

## 2024 CIL Bids

	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>CIL requested</b>
1	Sustrans	Kemble to Cirencester Greenway: Kemble to Steadings section – design and development.	180,301	180,301
2	GCC	Cirencester to Kemble Cycle Link – Cirencester End	100,000	100,000
3	GCC	Bourton-on-the-Water Interchange Hub	371,400	185,700
4	GCC	Footpath in Moreton-in-Marsh	171,030	146,040
5	GCC	The Forum Interchange Hub	132,600	66,300
6	MiM TC/GWR	Moreton-in-Marsh Transport Hub/Interchange and Station Improvement Works	2,216,000	2,216,000
				<b>2,894,341</b>

## Kemble to Cirencester Greenway: Kemble to Steadings section – design and development (Sustrans - £180,301)

Criteria	Score
<p><b>Is the project identified in policies SA1, SA2 or SA3 of the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan (Chapter 7) as an essential or critical project?</b>  <i>Provide information on which project it would help deliver (please include policy reference number). If your project is not identified as essential or critical in the Local Plan, please explain why it was not identified as such when the plan was made.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Yes, it listed as an infrastructure requirement under SA1 and categorised as an essential project in the IDP. Given it supports the Steadings Strategic Site which is still being developed and is a sustainable transport project, it will almost certainly be retained in the new IDP. Not given full marks as critical projects have priority over essential projects.</p>	15/20
<p><b>Is the project identified on the Council's Infrastructure List (in the Infrastructure Funding Statement) as a CIL spending priority?</b>  <i>Provide information on which project it would help deliver. If your project is not on the Infrastructure List please explain why you think it should be prioritised over projects on the list.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Yes, the project is listed in in Infrastructure List.</p>	20/20
<p><b>Is the project deliverable and what is the delivery timeframe? Have you considered alternative options to deliver the outcome of your project?</b>  <i>Set out the timeframe for your project and provide evidence your project is deliverable within this timeframe. Demonstrate your project has a clear delivery programme and is financially viable. For large projects, the Council may allocate CIL funds to your project even though not enough funds are available yet.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Sustrans has plenty of experience in designing greenways along disused railways as well as designing for rural crossings and quiet lane design. The timeline provided seems sound. The applicant provided a list of potential funding sources for the delivery of the greenway and seems confident that they will be able to deliver the project as a whole, although this remains an uncertainty.</p>	20/30
<p><b>Have you secured match funding to increase potential outputs from the project?</b>  <i>Provide evidence that shows other funding options for the project have been explored. Explain which match funding has already been secured and which funding is dependent on your bid for CIL funding being successful. Priority will be given to projects that can evidence match funding.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No match funding although Sustrans have invested £24,000 in a Feasibility Study, which generally cannot be funded through CIL.</p>	10/20
<p><b>Does your project meet the legal requirements in the CIL Regulations?</b> Please note that scoring zero on this criterion will automatically fail your bid, regardless of the total score.  <i>The CIL Regulations require that CIL funding must fund the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure to support the development of its area. The levy should not be used to remedy pre-existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision unless those deficiencies will be made more severe by new development. Please explain how your project meets these legal requirements. The Council is legally bound to use collected CIL funds in line with the above definition. Feasibility and other preliminary studies can therefore only be funded if sufficient evidence is provided showing that such studies are likely to lead to the delivery of infrastructure (such as evidence of part match funding secured, full timeline for the whole project...).</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> 'Concept Design' can only be funded through CIL if there is a clear future project plan. This seems to be missing although detailed info on proposed works is given and they have provided a list of funding sources for the rest of the project. It therefore seems likely that the project will meet the legal requirements, but we cannot be certain of this.</p>	5/10
<b>Total 70/100</b>	

Linked to bid 2 and the overall delivery of the project requires both pieces of work to be completed.

Recommend approval.

## Cirencester to Kemble Cycle Link – Cirencester End (GCC - £100,000)

Criteria	Score
<p><b>Is the project identified in policies SA1, SA2 or SA3 of the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan (Chapter 7) as an essential or critical project?</b>  <i>Provide information on which project it would help deliver (please include policy reference number). If your project is not identified as essential or critical in the Local Plan, please explain why it was not identified as such when the plan was made.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Yes, it listed as an infrastructure requirement under SA1 and categorised as an essential project in the IDP. Given it supports the Steadings Strategic Site which is still being developed and is a sustainable transport project, it will almost certainly be retained in the new IDP. Not given full marks as critical projects have priority over essential projects.</p>	15/20
<p><b>Is the project identified on the Council's Infrastructure List (in the Infrastructure Funding Statement) as a CIL spending priority?</b>  <i>Provide information on which project it would help deliver. If your project is not on the Infrastructure List please explain why you think it should be prioritised over projects on the list.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Yes, it listed as an infrastructure requirement under SA1 and categorised as an essential project in the IDP. Given it supports the Steadings Strategic Site which is still being developed and is a sustainable transport project, it will almost certainly be retained in the new IDP. Not given full marks as critical projects have priority over essential projects.</p>	20/20
<p><b>Is the project deliverable and what is the delivery timeframe? Have you considered alternative options to deliver the outcome of your project?</b>  <i>Set out the timeframe for your project and provide evidence your project is deliverable within this timeframe. Demonstrate your project has a clear delivery programme and is financially viable. For large projects, the Council may allocate CIL funds to your project even though not enough funds are available yet.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> GCC in combination with their contractor Atkins have plenty of experience with designing walking and cycling infrastructure in the centre of towns. The timeline provided seems sound. Although claims this is their top priority in regards to cycleways in the whole county, it remains unclear how the rest of the path will be funded.</p>	20/30
<p><b>Have you secured match funding to increase potential outputs from the project?</b>  <i>Provide evidence that shows other funding options for the project have been explored. Explain which match funding has already been secured and which funding is dependent on your bid for CIL funding being successful. Priority will be given to projects that can evidence match funding.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No match funding although GCC have invested £28,000 in a Feasibility Study, which generally cannot be funded through CIL.</p>	10/20
<p><b>Does your project meet the legal requirements in the CIL Regulations?</b> Please note that scoring zero on this criterion will automatically fail your bid, regardless of the total score.  <i>The CIL Regulations require that CIL funding must fund the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure to support the development of its area. The levy should not be used to remedy pre-existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision unless those deficiencies will be made more severe by new development. Please explain how your project meets these legal requirements. The Council is legally bound to use collected CIL funds in line with the above definition. Feasibility and other preliminary studies can therefore only be funded if sufficient evidence is provided showing that such studies are likely to lead to the delivery of infrastructure (such as evidence of part match funding secured, full timeline for the whole project...).</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> 'Developed Concept Design' can only be funded through CIL if there is a clear future project plan. This seems to be missing although detailed info on proposed works is given. The project is also considered to be a top priority for delivery by GCC. It therefore seems likely that the project will meet the legal requirements, but we cannot be certain of this.</p>	5/10
<b>Total</b>	
<b>70/100</b>	

Linked to bid I and the overall delivery of the project requires both pieces of work to be completed.

Some concerns raised about the requested amount. To receive the funds, a more detailed spending plan is required (or alternatively invoices etc. required)

Recommend conditional approval.

## Bourton-on-the-Water Interchange Hub (GCC - £137,700)

Criteria	Score
<p><b>Provide information on how the project would meet all or some of the actions in the following strategies</b></p> <p>a. <a href="#">Climate Emergency Strategy 2020 to 2030 (climate change related projects)</a></p> <p>b. <a href="#">Ecological Emergency Action Plan (ecology related projects)</a></p> <p>c. <a href="#">Any adopted or emerging local nature recovery strategy such as the Gloucestershire Nature Recovery Network (ecology related projects)</a></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Would improve health and air quality, and introduce new ways for Cotswold residents to access services as per the CE Strategy. Although no full marks as it improves on services already there.</p>	25/30
<p><b>Lead bid partner must have a robust constitution; been in existence for at least 6 months prior to the application; have a good track record of delivering relevant projects.</b></p> <p><i>Please provide evidence of the above, including a copy of the constitution and examples of previous successful projects.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> GCC is a well known infrastructure provider with plenty of experience in regards to a project like this.</p>	10/10
<p><b>Is the project deliverable and what is the timeframe?</b></p> <p><i>Set out the timeframe for your project and provide evidence your project is deliverable within this timeframe. Demonstrate your project has a clear delivery programme and is financially viable. Explain why alternative options cannot be used to deliver the project?</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> The expected delivery timeframe is up to 12 months, primarily due to the lead times for the supply of bus shelters. The first two months will be for governance and detailed design work. GCC has plenty of experience in delivering such projects and the project and timeframe would be deliverable. The bid was originally for four stops, but one of them was on Parish Council land who opposed this stop and it was consequently removed from the bid by GCC. Please note that the Parish Council is supportive of two of the remaining shelters, but opposes the proposed stop on the other side of the War Memorial on Heritage Grounds. As this is Highways land, the bus stop falls under permitted development rights and CDC is therefore not able to object on these grounds</p>	20/20
<p><b>Does your project meet the legal requirements in the CIL Regulations?</b> Please note that scoring zero on this criterion will automatically fail your bid, regardless of the total score.</p> <p><i>The CIL Regulations require that CIL funding must fund the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure to support the development of its area. The levy should not be used to remedy pre-existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision unless those deficiencies will be made more severe by new development. Please explain how your project meets these legal requirements. The Council is legally bound to use collected CIL funds in line with the above definition. Feasibility and other preliminary studies can therefore only be funded if sufficient evidence is provided showing that such studies are likely to lead to the delivery of infrastructure (such as evidence of part match funding secured, full timeline for the whole project...).</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Delivers infrastructure that would support the sustainable development of Bourton-on-the-Water.</p>	10/10
<p><b>Desirable Criteria</b></p> <p><i>Provide evidence that shows other funding options for the project have been explored. Explain which match funding has already been secured and which funding is dependent on your bid for CIL funding being successful. Priority will be given to projects that can evidence match funding.</i></p> <p><i>For ecology related projects located within the Cotswold Water Park or Cotswolds National Landscape: Provide information on how the project would meet all or some of the actions in the Cotswolds National Landscape Nature Recovery Plan and/or Cotswold Water Park Nature Recovery Plan.</i></p> <p><i>Describe any additional benefits that your project would bring to the community – and which communities (of location or interest).</i></p> <p><i>Describe how your project would help deliver the Cotswold District Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Strategic Framework for Green Infrastructure in Gloucestershire.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> 50% match funded. Two of the shelters are supported by Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council, while they are strongly opposed to third one.</p>	20/30
<b>Total</b>	<b>85/100</b>

Recommend approval. Although objection from BotW to the third stop will be clearly stated in our report.

## Footpath in Moreton-in-Marsh (GCC - £146,030.17)

Criteria	Score
<p><b>Is the project identified in policies SA1, SA2 or SA3 of the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan (Chapter 7) as an essential or critical project?</b> Provide information on which project it would help deliver (please include policy reference number). If your project is not identified as essential or critical in the Local Plan, please explain why it was not identified as such when the plan was made.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Yes, 'Improvements to A429 (Fosse Way)' is identified as a critical project in SA3. This project would deliver on that requirement in a sustainable way.</p>	20/20
<p><b>Is the project identified on the Council's Infrastructure List (in the Infrastructure Funding Statement) as a CIL spending priority?</b> Provide information on which project it would help deliver. If your project is not on the Infrastructure List please explain why you think it should be prioritised over projects on the list.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Yes, 'Improvements to A429 (Fosse Way)' is included on the List.</p>	20/20
<p><b>Is the project deliverable and what is the delivery timeframe? Have you considered alternative options to deliver the outcome of your project?</b> Set out the timeframe for your project and provide evidence your project is deliverable within this timeframe. Demonstrate your project has a clear delivery programme and is financially viable. For large projects, the Council may allocate CIL funds to your project even though not enough funds are available yet.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> The bids was originally for a path on the western verge of the A429. However, there were several issues with land boundary ownership, making that option currently undeliverable. Moreover, a footpath has been constructed on the other side of the road. After engaging with GCC officers, they agreed to submit a revised bid which extends the new footpath on the eastern verge to the garden centre and then creates a crossing point over the A429.</p>	25/30
<p><b>Have you secured match funding to increase potential outputs from the project?</b> Provide evidence that shows other funding options for the project have been explored. Explain which match funding has already been secured and which funding is dependent on your bid for CIL funding being successful. Priority will be given to projects that can evidence match funding.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> £25,000 in S106 is already available for this project. No further financial commitment from GCC.</p>	5/20
<p><b>Does your project meet the legal requirements in the CIL Regulations?</b> Please note that scoring zero on this criterion will automatically fail your bid, regardless of the total score. The CIL Regulations require that CIL funding must fund the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure to support the development of its area. The levy should not be used to remedy pre-existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision unless those deficiencies will be made more severe by new development. Please explain how your project meets these legal requirements. The Council is legally bound to use collected CIL funds in line with the above definition. Feasibility and other preliminary studies can therefore only be funded if sufficient evidence is provided showing that such studies are likely to lead to the delivery of infrastructure (such as evidence of part match funding secured, full timeline for the whole project...).</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Delivers infrastructure that would support the sustainable development of Moreton.</p>	10/10
<b>Total</b>	
<b>80/100</b>	

Recommend approval.

## The Forum Interchange Hub (GCC - £66,300)

Criteria	Score
<p><b>Is the project identified in policies SA1, SA2 or SA3 of the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan (Chapter 7) as an essential or critical project?</b>  <i>Provide information on which project it would help deliver (please include policy reference number). If your project is not identified as essential or critical in the Local Plan, please explain why it was not identified as such when the plan was made.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Yes, it listed as an infrastructure requirement under SA1 and categorised as an essential project in the IDP. Given it supports the Steadings Strategic Site which is still being developed and is a sustainable transport project, it will almost certainly be retained in the new IDP. Not given full marks as critical projects have priority over essential projects.</p>	15/20
<p><b>Is the project identified on the Council's Infrastructure List (in the Infrastructure Funding Statement) as a CIL spending priority?</b>  <i>Provide information on which project it would help deliver. If your project is not on the Infrastructure List please explain why you think it should be prioritised over projects on the list.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No.</p>	0/20
<p><b>Is the project deliverable and what is the delivery timeframe? Have you considered alternative options to deliver the outcome of your project?</b>  <i>Set out the timeframe for your project and provide evidence your project is deliverable within this timeframe. Demonstrate your project has a clear delivery programme and is financially viable. For large projects, the Council may allocate CIL funds to your project even though not enough funds are available yet.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> The expected delivery timeframe is up to 12 months, primarily due to the lead times for the supply of bus shelters. The first two months will be for governance and detailed design work. GCC has plenty of experience in delivering such projects and the project and timeframe would be deliverable.</p>	30/30
<p><b>Have you secured match funding to increase potential outputs from the project?</b>  <i>Provide evidence that shows other funding options for the project have been explored. Explain which match funding has already been secured and which funding is dependent on your bid for CIL funding being successful. Priority will be given to projects that can evidence match funding.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> 50% match funded</p>	20/20
<p><b>Does your project meet the legal requirements in the CIL Regulations?</b> Please note that scoring zero on this criterion will automatically fail your bid, regardless of the total score.  <i>The CIL Regulations require that CIL funding must fund the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure to support the development of its area. The levy should not be used to remedy pre-existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision unless those deficiencies will be made more severe by new development. Please explain how your project meets these legal requirements. The Council is legally bound to use collected CIL funds in line with the above definition. Feasibility and other preliminary studies can therefore only be funded if sufficient evidence is provided showing that such studies are likely to lead to the delivery of infrastructure (such as evidence of part match funding secured, full timeline for the whole project...).</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Delivers infrastructure that would support the sustainable development of Cirencester.</p>	10/10
<b>Total</b>	
<b>75/100</b>	

Recommend approval.

## Moreton-in-Marsh Transport Hub/Interchange and Station Improvement Works (MiM TC/GWR - £2,216,000)

Criteria	Score
<p><b>Is the project identified in policies SA1, SA2 or SA3 of the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan (Chapter 7) as an essential or critical project?</b>  <i>Provide information on which project it would help deliver (please include policy reference number). If your project is not identified as essential or critical in the Local Plan, please explain why it was not identified as such when the plan was made.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No, although the importance of the railway station is mentioned in the local plan, no need for improvements were identified in the current LP and IDP. However, traffic congestion is a major issue in the town and three highway improvement projects are identified as critical. The proposed project could be considered as a more sustainable alternative to the junction improvements originally identified.</p>	15/20
<p><b>Is the project identified on the Council's Infrastructure List (in the Infrastructure Funding Statement) as a CIL spending priority?</b>  <i>Provide information on which project it would help deliver. If your project is not on the Infrastructure List please explain why you think it should be prioritised over projects on the list.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No, but the project is an alternative for the junction improvements that are identified on the Infrastructure List.</p>	15/20
<p><b>Is the project deliverable and what is the delivery timeframe? Have you considered alternative options to deliver the outcome of your project?</b>  <i>Set out the timeframe for your project and provide evidence your project is deliverable within this timeframe. Demonstrate your project has a clear delivery programme and is financially viable. For large projects, the Council may allocate CIL funds to your project even though not enough funds are available yet.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> GWR has a lot of experience in delivery similar projects around the country. However, the project has not entered the pre-application stage yet and although it sets out what it expects to happen each year, no actual planned commencement date is set. There has been no engagement with the Council in regards to this project and it would not be appropriate for the Council to make a spending decision on something that it has not yet granted planning permission for.</p>	0/30
<p><b>Have you secured match funding to increase potential outputs from the project?</b>  <i>Provide evidence that shows other funding options for the project have been explored. Explain which match funding has already been secured and which funding is dependent on your bid for CIL funding being successful. Priority will be given to projects that can evidence match funding.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Collectively, Moreton-in-Marsh Town Council and Great Western Railway have committed £1,250,000.00 However, the majority of these funds come from GWR for the purchase of the former Royal British Legion site (1.2M) and on the installation of a new cycle hub and associated works including CCTV (£275k). These works are also not included as being part of the current project in the EoI form. The form also refers to monies from a Unilateral Undertaking which MiM TC has allocated. These funds are currently held by CDC and it is our understanding MiM TC wants to use a substantial portion of these funds for the Resedale Hall refurbishments.</p>	10/20
<p><b>Does your project meet the legal requirements in the CIL Regulations?</b> Please note that scoring zero on this criterion will automatically fail your bid, regardless of the total score.  <i>The CIL Regulations require that CIL funding must fund the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure to support the development of its area. The levy should not be used to remedy pre-existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision unless those deficiencies will be made more severe by new development. Please explain how your project meets these legal requirements. The Council is legally bound to use collected CIL funds in line with the above definition. Feasibility and other preliminary studies can therefore only be funded if sufficient evidence is provided showing that such studies are likely to lead to the delivery of infrastructure (such as evidence of part match funding secured, full timeline for the whole project...).</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Delivers infrastructure that would support the sustainable development of Moreton.</p>	5/10
<b>Total 45/100</b>	

There are 3 issues with this bid:

There is not a strong link into the Council's policies while it would be using up the majority of available CIL funds. If the project were to be included in a revised IDP, this would strengthen the bid.

Part of the funding would be used to create additional parking spaces, which would create profit for GWR and is therefore not suitable for public funding.

There has been no engagement with the Council before this bid. It would not be appropriate for the Council to make a spending decision on something that it has not yet granted planning permission for.

Recommended for refusal with the caveat there is overall support for the project and the Council would welcome a revised bid next year.