

Money Matters - Capital Programme 2017/18 – 2020/21

Contents	Page
1. Introduction	2
2. Proposed Programme and Funding	2
3. Capital Finance Charges	4

Money Matters – Capital Monitoring Programme 2017/18 – 2020/21

1. Introduction

Cabinet on 6th October 2016 approved a re-profiled programme for 2016/17 to 2018/19 and beyond, totalling £390.967m, of which £151.510m related to 2016/17. This report restates and updates the 2017/18 onwards element of that re-profiled programme

2. Proposed Programme and Funding

Table 1 below details the re-profiled capital programme for the period 2017/18 to 2019/20 and 20/21, as approved as part of the 2016/17 and beyond re-profiled programme at Cabinet on 6th October 2016, and the funding thereof including an addition to the programme totalling £1.428m added to the Corporate block of the programme. The addition of £1.428m will be spent partly on White Cross Education Centre-Mill 14, Lancaster, and partly on County Hall Old Building essential capital works.

City Deal is included only where LCC make a direct contribution to it or where the County Council is supporting the cash flow requirements of the project in the early years. City Deal and other Lancashire Economic Partnership activity is reported separately via the existing LEP reporting and performance framework. LCC is the accountable body for the LEP.

It should also be noted that the programme below does not include any estimate of spend carried forward from 2016/17, which will be quantified in the 2016/17 outturn report.

TABLE 1	2017/18 (£m)	2018/19 (£m)	2019/20 & 2020/21 (£m)	Total (£m)
Schools (excluding Devolved Formula Capital)	29.686	28.562	2.580	60.828
Schools Devolved Formula Capital	2.634	2.634	0.000	5.268
Children and Young People	3.014	4.560	3.586	11.160
Waste and Other	2.023	0.100	1.665	3.788
Adult Social Care	0.562	7.808	6.061	14.431
Corporate	12.276	13.661	11.349	37.286
Vehicle Replacement	3.930	3.460	0.000	7.390
Transport	26.082	14.641	0.840	41.563
Highways	39.604	19.567	0.000	59.171
TOTAL	119.811	94.993	26.081	240.885

FUNDED BY:	2017/18 (£m)	2018/19 (£m)	2019/20 & 2020/21 (£m)	Total (£m)
GRANTS RECEIVABLE (shown in year to be received)				
DfT Street Lighting Challenge Fund	-4.800	0.000	0.000	-4.800
DfT Annual Highways Maintenance Grant	-20.514	-18.567	0.000	-39.081
DfT Highways Maintenance Incentive Funding 2017/18 to be determined	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC
DfT LTP/Integrated Transport Block annual grant	-6.054	-6.054	0.000	-12.108
DfE School Basic Need annual grant	-29.006	-2.580	0.000	-31.586
DfE Schools Condition annual grant	-11.209	0.000	0.000	-11.209
Schools Devolved Formula Capital	-2.634	-2.634	0.000	-5.268
Growing Places	0.000	0.000	-2.479	-2.479
Sub Total	-74.217	-29.835	-2.479	-106.531
GRANTS UNAPPLIED BALANCES as at 31st March 2016				
DfT Flood Damage Funding received in 2015/16	-0.911	0.000	0.000	-0.911
Adult Social Care grant	-2.386	0.000	0.000	-2.386
School DfE grants brought forward	-11.690	0.000	0.000	-11.690
Sub Total	-14.987	0.000	0.000	-14.987
GROWTH DEAL FUNDING				
Burnley Pendle Growth Corridor	-4.000	-4.000	0.000	-8.000
East Lancs Cycle Network	0.000	-1.550	0.000	-1.550
Sub Total	-4.000	-5.550	0.000	-9.550
DISTRICT CONTRIBUTIONS				
Burnley Town Centre	-0.550	0.000	0.000	-0.550
Burnley Pendle Growth Corridor	0.000	-0.485	0.000	-0.485
Blackpool Borough Council contribution to Waste projects (held in designated reserve)	-0.194	0.000	0.000	-0.194
Sub Total	-0.744	-0.485	0.000	-1.229
CONTRIBUTIONS FROM OTHER				

EXTERNAL BODIES				
BDUK re SFBB Phase 2	-0.965	0.000	0.000	-0.965
Sub Total	-0.965	0.000	0.000	-0.965
USE OF RESERVES				
Asset maintenance earmarked reserve	-0.727	0.000	0.000	-0.727
Sub Total	-0.727	0.000	0.000	-0.727
CAPITAL RECEIPTS				
Funding for School Playing Field programme from sale of school approved via Cabinet report	-1.036	0.000	0.000	-1.036
Sub Total	-1.036	0.000	0.000	-0.965
TOTAL FUNDING	-96.676	-35.870	-2.479	-135.025
NET BORROWING REQUIREMENT	23.135	59.123	23.602	105.860

Table 1 above shows that the total borrowing requirement over the life of the programme is expected to be £105.860m. These figures exclude cashflow support to City Deal.

It should be noted however that the mix of borrowing and external funding in each individual year is subject to change in line with factors such as changes in awards from funding bodies, changes in timing of external funding, and changes to programmed spend.

The grants receivable section includes both confirmed and indicative amounts in the year for which they are allocated and paid to the authority by national government. There is currently no indication from the Education Funding Authority (EFA) of any allocation for 2018/19, hence for prudence, no estimate for this year is included in the funding table below, and no expenditure for this allocation is included in the Schools profiled spend.

3. Capital Finance Charges

The County Council has a current debt level of approximately £1bn which has been incurred over a number of years and consists of debt incurred under the current Prudential System as well as under the previous credit control system. Prior to the introduction of the Prudential Code in April 2004 the County Council were given credit approvals from central government. This was a limit on the amount the County Council could borrow and the government included provision for the financing of the debt within the RSG settlements. Traditionally the County Council borrowed up to the maximum permitted. The introduction of the Prudential Code removed these limits enabling authorities to borrow at a level they deem as affordable. It is accepted that all authorities

would have a different basis on the concept of affordability based on their differing priorities and the need for capital expenditure.

As at the 31/3/2016 since the inception of the Prudential Code the County Council has incurred £135m of capital expenditure funded from borrowing to meet its capital priorities. These prior decisions mean that there is a long term budget commitment in terms of both Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP), which is effectively a charge for the principal repayment, and interest charges. Under the current MRP policy the charge for the debt prior to the introduction of the Prudential Code is £8.887m per annum. In addition, the MRP to cover since the implementation of the Prudential Code is in the region of £11m. This is forecast to rise to £11.7m by 2020/21.

The loans, and therefore interest charges, are not tied to specific expenditure but are managed as a pool. To fund the outstanding debt the interest charges are in the region of £18m per annum although this will vary as interest rates and MRP payments change. Therefore without any additional borrowing being incurred there is a commitment in future years' budgets of some £37.7m by 2020/21. In addition the re-profiled Capital Programme for 2016/17 onwards approved at 6th October 2016 Cabinet included borrowing of £158m over the period of the Programme. By 2020/21 the additional borrowing cost will depend on the estimated economic life of the assets, and the timing of the borrowing. It is currently estimated that by 2020/21, the additional MRP charge will be £4.4m and interest charges £2.4m. The current MTFs includes the estimated impact of the Programme.

Table 2 below shows the borrowing costs for the existing programme and new re-profiled programme, totalling £44.5m.

TABLE 2	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	20/21
Borrowing costs of existing and new re-profiled capital programme	£m	£m	£m	£m
MRP				
Current Debt	19.986	19.788	20.188	20.603
New Capital Programme	1.397	2.040	3.683	4.431
Interest				
Current Debt	18.135	17.809	17.458	17.076
New Capital Programme	0.953	1.565	2.186	2.363
Total				
Current Debt	38.121	37.597	37.646	37.679
New Capital Programme	2.350	3.605	5.869	6.794
Grand total borrowing costs old and new programmes	40.471	41.202	43.515	44.473

Under the CIPFA Prudential Code consideration must be given as to the affordability of the Capital Programme. A budget of £44.5m represents approximately 6.4% of the estimated resources available to the County Council in 2020/21 (excluding potential Council Tax increases); although once investment income is taken into account the net budget represents 5.6% of revenue. There is no guidance on what is considered to be a reasonable proportion of the revenue budget is used for capital financing purposes. This is a matter for individual authorities and reflects their different aims. It should be noted that financing capital expenditure from borrowing does represent a long term commitment in the revenue budget. If the revenue budgets were to fall then the percentage committed to capital financing would increase.

The National Audit Office produced a report in June 2016 which expressed concern about the levels of debt currently serviced by local authorities. The NAO said: "If authorities cannot reduce their debt servicing costs, this will place further pressure on revenue spending." It added that minimising the revenue cost of capital programmes is the "primary challenge facing authorities." The NAO report does not refer to individual authorities' data however the DCLG has recently published information on borrowing at 31/3/16 which shows that Lancashire has the second highest level of borrowing of all the shire Counties. By head of population Lancashire has the highest level of borrowing. There is currently little information on the financing costs. The CIPFA 2014/15 actuals show that the principal repayment and interest charges represent on an average of 8.5% of the budget requirement. Lancashire's figure was shown as 9.8%, which was the 8th highest.

It should be noted that the figures quoted for 2019/20 show that capital financing budget represents a lower proportion of the budget than shown by the CIPFA statistics. This is the result of the change in MRP policy in 2015/16 which has seen significantly lower MRP charges. Excluding any potential Council Tax increases it is estimated that the net capital financing charges will increase to 5.6% of the budget in 2020/21 from 4.33% in 2016/17. Therefore the available statistics suggest that the County Council is facing an increase in financing and that it is starting from a relatively high debt base. It is therefore potentially one of those authorities who face the problem identified by the National Audit Office and future borrowing requirements should be subject to scrutiny.