does not meet the CEE requirements. The panel can see the merit in the scheme and can see it would complement the other similar bid by GCC and WWCT, however, the bid would need to address the relevant SF CIL criteria. The panel would invite this bid to be remade in the next bidding period (May 2026).



5. CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 The multidisciplinary officer panel puts these recommendations forward to Cabinet for endorsement. The next steps would then be to organise legal agreements and draw down of funds with successful bidders, as well as liaise with unsuccessful bidders about potential future funds.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The CIL SF fund is a standalone budget which cannot be spent on anything other than infrastructure projects in accordance with the CIL Regulations.
- 6.2 The financial implications of this funding would be that the funding is provided to external organisations and stakeholders in line with the CIL Regulations and the Council's own CIL processes.
- 6.3 There would necessarily be a reduction in current CIL SF balance, as set out in Table 5, however, this is continually topped up by CIL receipts which may.

Table 5- Available CIL receipts after funding approved bids

Totals	Amounts (£)
CIL SF available (less 2024 successful bids)	4,321,738.32
Successful Bid (Bid 2) Cycle parking CNC	27,700.00
Successful Bid (Bid 6) Farmor's School 3G Pitch	723,006.00
Successful Bid (Bid 7) Redesdale Hall Phase 2	200,000.00
2025 CIL SF available (less successful bids)	3,371,032.32

- 6.4 The amount of funding recommended this year is proportionate to the previous year's receipts and expected receipts for next year. The bids relate to capital projects, and there would be no revenue implications for the Council. The remaining CIL balance will be subject to bids for infrastructure in 2026, and any available funds can be used to contribute towards the delivery of infrastructure identified as critical to the emerging Local Plan. As set out in paragraph 2.6, recommendations for improvements to the governance and spending policy for CIL will be brought before Cabinet early next year.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The successful bids comply with the CIL legal requirements.
- 7.2 Legal services have provided template legal agreements, which will be signed and sealed before any funds are drawn down. These legal agreements contain reporting and other obligations for the bidders who intend to mitigate the risk of loss of the relevant CIL SF funding, and also provisions for clawback of unspent funds. The risk



of loss of CIL SF funding by relevant infrastructure projects not being delivered as agreed is limited and discrete.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 There are no significant risks to the Council in respect of CIL SF funding, other than the potential for external factors which might stymie the delivery of the infrastructure projects being delivered by the bidders (infrastructure stakeholders). This risk is discrete and isolated and is mitigated as above.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACT

- 9.1 The infrastructure funded in part or in full by the CIL SF fund will meet the needs of a wide demographic of residents, and none of the projects funded would be inaccessible to any groups or individuals. The CIL SF funding has a positive impact on equality, and the needs of all groups were considered in decision-making (per the feedback forms).

10. CLIMATE AND ECOLOGICAL EMERGENCIES IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The CIL SF includes a ring-fenced amount for climate and ecological emergencies infrastructure responses. Whilst no bids have been successful under this fund, the Infrastructure Delivery Team will continue to engage with potential stakeholders.
- 10.2 The majority of successful bids relate to sustainable transport and/or provide sustainable responses to meeting residents' needs. At present, it is not possible to quantify this impact, other than to recognise that reductions in carbon emissions from transport and air pollution are expected. (Include details of any climate and ecological emergency implications. There is also potential for energy use reduction via renewable energy sources. This will be determined by the detailed schemes as they are developed.

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 11.1 None

(END)