



COTSWOLD

District Council

Council name	COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL
Name and date of Committee	CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND PLANNING DECISION MEETING, 25 SEPTEMBER 2026
Subject	CHIPPING CAMPDEN, AND SIDDINGTON, NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS
Wards affected	Chipping Campden: Campden & Vale Siddington: Siddington & Cerney Rural Ward
Accountable member	Juliet Layton, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning Email: juliet.layton@cotswold.gov.uk
Accountable officer	Mark Harrison, Senior Local and Neighbourhood Planning Policy Officer Email: mark.harrison@cotswold.gov.uk
Report author	Mark Harrison, Senior Local and Neighbourhood Planning Policy Officer Email: mark.harrison@cotswold.gov.uk
Summary/Purpose	Chipping Campden 1. Make the Neighbourhood Plan following a successful referendum. Siddington 2. To decide on the CDC response to the Reg. 16 Siddington Neighbourhood Plan consultation. 3. To decide that CDC will procure through a bid process an Independent Examiner (IE) to undertake examination of the Siddington Neighbourhood Plan (Reg. 17).
Annexes	Annex A – Declaration of Result for Chipping Campden Neighbourhood Plan Referendum Annex B – Chipping Campden Neighbourhood Plan



	Annex C – Policies Map for Chipping Campden Neighbourhood Plan Annex D – Siddington Draft Neighbourhood Plan Annex E – Policies Map for Siddington Neighbourhood Plan Annex F – Siddington Reg. 16 Consultation Representations
Recommendation(s)	That the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning resolves to: For Chipping Campden, 1. make the Neighbourhood Plan following a successful referendum. For Siddington, 2. agree on the CDC response to the Reg. 16 Siddington Neighbourhood Plan consultation; and 3. confirm that CDC will procure through a bid process an Independent Examiner (IE) to undertake examination of the Siddington Neighbourhood Plan (Reg. 17).
Corporate priorities	All of the corporate priorities are captured by the draft Neighbourhood Plan: • Delivering Good Services • Responding to the Climate Emergency • Delivering Housing • Supporting Communities • Supporting the Economy
Key Decision	NO Whilst a Neighbourhood Plan <i>could</i> have a significant impact in regards part 2, in their current guises the proposed plans are not deemed to have a <i>significant</i> impact to the planning framework, particularly as none contain housing allocations.
Exempt	NO



COTSWOLD

District Council

Consultees/ Consultation	The Cotswold District Council response has been consulted internally with officers who have specialist expertise in specific planning topics, as listed in the table. A comprehensive list of local, national and statutory consultees was prepared by CDC, and informed of the Reg. 16 consultation for Siddington.
Summary of Neighbourhood Plan Regulation stages for reference	Reg 14 - Public consultation on draft Plan (led by Parish or Town Council); Reg 15 - Submit revised plan to CDC with submission documents; Reg 16 - Public consultation on submitted Plan (led by CDC); Reg 17 - CDC appoints independent examiner; Reg 17a - Make decisions on examiner's recommendations; Reg 18 - CDC publish examination report and decision statement; Referendum - CDC to arrange referendum (polling station type); Making - CDC makes (adopts) the Plan if >50% votes YES.



Chipping Campden

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Council should make the Chipping Campden following a successful referendum.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Chipping Campden Town Council prepared a Neighbourhood Plan which was submitted to Cotswold District Council (under Reg. 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012).
- 2.2 A Reg. 16 public consultation was held by CDC between 4 July 2025 and 15 August 2025; consulting relevant stakeholders, statutory consultees, and people with local interests identified from the Reg. 14 consultation.
- 2.3 Following this, an Independent Examiner was procured, who [determined](#) that the plan met (with modifications) the basic conditions.
- 2.4 After deciding on the IE's recommendations, CDC ran a referendum process starting with a Decision Statement on 10 July 2026, and culminating with a vote on Thursday 20 August 2026.

3. MAIN POINTS

Referendum

- 3.1 There was a single voting station at Chipping Campden Town Hall, with postal votes also accepted. The question posed was, "*Do you want Cotswold District Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Chipping Campden to help it decide planning applications in the Neighbourhood Area?*"
- 3.2 All registered voters in Chipping Campden parish (which was commensurate with the Neighbourhood Area) were eligible to vote. The IE had not deemed it necessary to extend the voting area beyond the Neighbourhood Area.
- 3.3 There were 757 votes recorded (equating to a turnout of 36.7%). 95% voted in favour of YES, 5% voted in favour of NO (see Annex A – Declaration of Result).



- 3.4 A Neighbourhood Plan requires more than 50% of ballots to be in favour. Since this was achieved, the Neighbourhood Plan already carries weight in planning decision making.
- 3.5 The purpose of this agenda item is to formally adopt (or "make") the Neighbourhood Plan into the planning development framework.
- 3.6 Where relevant, the Neighbourhood Plan will be considered alongside the Local Plan (and any other material documents/ guidance), in planning decision making.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 As per government guidance, the Council must make the Neighbourhood Plan within 8 weeks of a successful referendum. The only time this would not apply is if a legal challenge had been raised on the conduct of the referendum.
- 4.2 Or the Council could not make the Neighbourhood Plan is where it considers that making it would breach, or be incompatible with, EU or human rights obligations (section 61E(8) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended).

5. CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning makes the Chipping Campden Neighbourhood Plan.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 None direct.
- 6.2 The Council have already made financial obligations towards the procedural elements of Neighbourhood Planning following Reg. 15, such as consultation, examination and referendum. Some or all of this can be reclaimed from the Government (MHCLG) in the next financial year.
- 6.3 Officer support towards Neighbourhood Planning is already budgeted for.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 None direct.
- 7.2 Once adopted the Neighbourhood Plan must be considered as part of relevant planning applications, and planning is a statutory function for Cotswold District Council.



8. RISK ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 There are not perceived to be any risks in making this Neighbourhood Plan.
- 8.2 The NP is considered to be compatible with the emerging Local Plan. If there are conflicting elements, planning guidance sets out how to deal with this, namely, how to apportion weight to each plan/ policy in planning decision making.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACT

- 9.1 Under equality legislation, the Council has a legal duty to pay 'due regard' to the need to eliminate discrimination and promote equality in relation to:
- Race
 - Disability
 - Gender, including gender reassignment
 - Age
 - Sexual Orientation
 - Pregnancy and maternity
 - Religion or belief
- 9.2 There has been no indication throughout the process that the Neighbourhood Plan could discriminate against any of the above characteristics.

10. CLIMATE AND ECOLOGICAL EMERGENCIES IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 Policy 5 is focused on the Environment, Biodiversity Net Gain and Local Nature Recovery.
- 10.2 Throughout preparation of the plan, and in the responses provided, consideration is given to the sustainable balance of development in line with national policy and guidance, including climate change/ adaptation.

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Annex A – Declaration of Result – Chipping Campden Neighbourhood Plan Referendum

Annex B – Chipping Campden Neighbourhood Plan

Annex C – Policies Map for the Chipping Campden Neighbourhood Plan



Siddington (Reg. 16)

12. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 12.1 To decide on the CDC response to the Reg. 16 Siddington Neighbourhood Plan consultation.

13. BACKGROUND (REG. 14)

- 13.1 Siddington Parish Council have prepared a draft Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2043.
- 13.2 A Reg. 14 consultation (organised by the PC) was held between 22 March 2026 and 10 May 2026. CDC agreed at a [meeting on 15 June 2026](#) on comments to send as a representation to the Reg. 14 consultation.
- 13.3 Siddington PC took representations and comments into account, and a revised Reg. 15 version was submitted to CDC, accepted at a [meeting on 3 July 2026](#).

14. REG. 16 CONSULTATION

- 14.1 The Reg. 16 public consultation is the responsibility of CDC, and we have consulted other relevant stakeholders, statutory consultees, and people with local interests identified from the previous consultation.
- 14.2 The Reg. 16 consultation was open between 16 July 2026 and 26 August 2026 for external comments. Comments received by CDC have been collated and redacted (Annex F).
- 14.3 CDC should also provide comments on the proposed Siddington Neighbourhood Plan, which will be given to an Independent Examiner (once appointed) along with the external representations received.

15. CDC Response

- 15.1 The following comments are proposed to be submitted by CDC into the Regulation 16 consultation for the Siddington Neighbourhood Plan:



<u>Policy No.</u>	<u>Policy Summary</u>	<u>CDC Comments</u>
Policy S1 – Preventing Coalescence of Siddington with Cirencester <i>(Matt Britton, Strategic Planning Policy Manager was consulted on this policy).</i>	This policy proposes a “green gap” restricting development, to prevent the coalescence of Cirencester and Siddington.	The objective of preventing the physical coalescence of Siddington and Cirencester is supported. However, the extent of the proposed "Preventing Coalescence of Siddington with Cirencester" designation includes land proposed for allocation in the emerging Cotswold District Local Plan 2026-2043 (sites SD17 and SD23). Whilst maintaining separation between settlements is an important planning consideration, the emerging Local Plan evidence base indicates that development can be accommodated on parts of these sites without resulting in the coalescence of Siddington and Cirencester. The proposed designation therefore appears to conflict with the development strategy of the emerging Local Plan. In particular, reference should be made to Appendix C (Site Development Templates) [SD17, SD23] of the emerging Local Plan, which identifies the areas of the allocations expected to accommodate development and the landscape and green infrastructure measures required to maintain an appropriate degree of separation between settlements. The supporting text refers to the White Consultants report. It should be noted that the emerging Local Plan is supported by a more recent suite of evidence, including landscape sensitivity assessments undertaken around settlements across the District, including Siddington. The Neighbourhood Plan should have regard to this updated evidence base.
Policy S2 – Settlement Boundary and	This policy proposes a settlement boundary tight to the existing built form. Outward expansion of the	The policy currently states that "The Plan defines the Development Boundary as shown on the map below (Figure 20)." Figure 20 appears above the text rather



Infill Development <i>(Matt Britton, Strategic Planning Policy Manager was consulted on this policy).</i>	settlement is specifically not supported. Infill development within the settlement boundary is supported in this policy. However, Local Plan policy DS3 (Small-Scale Residential Development in Non Principal Settlements) already permits small-scale residential development subject to some criteria.	than below. For accuracy, this should be amended to refer to the map shown above. Siddington is identified as a Non-Principal Settlement in the emerging Cotswold District Local Plan 2026-2043. Core Policy 4 of the emerging Local Plan states that development within Non-Principal Settlements will be acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with other relevant development plan policies. Neither the emerging Local Plan nor the Government's proposed revisions to national policy introduce a size threshold restricting the scale of development that may come forward within settlements. The approach set out in Policy S2 may therefore conflict with the policy direction of the emerging Local Plan if that Plan is adopted in its current form and the NPPF. Consideration should therefore be given to ensuring that the policy provides sufficient flexibility to remain in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan over the lifetime of the Neighbourhood Plan.
Policy S3 – Housing Mix	This policy indicates the type of housing supported in the Parish, but does not make any formal requirements.	There is only a simple demographic justification for this policy. This policy might be more effective if certain proportions of units were defined, or developers to provide assessments (say on major developments).
Policy S4 – General Design Principles <i>(Harrison Bowley, Head of Planning Services was</i>	This policy supports high quality design and sets out a list of criteria which should be met by all development.	- The current opening wording makes every criterion a requirement. Does this need a caveat such as 'Development proposals will be supported where, having regard to their nature, scale and location, they:' - Point 7 and 14 should probably include 'or any updated version of the design



<i>consulted on this policy).</i>		code' or something similar, as the new design code may not be appendix D of the Local Plan. - Point 15 requires regular review of management plans, it is unclear what mechanism would control this. It is unreasonable to expect reviews to be submitted annually (for example). - 19 should state 'such as photovoltaics...' so as not to be too narrow. It would be better to re-write this section to require low-carbon or renewable-energy measures to allow for advancements in technology or more tailored design solutions for developments. It should also note that these should be well designed and integrated into the design, to avoid developers arguing for unattractive design solutions that technically meet this policy requirement. - Point 20 may also need to add a caveat to cover the new Local Plan. This policy may cause conflict with GCC Highways requirements, as they will generally require driveway and accesses to be a bound material, such as tarmac, for the first 5m from the carriageway edge. There are some examples of bound, permeable surfaces that might be in accordance with this policy, but this will often need to be a balance and this policy is quite narrow.
Policy S5 – Old Talland School of Equitation <i>(Justin Ayton, Senior Conservation & Design Officer</i>	This policy supports development on a brownfield site, which conserves, re-uses and enhances heritage assets on the site. This is primarily a heritage and design policy and does not specifically support or seek to allocate the site for housing, for example.	• The inclusion of the open, northern part of the site, wrapping around the rear or the tithe barn & even the church would be a huge concern, severely harming the rural setting & significance of the heritage assets, & a blatant encroachment into the open countryside; any development site should be limited to the area of the current agricultural



<i>was consulted on this policy)</i>		sheds, to the west & north-west of the barn. • Achieving the restoration of & <i>optimum viable use</i> (most benign viable use, not the most profitable use) for the barn was always previously regarded as absolutely fundamental to any development on this site, which should entail an holistic approach to the entire site as well as an assessment to ascertain what the optimum viable use would be (preferably one that avoided internal subdivision & fenestration, so open-plan, community or even commercial uses may be preferable to residential conversion, & the form & use of any adjacent development should support & complement this, not clash with or preclude it (new dwellings may, for example, preclude a wedding venue type use)); it was advised that any development would need to be assessed as 'Enabling Development' if it were to be considered otherwise contrary to policy (& harm to the setting & significance of a listed building would be contrary to policy). Consequently, the fundamental necessity of identifying & achieving the optimum viable use for the barns, & the part (enabling though cross-funding or direct functional association) really should be fundamental to any proposal, & some stronger emphasis in this direction would be advisable, • The additional wording along the lines of the below would be strongly encouraged: <i>'1. Development at the Old Talland School of Equitation site will be supported only where it is demonstrated it will secure, through use and/or cross-funding, the long-term conservation, reuse and enhancement of the designated heritage assets in their Optimum Viable Use, and is the minimum level of development</i>
---	--	---



		<i>reasonably necessary in order to achieve this.'</i> • The tithe barn is not a '<i>Grade II* Scheduled Monument</i>' (these are two separate things), it is '<i>Listed Grade II*, and a Scheduled Ancient Monument</i>'. • The presumption in the introductory line of 3 appears a little too strong, rather stronger than that of 1 with which it them somewhat clashes; perhaps it would be better to reduce this to say only '<i>Development proposals should:</i>' • It might be worth adding to 3(a): '<i>... informed by a proportionate heritage assessment demonstrating how the heritage assets will be conserved and enhanced, and their optimum viable use achieved and sustained ...</i>' • It was previously advised that the style & form of any development should reflect the agricultural character of the site; there would be no harm should this be made more explicit in 3(b). It would also be worth saying '<i>... in scale, form, design, appearance and use ...</i>'
Policy S6 – Local Green Space Policy	This policy highlights two local green spaces that are already designated through the Local Plan.	To improve clarity, suggest re-wording this policy to simply... <i>The following sites are designated as Local Green Spaces:</i> <i>a) the playing fields on Park Way</i> <i>b) the Siddington allotments</i> <i>c) Canal Lane green space.</i> As NPPF and LP are quite clear how to deal with these spaces. Question whether (c) Canal Lane meets the criteria. Perhaps the northern part has some merit, with mature trees, a rustic stone boundary wall, and impressive views across the field. However, the southern part is a lane with grass verges, between



		hedgerows; a very typical scene in the country, and therefore not particularly special to meet the criteria.
Policy S7 – Important Views Policy	This policy identifies views considered important by the community and how to preserve them in the context of new development.	Appreciate Reg. 14 comments have been taken into account.
Policy S8 – Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland <i>(Danielle Berry, Head of Natural, Built and Historic Environment was consulted on this policy).</i>	Policy addresses protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland	• In relation to Policy S8 (Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland), consider the wording to be somewhat vague and insufficiently reflective of the importance and value of certain habitats, particularly those that are irreplaceable or of significant biodiversity importance. • The policy title refers to woodland; however, woodland is not specifically addressed within the policy itself. Consider adding a reference to woodland in Clause 1, for example: <i>“woodlands of high landscape, amenity, ecological or historical value.”</i> • In relation to Clause 1(b), insert <i>“ancient and/or”</i> before veteran to ensure ancient woodland is explicitly covered. • In Clause 2, replace <i>“supports biodiversity”</i> with <i>“conserves and enhances biodiversity”</i>. In addition, any habitat creation and/or enhancement should seek to comprise native species of local provenance. • Add the following wording to the end of Clause 2, after <i>“where practicable”</i>: <i>“or where the proposed species demonstrates resilience and/or adaptability to climate change.”</i> • Section 6.14.1 refers to Clause (d); however, no Clause (d) is included



		within the policy and this should be corrected. Concerns that the following wording may inadvertently weaken the policy protection afforded to irreplaceable habitats: "and it can be demonstrated that the benefits of the development outweigh the loss, replacement trees or hedgerows of an equivalent or better standard will be required in an appropriate location on the site." The NPPF is clear that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees, should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy is secured. As such, the current wording could be interpreted as allowing the loss of irreplaceable habitats to be offset through replacement planting, which is not consistent with national policy.
Policy S9 – Flooding <i>(Jo Corbett, Senior Planning Policy Officer was consulted on this policy).</i>	Policy addresses how flood risk will be assessed and managed in context of new development.	Reg. 14 comments to do not seem to have been taken into account. They are repeated here in their entirety: The policy could be more positively named e.g. Managing Flood Risk The policy has elements which repeat national and Local plan policy (SuDs, betterment, prevention flooding elsewhere), but no mention of flood zones. Could cross ref perhaps to other water polices NPPF/ LP to avoid any conflict, '...in accordance with other relevant policies...' Note this is mentioned in the supporting text below 6.15.1.



		The intent of the policy is to reduce flood risk in the parish (alongside the strategic policy of the Local Plan). This is best stated in the supporting text '...within the vicinity of the development to reduce surface water run-off and mitigate against any fluvial flood risk, but also to any impact to lower lying parts of the parish (para. 6.15.5). This could be moved for clarity to the top/ introduction of the supporting text, or to help introduce the policy with a short explanation. There is focus on attenuation in the policy (which is part of a SuDs system) - is it the only possible achievable SuDs type in the NDP area? Should this be re-worded to mean SuDs in their entirety? E.g. 'Where development is proposed in an area at risk of flooding mitigation measures giving priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) must be included'. 'attenuation features must be accompanied by a long-term funded maintenance/management plan' is this meant to be only specific this type of SuD, and if so, perhaps why (additional information is needed in the supporting text)? Also if SuDs are to be mentioned, would suggest the positive 'multi-functional benefits' of SuDs: along the lines of e.g. 'Where practicable, SuDs must be designed to be multi-functional and deliver benefits for wildlife, amenity and landscape'. Is there a development size limit on the requirement for the 'Water Management Statement'? Use the supporting text to explain where the policy would apply. 'New development' suggests new build (and not extensions / change of use?).
--	--	--



		Could remove the words 'secure arrangements for' is not strictly necessary in clause (g)? The supporting text mentions the SWOX and 'The Plan encourages the use of designs and technologies to reduce water usage' but this is not referenced in the policy? E.g. 'Schemes that incorporate rainwater harvesting to capture, store and reuse grey water will be supported'
Policy S10 – Sustainable Transport and Active Travel <i>(Allan Keller, Sustainable Transport Lead was consulted on this policy).</i>	This policy identifies new pedestrian/ cycle routes and promotes sustainable transport.	Reg. 14 comments to do not seem to have been taken into account. They are repeated here in their entirety: S10A Suggest merging S10A and S10B and removing duplication. Remove S10A1, put S10A2 at the bottom of the policy. Then add ", including through proposals in point X of this policy" to S10B 2 a. S10B 1 and 3 and 2 & 4 appear to be duplicates and different versions so should be consolidated (keeping 1 & 2). Would also suggest they add "in line with the sustainable transport hierarchy" to S10B 2 b, along with a visual or written hierarchy such as shown here An introduction to the sustainable travel hierarchy - Energy Saving Trust. As per my comments pre-R14, the engagement and proposals on new routes is good to see.
Policy S11 – Community Facilities	This policy identifies community facilities to conserve.	Still not sure how "suitable employment or service trade uses" fit into this, in part (c). Could "reasonable" or a similar term be added before "interest"?



16. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 16.1 The Council does not have to respond to the Reg. 16 consultation. However, an Examiner of the plan could rightly question this approach, and would likely insist on CDC providing comments, which would slow the examination process.

17. CONCLUSIONS

- 17.1 The response aims to provide supportive comments or queries to support Siddington Parish Council in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan that meets the basic and legal requirements, whilst reflecting the objectives of their community.
- 17.2 It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning resolves that CDC will procure through a bid process an independent examiner, suitably qualified and experienced, to undertake examination of the Siddington Neighbourhood Plan. The appointment must be consented by the qualifying body (Siddington Parish Council).

18. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 18.1 None direct.
- 18.2 The Council already have financial obligations towards the procedural elements of Neighbourhood Planning following Reg. 15. Some or all of this can be reclaimed from the Government (MHCLG).
- 18.3 Officer support towards Neighbourhood Planning is already budgeted for.

19. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 19.1 None direct.
- 19.2 Once adopted the Neighbourhood Plan must be considered as part of relevant planning applications, and planning is a statutory function for Cotswold District Council.

20. RISK ASSESSMENT

- 20.1 As there are no legal nor financial responsibilities in the Council providing this response, the sole risk at this stage would be reputational as the comments can be made public through the Consultation Statement and publication of Neighbourhood Plan documents for examination.



21. EQUALITIES IMPACT

21.1 Under equality legislation, the Council has a legal duty to pay 'due regard' to the need to eliminate discrimination and promote equality in relation to:

- Race
- Disability
- Gender, including gender reassignment
- Age
- Sexual Orientation
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Religion or belief

21.2 The response would indicate where the draft Neighbourhood Plan could discriminate against any of the above; there are none identified at this stage.

22. CLIMATE AND ECOLOGICAL EMERGENCIES IMPLICATIONS

22.1 Policy S9 is focused on Flooding, and Policy S10 is focused on Sustainable Travel and Active Travel.

22.2 Throughout preparation of the plan, and in the responses provided, consideration is given to the sustainable balance of development in line with national policy and guidance, including climate change/ adaptation.

23. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Annex D – Siddington Draft Neighbourhood Plan

Annex E – Policies Map for Siddington Neighbourhood Plan

Annex F – Siddington Reg. 16 Consultation Representations



Siddington (Reg. 17)

24. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 24.1 To decide that CDC will procure through a bid process an Independent Examiner (IE) to undertake examination of the Siddington Neighbourhood Plan (Reg. 17). The appointment should be consented by the qualifying body (Siddington Parish Council).

25. MAIN POINTS

Examination

- 25.1 Once a draft neighbourhood plan has gone through its Reg 16 consultation, CDC should source an Independent Examiner. The Examiner will consider the submitted documents (including Annex D and Annex E), representations from the Reg. 16 consultation (Annex F and Table at para 16.1) and relevant evidence and guidance.
- 25.2 The Independent Examiner will examine whether the plan meets the 'Basic Conditions' and other relevant legal requirements.
- 25.3 The Independent Examiner may recommend that the plan proceed to the referendum stage (i.e. that it meets all the legal requirements) or may suggest that modifications are needed to the plan before it can proceed to the referendum (this is typically the case).

Procurement

- 25.4 The Officer will undertake a procurement process, in line with CDC's procurement processes. An Invitation to Quote will be sent to at least two (likely three) examiners known to CDC, and of significant experience and reputation nationally. At least two quotes must be received, and bids must be below £30,000, to be valid.
- 25.5 Examiners bids will be assessed on their qualifications/ professional experience, their Neighbourhood Planning examination experience, cost, and availability.
- 25.6 In the case of Siddington, Examiners will be asked whether they can meet an ambitious (but achievable) timetable in order to hold the referendum in February, before a "black-out" period, when the Elections Team will be preparing for the May



local elections. If this timetable slips, the referendum would be delayed several months to be held in tandem with the May local elections:

	Siddington
Contracts	w/b MON 5 OCT
Arrangement Note	w/b MON 5 OCT
Visit	w/b MON 12 OCT
Clarification Note	By FRI 23 OCT
PC (or SG) meet and respond to questions (2 weeks)	By FRI 6 NOV
Examiner draft report	By FRI 20 NOV
Fact Check	By FRI 27 DEC
Examiner Final Report	w/b MON 30 NOV
CDC consider recommendations	1 week
Report (Agenda) Deadline	THU 10 DEC (latest)
Cabinet Member Decision Meeting	FRI 18 DEC
Call-in period	21/12-24/12, and 29/12
Decision statement	WED 30 DEC
Information Statement	MON 11 JAN
POLLING DAY	THU 25 FEB

25.7 Successful bidders will have to agree to CDC's Terms and Conditions, and agree to undertake the examination for the quoted price, in the timescale indicated, unless adjustments are agreed by the Officer (for example if a hearing is required).

25.8 In deciding on an Examiner, Paragraph 7 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 applies, particularly that the person appointed:



- a) Is independent of the qualifying body and the authority;
- b) Does not have an interest in any land that may be affected; and
- c) Has appropriate qualifications and experience.

25.9 As the qualifying body, Siddington Parish Council should consent to the appointment. As such, the Officer will share the bids, along with a recommendation to the Parish Council.

25.10 CDC are responsible for the costs of the examination, but the costs are normally reclaimed from the Government in the next financial year.

26. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

26.1 The procurement process could be opened/ publicised more widely, but inviting quotes only from Examiners known to CDC will mean the tight timescales can be adhered to, and procurement processes will have been adhered to.

27. CONCLUSIONS

27.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning resolves that CDC will procure through a bid process an Independent Examiner, suitably qualified and experienced, to undertake examination of the Siddington Neighbourhood Plan in the timescales outlined.

28. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

28.1 CDC will be responsible for the costs of the examination.

28.2 The Council already have financial obligations towards the procedural elements of Neighbourhood Planning following Reg. 15 (including examination). This can be reclaimed from the Government (MHCLG).

28.3 Officer support towards Neighbourhood Planning is already budgeted for.

29. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

29.1 None direct.

29.2 Once adopted the Neighbourhood Plan must be considered as part of relevant planning applications, and planning is a statutory function for Cotswold District Council.



30. RISK ASSESSMENT

30.1 There is a risk that the timescales may slip, particularly if a hearing is required. In which case, the referendum cannot be held until the May local elections.

31. EQUALITIES IMPACT

31.1 Under equality legislation, the Council has a legal duty to pay 'due regard' to the need to eliminate discrimination and promote equality in relation to:

- Race
- Disability
- Gender, including gender reassignment
- Age
- Sexual Orientation
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Religion or belief

31.2 The examination should ensure the Neighbourhood Plan does not discriminate against any of the above characteristics.

32. CLIMATE AND ECOLOGICAL EMERGENCIES IMPLICATIONS

32.1 Throughout examination of the plan, consideration is given to the sustainable balance of development in line with national policy and guidance, including climate change/ adaptation.

33. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Annex D – Siddington Draft Neighbourhood Plan

Annex E – Policies Map for Siddington Neighbourhood Plan

Annex F – Siddington Reg. 16 Consultation Representations