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## 1. Foreword

Welcome to the latest edition of Charnwood Borough Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) covering the three-year period between 1 April 2022 and 31 March 2025.

Once again the financial outlook for the Council is characterised by uncertainty and risk. The lack of detailed information on government funding plans in the medium term remains an ongoing issue, the Environment Bill could have major financial implications, and of course, COVID-19
 is still with us.

In respect of the pandemic, I think we can be generally optimistic. The 'Omicron variant' shows that we are not yet completely out of the woods here, but I hope that the major health challenges faced by our communities are now on the wane. There is clearly no room for complacency and the Council continues to direct resources into supporting our communities but looking forward into the period of the MTFS the issues now appear more likely to be around the impact on income streams created by changes in the habits of our customers, and the overhang of public borrowing that will act as a brake on future government expenditure.

In this version of the MTFS additional information is provided covering the funding of the Council in historical context. This shows that since 2010/11 - essentially the final settlement before austerity and the peak level for funding - total Council funding (government grants plus council tax) has fallen by some £2m in cash terms, equating to a real terms reduction of around $30 \%$, and demonstrating the financial challenges that the Council has already overcome. However, the latest funding settlement for local government (Provisional Settlement, December 2021), in combination with 'Spending Review 2021' (outlined by the Chancellor in October), does not suggest that funding is likely to increase in the medium term. Further, whilst the latest funding settlement for 2022/23 was in line with the core assumptions of the previous MTFS, a major disappointment was that this was once again just a settlement for a single year, and with clear messages that the distribution of funding to individual local authorities - the total of which will not, according to the Spending Review, increase - cannot be used as a guide to funding in future. It appears that the new Secretary of State wishes to revisit the premises on which previous proposals on 'Fair Funding' were to be based and a new distribution mechanism reflecting the 'levelling up' agenda will be developed for subsequent settlements.

I obviously hope that the Council will benefit from the future redistribution of the total local government 'pot' but clearly there is a downside risk. Combined with risks arisng from the enactment of the Environment Bill, particularly the potential requirement to provide free garden waste collections which would reduce our annual income by around $£ 1.7 \mathrm{~m}$, our ongoing issues in respect of irrecoverable housing benefit payments (a possible excess exceeding £1m) and increasing inflationary pressures on
payroll and contract costs, it is fair to say that the future financial outlook is very challenging.

As I reflect above, the Council does have a track record in meeting financial challenges, and our previous careful management of our finances mean that our reserves remain adequate. Our past achievements allow us to be optimistic about creating future financial sustainability for the Council, but it almost goes without saying that a lot of hard work and judicious decision making lies ahead.

Councillor Tom Barkley
Cabinet Lead Member for Finance
January 2022

## 2. Executive summary

This Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) considers the financial outlook for Charnwood Borough Council ('Charnwood', or the 'Council') for the three financial years 2022/23, 2023/24 and 2024/25. The document's focus is on the 'General Fund'; certain aspects of the Housing Revenue Account are also discussed but the outlook for this is dealt with separately within the 30 year Housing Revenue Account business plan.

At the core of this document are the financial projections for these three years which show the funding challenges during this period. The timing of this iteration of the MTFS has allowed us to take account of Spending Review 2021, outlined by the Chancellor in October 2021 and the provisional local government finance settlement of December 2021. A draft budget which forms the first year (2022/23) of the projections has been prepared and is presented in conjunction with this MTFS.

Council will be asked to approve the final versions of both the budget and MTFS at the meeting scheduled for 21 February 2022.

In summary the financial projections show:

- 2022/23 (the budget) shows a use of reserves of some £0.3m
- 2023/24 will see a $£ 1.2 m$ use of reserves
- 2024/25 will see a further $£ 2.1 \mathrm{~m}$ use of reserves

It should be noted that $£ 0.3 \mathrm{~m}$ use of reserves is planned in 2022/23; in latter years the use of reserves reflects the financial challenge that will need to be addressed if the Council is to achieve financial sustainability - in 2024/25, the projections show the Council would need to reduce net costs on an ongoing basis by £2.1m against the 2022/23 budget amounts.

Over the three year MTFS period this would imply a use of reserves of $£ 3.6 \mathrm{~m}$, leaving the working balance at $£ 1.3 \mathrm{~m}$ by 31 March 2025. The projected working balance of $£ 4.6 \mathrm{~m}$ at 31 March 2023 represents a reasonable level of financial stability but both the MTFS projections and sensitivity analysis shows that there is no room for complacency.

Once again, the uncertainty, and associated limited confidence that can be placed on these projections should not be underestimated, the future financial settlements that local government will be offered about which little is known at present, and other factors, such as inflation and the financial impact of the implementation of the Environment Act 2021. A sensitivity analysis is included within the body of this MTFS which illustrates the very wide range of possible outcomes within individual lines for income, expenditure and government funding.

The financial settlement for 2022/23 was broadly in line with that estimated within the draft budget but once again the Settlement is for a single year and no certainty around future funding exists.

Given the narrative around the Provisional Financial Settlement which made it clear that 2022/23 funding could not be used as a guide for future years there is limited information available in respect of the latter years of the MTFS period. It is therefore assumed - in the absence of other information - that future financial settlements will reduce by amounts equivalent to half (2023/24) and all (2024/25) of the final New Homes Bonus amount awarded in 2022/23 of $£ 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$. This represents an overall reduction reflecting Charnwood's relative affluence, with transitional funding being provided within the middle MTFS year.

This assumption is highly speculative and represents a major financial risk within the MTFS projections.

The budget for 2022/23 reflects the results of further income generation and identification of savings but projections for 2023/24 and 2024/25 do not represent a financially sustainable outlook. Section 11 of this Strategy sets out more detail on this.

Finally, It is important to note that in respect of the 2023/24 and 2024/25 financial years the projections do not take account of management actions - which will clearly be necessary - to address the financial challenges identified these projections. To this extent the financial projections for these years should be be regarded as an estimate of the financial challenge facing the Council, not a financial prediction.

Going forward, it will be necessary to continue with the efforts targeted at financial sustainability and this will be a major component of Council activity for the foreseeable future.

## 3. Introduction

The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) takes a forward look at the political, economic and regulatory environment facing the Council and uses these to create a high level financial model of future potential revenues and costs. Additionally, this version of the MTFS also looks at historical funding patterns to offer further insight into the current financial outlook.

This model attempts to identify potentially significant funding surpluses or shortfalls that may arise in the medium term, and to inform the Council's budget setting process. It takes into account existing income and expenditure patterns - although these remain disrupted due to COVID-19 - together with identified and material cost pressures. The model also incorporates projected savings and efficiencies from the implementation of existing strategies, policies and projects, where these are considered sufficiently likely to materialize, and considers significant budgetary risk identifiable from current budgetary monitoring to attempt a holistic view of the Council's future financial position.

In order to balance the desire to take a long term view of the Council's financial future, and the limits on our ability to create meaningful forecasts over such a period, the MTFS has been developed to cover three years, from 1 April 2022 to 31 March 2025. The first year of this projection uses the 2022/23 budget figures presented to Council for approval alongside this document.

The purpose of this document can be summarised as follows:

- Outline the principal factors that will influence the availability of the Council's financial resources in the medium term
- Inform and define the medium term service delivery plans, in the context of financial challenges identified in financial terms
- Provide the financial basis for the Council to decide its corporate priorities for future years.

However - it is important to state that in respect of the 2023/24 and 2024/25 financial years the projections do not take account of management actions - which will clearly be necessary - to address the financial challenges inherent in these projections. To this extent the financial projections for these years should be be regarded as an estimate of the financial challenge facing the Council, not a financial prediction.

## Scope of the MTFS

This strategy document concentrates on the General Fund, which deals with nonhousing revenue items and derives its income from charges, government grants, council tax and business rates. The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) has its own business plan and both General Fund and HRA capital expenditure are subject to a three year programme which is reviewed separately from revenue items. However, the impact of capital investment and the HRA on the General Fund is considered as part of this strategy. In particular, the MTFS reflects the impact of the

Council's Capital Strategy, which itself incorporates both the Treasury Management Strategy and the Commercial Investment Strategy.

The Council's finances are actively managed on an ongoing basis and the adoption of this strategy will require executive decisions to carry out any significant actions identified.

## 4．Political，economic and regulatory outlook

In assessing prospects for the Council＇s finances it is necessary to consider how the wider political and macro－economic factors feed through into the availability of funding for the public sector，what proportion of this will be allocated to local government，and within this allocation，what the funding settlement for each Council will be．Local economic factors will also impact Council income streams，the demand for Council services，and the Council＇s ability to fund these．

At the time of drafting this Strategy（January 2022）the economic impact of the trade deal secured with the EU following the United Kingdom＇s exit from the European Union is starting to become more apparent whilst the ongoing issues created by COVID－19 are hopefully abating but may still constrain economic activity in the short and medium term．

The summary views of the Organisation for Ecomic Cooperation and Development （OECD）are set out below．A detailed economic review，will be presented within the Capital Strategy（due to be presented to Cabinet and then Council for approval in February 2022）．

## OECD Economic Forecast Summary－United Kingdom－December 2021

The economy is recovering and expected to reach pre－crisis levels at the beginning of 2022．Output is projected to rise by $6.9 \%$ in 2021，with growth moderating to $4.7 \%$ in 2022 and $2.1 \%$ in 2023 ．Consumption is the main driver of growth during the projection period．Business investment will improve but continues to be held back by uncertainty．Increased border costs following the exit from the EU Single Market are weighing on imports and exports．Unemployment will continue to decline．Inflation will keep increasing due to higher energy and commodity prices and continuing supply shortages．It is expected to peak at $4.9 \%$ in the first half of 2022 and then fall back towards the $2 \%$ target by the end of 2023.

Monetary policy should tighten gradually to bring inflation back to target over the medium term，as price pressures show signs of becoming persistent．Fiscal policy should continue to support the economy and become more targeted to aid economic restructuring．Boosting training and career counselling programmes can facilitate economic reallocation and ease job transitions．Government programmes should focus on providing certainty on long－term issues such as the transition to net zero in order to support investment． The effects from phasing out fiscal support measures on businesses and households should be closely monitored，in the context of planned tax increases，to avoid derailing the recovery．

```
＝ニニニニニニニニニニニ＝
```

The demand for the Council＇s services and its income streams are affected by the general economic health of the Borough，whilst prevailing interest rates have a direct impact on the Council＇s interest receipts．Areas of deprivation do exist in the Borough but as a whole Charnwood is above averagely prosperous，with a ranking of 236 out of 317 English local authorities ${ }^{1}$（where＇ 1 ＇is the most deprived and＇ 317 ＇ the least deprived local authority respectively）．This relative prosperity is an important factor in the projected housing growth in the Borough and this growth will affect both costs and revenues as it arises．In the relatively short term however，and over the period

[^0]of this MTFS, the general assumption is that the economic landscape will be one of an uncertain and patchy recovery.

## Environment Act 2021

This long awaited and wide-ranging piece of legislation was finally enacted, receiving Royal Assent on 9 November 2021. Included within the legislation is the creation of the new Office for Environmental Protection which replaces previous EU governance structures together with a raft of new environmental targets and monitoring requirements covering waste collection and disposal, air pollution, and water quality. There are also new responsibilities placed on producers to mitigate the environmental impact of their activities.

Of principle interest in relation to the MTFS are the potential new financial burdens placed on local authorities, and specifically, as a Shire District, the requirements to introduce weekly food waste collections, separate household recyclables into individual collection streams (rather than being co-mingled, as present), and potentially, to provide free collections of garden waste.

The detailed implementation of the Act will be determined by Regulations yet to be determined by the Secretary of State. There government say they have recognised the financial and operational challenges associated with the Act and implementation dates are still to be finalised, with some elements (eg. food waste collections) not likely to commence until 2025.

The principal and immediate financial risk would be the cessation of the Council's ability to charge for garden waste collections. This currently generates (2021/22) around $£ 1.4 \mathrm{~m}$ per annum and an increase is proposed which would bring in an additional £0.3m revenue into the budget for 2022/23. If charging were to cease from 1 April 2023 (a possibility) it could be expected that renewals would decline significantly in 2022/23 as customers would anticipate the arrival of free collections from April 2023; all revenue would disappear from 2023/24 and costs would increase as residents not currently taking advantage of the service would become entitled to free collections.

Based on the provisions within the Act it seems inevitable that additional capital and revenue costs will be incurred as new arrangements for waste collection and disposal are introduced. Generally, the government has stated that local authorities will be compensated for additional financial burdens arising from the new Act but details on this are not yet available. This gives rise to a financial risk if the governments calculation of additional cost burdens (or lost revenues) does not match the actual costs incurred. Further, previous experience suggests that new funding will be 'rolled' into the general financial settlement in future years (which may then be subject to reduction) leaving local authorities to pick up an increasing proportion of the additional costs.

## Future local government financial settlements

An initiative known as the 'Fair Funding' review has been awaited by the local government sector since 2019. This promised new distribution mechanisms and potentially new methods of local government funding underpinned by a $75 \%$ business
rate retention scheme (which would replace the current $50 \%$ business rate retention model).

Due to a mix of Brexit, COVID-19 and the general election of December 2019, the outcome of the Fair Funding review was delayed, and now appears to have been superseded by the new levelling-up policy. In particular it appears that the prospective $75 \%$ business rate retention scheme has been abandoned and from the Spending Review 2021 (SR2021) outlined by the Chancellor in October and the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement of December it is apparent that the new Secretary of State wishes to revisit the premises on which previous proposals on Fair Funding were to be based and a new distribution mechanism reflecting the levellingup agenda will be developed for subsequent settlements.

The total quantum of money available to the local government sector over the medium term (financial years 2022/23, 2023/24 and 2024/25) was set out within SR2021 but the net end result of the autumn and winter government statements was yet another single year settlement for 2022/23 and significant uncertainty as to the future distribution amongst local authorities of the total local government 'pot'.

Once again, given the one-year only basis of the recent settlements, and the absence of any material indication of future settlements, there is little option but to assume future settlements will be in line with the most recent. This is discussed further in subsequent sections of the MTFS alongside more detailed assumptions around the key individual components of the Council's revenue streams and expenditure, and the risks associated with these assumptions.

## 5. Financial projections - overview

At the heart of this MTFS is the high level financial model. This is used to derive an estimate of the Council's future revenues and costs and the associated impact on the Council's reserves. Subsequent sections describe how the model has been developed and the key assumptions used, as follows:

- Local government financing regime: discusses the projected mix of council tax and government grant revenues over the period of the MTFS
- Treasury management and investment income: discusses the Council's current approach to fund investment and projected levels of interest receivable, together with comments on envisaged future activities
- Key operational assumptions: describes the derivation and key assumptions underpinning the projections of operational income and expenditure
- Transformation and Efficiency Plans: describes the activities undertaken and identified, and initiatives planned and underway that will address the budget challenges
- Budget risks: sets out material high-level risks identified
- Existing financial resources and use of prudential borrowing: describes how revenue and capital expenditure of the Council may be financed over the period of the MTFS using reserves or prudential borrowing
- General Fund financial projections: presents the projected financial outlook for the Council over the period of the MTFS in tabular form


## 6. The local government financing regime

## Historical context

The Council's funding is currently derived from a mixture of council tax receipts, new homes bonus payments, a share of locally collected business rates and direct government grant funding. A continuing theme from the government has been the drive towards financial independence for local authorities and the move towards localism. In practice this now means a reduction in levels of direct (formula) grant funding, and increasing reliance on council tax receipts.

The peak funding year for the Council was back in 2010/11 when adjusted total funding - council tax and government grants - amounted to some £19.5m. The total funding in each year from 2010/11 is set out below:

Figure 1: Charnwood Borough Council - adjusted total funding - 2010/11 to 2022/23


Notes:

- Figures are based on outturn other than 2021/22 (estimated outturn) and 2022/23 (projection based on provisional settlements)
- The funding is adjusted for one-off and specific grants relating to the concessionary travel scheme (now an upper-tier local authority responsibility) and COVID-19 grants
- The 'Real terms' calculation is based on the CPIH index - a consumer price index that includes housing costs

The settlement for 2010/11 was the third in a mult-year settlement package set out in Spending Review 2007, and can be regarded as the final settlement prior to the austerity policies of the 2010 - 2015 coalition government, and adjusted total funding peaked in this year at $£ 19.5 \mathrm{~m}$, two-thirds of which was provided by government grants. Projections based on the Provisional Settlement show adjusted total funding some £2m lower ( $£ 17.8 \mathrm{~m}$ ) in cash terms with over half ( $52 \%$ ) of this now being derived from council tax. In real terms, using CPIH as the base index, this funding would be
equivalent to around $£ 13.9 \mathrm{~m}$ at $2010 / 11$ prices - around $30 \%$ below the peak 2010/11 funding. Considering government grant funding alone, in real terms funding based on the Projected Settlement is less than half that received in 2010/11.

In addition to the reduction in the Council's funding, three significant changes to the structure of local government finance, all introduced in the 2013/14 financial year have added to the financial management challenge.

## i. Localisation of Council Tax Support (LCTS)

Prior to financial year 2013/14, a national scheme of council tax support was in operation whereby the Council administered the scheme and were able to reclaim payments from the government. Under the localisation process, local authorities were required to introduce their own local schemes and fund the costs. In practice, this had the impact of reducing the council tax base by around $£ 0.7 \mathrm{~m}$.

Initially (2013/14) the government did provide compensatory funding, theoretically covering $90 \%$ of the financial impact, by including this amount as a specific item within the Revenue Support Grant (RSG). However, in subsequent years compensation was deemed included within the RSG, even as RSG itself was phased out; from £4.9m in $2013 / 14$, RSG had been totally eliminated by 2019/20 (although zombie like, some small grant payments under the RSG heading - £0.2m for 2022/23 - have recommenced).

## ii. Council Tax capping and referendum rules

In 2013/14 'capping rules' for local authorities were introduced. Although requiring renewal each year, they have have always been renewed, and remain in place for financial year 2022/23. For District Councils, capping in recent years has restricted council tax increases to a maximum of either $2 \%$ or $£ 5$ per Band D property unless a referendum is held. Special Expense areas, such as Loughborough, are also captured by the capping regulations restricting tax raising capabilities compared to analogous town and parish councils.

If an increase above the capping limit is sought then a referendum on the increase will be required once billing of the higher amount has taken place. This is important as costs of rebilling (maybe $£ 0.2 \mathrm{~m}$ ) would be incurred on top of the costs of the referendum (maybe $£ 0.1 \mathrm{~m}$ ) should the referendum result reject the proposed increase. The political challenge of asking residents to vote for a tax increase, the financial costs of doing so, and the obvious risk that the proposals may be rejected have effectively discouraged all but very few councils pursuing this approach.

## iii. Local retention of business rates

Historically, billing authorities (including shire districts) had responsibility for the billing and collection of business rates, which they then remitted directly to the government. Subsequently, although not a formal hypothecation rule, these were then redistributed to local government via the grants system.

From 2013/14 the system changed and became rather more complex. A system of baselines, top-ups, tariffs and levies was introduced, with local authorities benefitting from business rate collections above the baseline, but bearing some risk where collections fell below baseline levels.

The rationale for the new approach was to incentivise local authorities in encouraging economic growth (and hence business rate growth) in their areas. However, the risk and uncertainty inherent in the new arrangements are significant, especially in the area of business rate appeals.

Nothwithstanding the localisation approach, the actual rateable value of a property on which business rates are calculated, is set by the Valuation Office, which is part of HMRC. Rateable values are set on a periodic basis to create the 'rating lists'; this was last updated in 2017 with the next version due in 2023.

Businesses may appeal their rateable values with the Valuation Office. Appeals may be based on alterations to the property but most appeals relate to the original listing. Appeals take some time to be processed (only now are appeals against valuations on the 2017 list being determined) with the result that significant repayments or debtor write-offs may be required as adjustments for successful appeals are applied for all financial years since the original listing.

At inception of the new arrangements the government transferred the risk of appeals on a backdated basis, such that allowance - provisions - had to be created for the risk of successful appeals for all appeals that were not determined. Due to the backlog of caseload within the Valuation Office, many appeals relating to the 2005 and 2010 rating lists were not determined, an issue exacerbated by reporting limits within the software of the billing systems which were not designed to give the data sets required to assess appeals risk.

As context, it may be noted that the current level of provisions held against business rate appeals is around $£ 5 \mathrm{~m}, 40 \%$ of which is attributable to the Council (the balance relating to the government, Leicestershire County Council, the Fire Authority and the LLEP). Individual appeals may be significant, whilst decisions on specific property categories can prove very material across the local business rate list. This single issue is therefore a source of both risk and volatility within the business rates funding stream.

In summary, the changes to local government financing arrangments from 2013/14:

- Increased costs of local authorities
- Resticted the ability of local authorities to increase taxation revenues
- Increased the risk and volatility of funding


## Assumptions and projections

## Council tax

The core assumption for the purposes of the MTFS is that the capping regime will continue, and that the Council will increase council tax by the maximum permitted amount in each year of the MTFS period. This is assumed at £5, but adjusted for the effect of the Loughborough Special Expense area.

In comparison to other districts, Charnwood's council tax charges are still amongst the lowest in the country as the data below illustrates:

Figure 2: Comparison of District Band D Council Tax Charges 2021/22

|  | Council Tax <br> Band D | Rank <br> (of 181) |  | Council Tax Band D | Rank (of 181) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NATIONAL PICTURE |  |  | LEICESTERSHIRE AUTH | RITIES |  |
| Lowest |  |  |  |  |  |
| Breckland | £100 | 1 | Hinckley \& Bosworth | £140 | 14 |
| West Oxfordshire | £109 | 2 | Charnwood | £154 | 24 |
| Hambleton | £114 | 3 | Harborough | £173 | 49 |
|  |  |  | Blaby | £173 | 51 |
| Charnwood | £154 | 24 | North West Leicestershire | £174 | 53 |
|  |  |  | Melton | £213 | 118 |
| Median |  |  | Oadby \& Wigston | £235 | 148 |
| Arun | £192 | 90 |  |  |  |
| South Holland | £193 | 91 |  |  |  |
| North East Derbyshire | £193 | 92 |  |  |  |
| Highest |  |  | * Calculation includes Band Special Rate (or equivalen | D and Share spread across | Loughbor le tax bas |
| Oxford | £320 | 179 |  |  |  |
| Preston | £327 | 180 | Source: MHCLG / DLUHC |  |  |
| Ipswich | £377 | 181 |  |  |  |

The impact of the capping rules are illustrated here. Were the Council allowed to increase council tax up to an average level for 2022/23 - say £193 - then this would generate an additional £2.3m in that year (with the obvious cumulative benefit in future years).

The actual amount of Council Tax collected will also vary in line with the tax base, essentially the number of properties against which Council Tax is levied. Historically the tax base has increased in a range between $1.5 \%$ and $2 \%$ per annum, reflecting the strong housing growth in the area. However, growth in the year to October $2021^{2}$ was weaker than this historical norm at just $0.9 \%$.

[^1]The tax base for the 'central case' on which the MTFS financial model is calculated is assumed to increase by $1.6 \%$ year on year over the period of this document. This assumes that the slower growth recently experienced was a blip and as the impact of the pandemic recedes historical growth trends are restored. The $1.6 \%$ figure is based on a moving average of increases in the years preceding the COVID-19 pandemic.

Figure 3: Projected Council Tax income tax increases

| (Amounts £000) | $2022 / 23$ budget | $2023 / 24$ | $2024 / 25$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assumed council tax income - CENTRALCASE | $\mathbf{7 , 9 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 3 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 7 9 1}$ |
| Assumed council tax income - OPTIMISTIC | 7,981 | 8,547 | 8,871 |
| Assumed council tax income - PESSIMISTIC | 7,981 | 8,333 | 8,741 |

The OPTIMISTIC case assumes that there will be a catch-up in housing completions leading to $2.5 \%$ year on year increases for 2023/24 and 2024/25. Conversely, the PESSIMISTIC case assumes the lower growth rate in the council tax base will continue resulting in $1 \%$ year on year increases.

In all scenarios it is assumed that the tax rate will increase by the maximum $£ 5$ allowed year on year (allowing for Loughborough Special Expenses adjustment).

## Loughborough Special Rate

The town of Loughborough does not have the equivalent of a town council and the role that this organisation would fulfill is therefore undertaken by the Borough Council.

The Loughborough Special Rate is levied on the residents of Loughborough by the Borough Council and is used for activities specifically related to Loughborough town. This set of activities is comparable to those performed by towns and parishes and used by other Councils in equivalent situations. These activities have been validated by the Council and include maintenance of parks, cemeteries and memorials, management of allotments and costs associated with the Loughborough Fair and festive decorations. A full list of activities is set out in the Budget Book issued by the Council each year and available at:
https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/2021_22_budget_book/Budget\ Book\ 2021-22.pdf
For the purposes of the MTFS projections the Special Rate is assumed to increase by $1.99 \%$ year on year, whilst the council tax base annual growth rate is assumed at $1.4 \%$ based on the average of recent years.

Note: The above paragraphs assume that council tax increases for 2022/23 will be approved by the meeting of the full Council in February.

It should also be noted that for the purposes of assessing whether Council Tax increases are excessive when the government calculates the year on year level of increase for Charnwood, it includes both the main Borough charge and the Loughborough Special Rate.

Figure 4: Projected Loughborough Special Rate income

| (Amounts $£ 000$ ) | $2022 / 23$ budget | $2023 / 24$ | $2024 / 25$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LSR $-1.99 \%$ increase assumed | 1,346 | 1,392 | 1,439 |

## Provisional local government finance settlement 2022/23

The latest (albeit provisional) local government finance settlement continues the recent series of 'one-off' allocations, and comprises a mix of business rate retention, and historic and new grant allocations. No COVID-19 specific funding has been allocated this year. This is tabulated below, alongside the 2021/22 budget for comparative purposes:

Figure 5: Provisional local government finance settlement

| (Amounts £000) | $2021 / 22$ budget | Draft budget 2022/23 | Provnl Settlement <br> $2022 / 23$ |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Retained business rates | 4,547 | 4,465 | 5,200 |
| Revenue Support Grant | $0^{3}$ | 0 | 174 |
| New Homes Bonus | 3,000 | 988 | 1,631 |
| Lower Tier Services Grant | 618 | 0 | 1,112 |
| Services Grant | 0 | 2,728 | 296 |
| Unspecified - estimated | 0 | $(15)$ | 0 |
| Movement on collection fund | 8,167 | 8,196 | 122 |
| Sub-total | 801 | 8,535 |  |
| Tranche \#5 COVID-19 funding | 8,968 | 8,196 | 0 |
| Total | 0,535 |  |  |

## Local share of national non-domestic rates ('business rates' or 'NNDR')

As noted previously, from 1 April 2013 the structure of local government finance changed, with local authorities retaining a share of business rates collected in their area. The calculations are based on baseline (target) rates of collection set by government and estimate that the Council will retain around $9 \%$ of the total collected (although this calculation has been skewed in recent years due to one-off COVID19 reliefs applied following which the Council is compensated via grants). A baseline amount of retention is set out within the settlement for 2022/23 equating to $£ 4.3 \mathrm{~m}$ for $2022 / 23$; the settlement also sets out the safety net balance ( $£ 4.0 \mathrm{~m}$ ) below which the collection deficit is compensated, and the levy rate, which has the effect of allowing 20\% retention for business rate collections above the baseline.

[^2]The amount the Council receives is subject to a number of variables including collection rates and business rate reliefs for which the Council may (or may not) receive compensation via 'Section 31' grants.

One of the challenges for the Council is the material lack of growth in business rates since the inception of the localised arrangements. This is due to two main factors:

- The business rates baselines were set immediately prior to the Council's biggest ratepayer, Astra Zeneca, vacating the site of what is now Charnwood Campus leading to a loss in business rates of over £2m; whilst the idea of a baseline reset is much mooted this has yet to be carried out (and is resisted by local authorities that have benefitted through business rates growth)
- Generally, business rates growth has been sluggish within Charnwood, with gains offset by losses arising from successful appeals, or empty properties

Discounting the impact of COVID-19, it could be expected that a small degree of business rates growth will arise over the period of the MTFS based on, in particular. medium term initiatives such as the development of Charnwood Campus and the inclusion of this in the Enterprise Zone and the expectation that the majority of successful valuation appeals are now settled. Combined with indexation gains the central case for the MTFS is that year on year growth of $£ 0.2 \mathrm{~m}$ in retained business rates will arise, as set out below.

Figure 6: Projected local share of business rates

| (Amounts $£ 000$ ) | $2022 / 23$ budget | $2023 / 24$ | $2024 / 25$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NDR retention - central case | $\mathbf{5 , 2 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 4 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 6 0 0}$ |
| NDR retention - OPTIMISTIC | 5,900 | 6,200 | 6,600 |
| NDR retention - PESSIMISTIC | 4,900 | 4,900 | 4,900 |

In the OPTIMISTIC case a higher baseline is assumed reflecting volatility within the underlying calculations ${ }^{4}$; further additional business rate growth - including a lesser proportion of empty properties - is experienced creating year on year growth above the budget (2022/23) of $£ 0.3 \mathrm{~m}$ and $£ 0.4 \mathrm{~m}$ for $2023 / 24$ and $2024 / 25$ respectively; these relatively low projections for the Optimistic case in the MTFS period reflect the absence of major development sites with planning permission and / or developer interest

In the PESSIMISTIC case business rate retention is assumed to remain at $£ 4.9 \mathrm{~m}$, being the projected outturn for the 2021/22 financial year; it is unlikely that business rate retention could fall much below this figure unless retention rules were significantly altered.

[^3]
## Other grants

The consultation associated with the Provional Settlement is summarized in respect of other grants as follows:

- Revenue Support Grant: indexation applied to 2021/22 amount to arrive at 2022/23 award but no information on future years
- New Homes Bonus: final legacy payment honoured and single year payment in respect of 2022/23 awarded; revised incentivisation scheme for development may be implemented but no detail available
- Lower Tier Services Grant: awarded on a single year basis for 2021/22 but a further single year awarded; total funding for the grant of $£ 111 \mathrm{~m}$ for 2022/23 with distribution designed to ensure no local authority sees a reduction in Core Spending Power
- Services Grant: one-off distribution of $£ 822 \mathrm{~m}$; it appears that this sum will be available to the sector in future years but with a different distribution; also of note is the comment that this grant will not be included in any baseline calculation for future transitional relief

In addition to the above it is known that the total pot of money relating to the above grants will be static across the MTFS period; therefore any increases or decreases in the Council's individual allocation will be due to the impact of redistribution across the local government sector.

The total funding relating to the above grants amounts to $£ 3.213 \mathrm{~m}$ for 2022/23. Given the absence of detail on the future of allocations, existence or replacement for the above, these other grants are considered as a single block.

For the purpose of MTFS, the central case assumes that the New Homes Bonus element is deemed to disappear, offset by transitional funding of half the lost amount ( $£ 0.8 \mathrm{~m}$ ) receivable in 2023/24 only. This reflects the nascent 'levelling-up’ agenda and Charnwood's relative affluence in comparison to other areas.

In the OPTIMISTIC case it is assumed that total funding from other grants will remain at $£ 3.213 \mathrm{~m}$ for each year of the projections. This reflects the overall 'cash flat' scenario set out in Spending Review 2021 with the underlying assumption that the Council will neither gain nor lose from future redistributions.

In the PESSIMISTIC case the loss in grant is assumed at $£ 1.2 \mathrm{~m}$ in 2023/24 with a further £1m reduction for 2024/25.

Figure 7: Other grant projections

| (Amounts $£ 000$ ) | $2022 / 23$ budget | $2022 / 23$ | $2023 / 24$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Other grants - central case | $\mathbf{3 , 2 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 4 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 6 0 0}$ |
| Other grants - OPTIMISTIC (rounded amounts) | 3,213 | 3,213 | 3,213 |
| Other grants - PESSIMISTIC (rounded amounts) | 3,213 | 2,000 | $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0}$ |

## COVID-19 funding

The government provided various types of COVID-19 funding within the 2020/21 and 2021/22 financial years. No funding has been mooted in respect of the 2022/23 financial year.

Figure 7. above, illustrates the risk that a very significant funding gap could arise following the outcome of future local government financial settlements given the oneoff or diminishing nature of awards contained within the 2022/23 provisional settlement. The principal risk would appear to be with the New Homes Bonus element of funding, amounting to $£ 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ and due to cease after 2022/23, but other reductions could arise due to the effects of redistribution.

It does not seem likely that all this funding would be lost without some significant level of mitigation or transitional arrangements hence the assumptions made within the PEESIMISTIC scenario. However, it must be stressed that even this pessimistic scenario is not the worst case that could be envisaged.

In the absence of further information, the central case and OPTIMISTIC and PESSIMISTIC scenarios are necessarily speculative and gives rise to a high level of uncertainty. This uncertainty within the MTFS projections is highly significant within the context of the overall projections.

## 7. Treasury management and commercial investment income

## Treasury management

The majority of the Council's investments are short-term, mainly made up of cash deposited for short periods on money markets. The remainder is made up of loans to other local authorities for periods of up to two years and longer term holdings in property funds. In recent years these have had a value in the range of $£ 40 \mathrm{~m}$ to $£ 70 \mathrm{~m}$ at any point in time. Broadly, these amounts represent a combination of Council Reserves (including the Housing Revenue Account), business rates and council tax collected on behalf of the County Council, local police and fire authorities, and parishes. The investment income generated from these balances remains an important source of funding for the Council despite the ongoing low level of interest rates.

In selecting its investments, the Council must balance the rates of return available whilst ensuring the security and liquidity of its investments. As a body that must take its stewardship of public money seriously, the Council adopts a prudent treasury management strategy. This strategy is subject to Council approval each year and aims to allow the Council's finance team appropriate levels of latitude in the day to day management of treasury operations within closely defined operational parameters.

The investment strategy is weighted towards security and liquidity of capital and, in general, it is envisaged that this approach will continue. The strategy assumes a continuation of the trend of recent years to seek increased returns through loans to other public sector bodies and investments in a wider range of financial instruments, such as property funds but security and liquidity remain paramount.

This matter is discussed in more detail in the Council's Capital Strategy, which is also scheduled for Cabinet and Council approval in February 2022.

For the purposes of projections, it is assumed that:

- Interest rates are likely to rise over the period of the MTFS; Bank of England projections ${ }^{5}$ suggest base rates will increase from $0.2 \%$ in graded steps to $1.1 \%$ by the end of 2022, and remain at that level for an extended period
- Average cash balances available for investment will reduce (reflecting use of internal borrowing to finance the delivery of the capital plan)
- The net effect of the above will deliver returns in line with the $2021 / 22$ budget

[^4]Figure 8: Investment income (interest receivable) projections

| (Amounts £000) | $2022 / 23$ budget | $2023 / 24$ | $2024 / 25$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interest receivable - central case | $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ |
| Interest receivable - OPTIMISTIC | 350 | 400 | 500 |
| Interest receivable - PESSIMISTIC | 300 | 280 | 250 |

In the OPTIMISTIC case it is assumed that increases in interest rate will offset reducing balances, whilst the PESSIMISTIC case assumes the reverse. In respect of this revenue, the current low levels of interest rates, and the recent history of the Council's cash holdings, suggest that there is more upside than downside.

## Interest payable - general fund

The Council has one external loan of £2m. This was taken out in 1984 at a fixed interest rate of $11.625 \%$ and is due for repayment in June 2024. Repayment of the loan will see a reduction in interest payable of around £180k in the final year of the MTFS period (and all £233k in subsequent years) unless new loans are taken out in the intervening period. Given the Council's cash balances, around $£ 10 \mathrm{~m}$ of capital expenditure could be financed via 'internal borrowing'6 so there are no plans to undertake additional external boorowing in the short term. More detail on this may be found within the Capital Strategy 2022/23.

## Commercial investment income

The Council has built up a portfolio of commercial properties for investment purposes at a cost of $£ 22 \mathrm{~m}$, generating gross annual rental returns in excess of $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$.

The property portfolio is performing well but the Council's ability to make additional commercial property acquisitions is now very restricted due to reduced access to Public Works Loan Board borrowing, and planned changes to the 'Prudential Code' which will effectively prevent the Council acquiring commercial property using debt. These restrictions may not completely prevent additional acquistions but workarounds such as the creation of special purpose corporate bodies may be required and for the purpose of this MTFS it is assumed that no further commercial property investment will occur.

Whilst over £1m in gross annual rentals will be generated from the existing investment properties the Council will adopt a prudent approach to recognizing this income with the 2022/23 budget and MTFS projections assuming net rentals of $£ 0.65 \mathrm{~m}$ per annum. This allows proper allowance of Minimum Revenue Provision (a charge reflecting the need to repay capital purchases unfunded by earmarked reserves), notional interest payments (reflecting the current internal borrowing arrangements) and creation of a reserve to allow for potential void rent periods, additional interest costs should debt need to be externalised, and similar.

[^5]Further details of the investment property portfolio are set out within the Capital Strategy 2022/23.

Figure 9: Commercial (investment) property income projections

| (Amounts £000) | $2022 / 23$ budget | $2023 / 24$ | $2024 / 25$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net rentals (after MRP, interest and provision) | 650 | 650 | 650 |

## 8. Key operational assumptions

The Council's 'Net Service Expenditure' (or 'Baseline net service costs' per the summary financial model at Figure 14) is the total amount spent on services, offset by income associated with the provision of those services such as planning fees receivable, income generated by the Council's car parks, or service specific grant income. The basis of the Council's projected Net Service Expenditure for the purposes of the MTFS is the 2022/23 budget.

For this iteration of the MTFS there are key assumptions are around payroll costs (wages, salaries and on-costs, particularly employer pension contributions), indexation increases in major contracts, and services pressures identified as part of the 2022/23 budget setting process. In contrast to previous versions of the MTFS the underlying inflation outlook is both less benign and less certain, creating greater challenge in developing the MTFS projections, whilst he implementation of the Environment Act could also have a very negative financial impact on the Council.

## Environment Act - assumptions

As discussed previously in this paper (Section 4), the Environment Act 2021 has the potential to create additional costs for the Council as well as remove income currently derived from garden waste collections. For the purposes of the central case MTFS projections it is assumed that no adverse financial impact will be experienced across the period of the MTFS due to allowance for the necessary lead times being made within the Regulations to the Act.

Figure 10: Environment Act 2021 - adverse financial impact assumptions

| (Amounts £000) | $2022 / 23$ budget | $2023 / 24$ | $2024 / 25$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Environment Act 2021 - central case | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Environment Act 2021 - OPTIMISTIC | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Environment Act 2021 - PESSIMISTIC | 800 | 1,700 | 1,700 |

In the PESSIMISTIC scenario the implementation of the Act would require the Council to offer free garden waste collections from 1 April 2023; given the profile of subsubscription renewals this would be assumed to reduce income by around half in $2022 / 23^{7}$, on the basis that customers would not renew subscriptions in the autumn and winter, with a full year loss of income from 2024/25.

## Inflation outlook

The inflation outlook is much less benign at this this point in time then has been experienced in recent history. The latest available data (November 2021) shows $C P I^{8}$ running at $4.6 \%$, significantly above the Bankof England target of $2 \%$. The Monetary Policy Committee report of November 2021 estimates that CPI will peak at around 5\% in April 2022 (although other forecasts suggest maybe 7\% here) with

[^6]a reduction to $3.4 \%$ in Q4 2022 and then $2.1 \%$ by Q4 2023; by this stage the forecast suggests that inflation will be back around the $2 \%$ target range for 2024 and subsequently.

## Payroll costs

The Council's bill is budgeted at £13.8m for 2022/23 which represents around $45 \%$ of general fund operating expenses; each additional percentage point on pay therefore represents therefore around $£ 0.14 \mathrm{~m}$.

In the autumn statement of 2020, the Chancellor announced a public sector pay freeze for all but the lowest paid staff. Whilst local government pay is not included within this definition of 'public sector pay', historically local government pay has tracked the public sector pay settlement and that was the base assumption for the 2021/22 budget and last year's version of the MTFS. However, The national local government pay award for the financial year 2021/22 has yet to be settled with rising inflation increasing the strength of the employee claim. Whilst the Trade Union claim for a $10 \%$ payrise does not appear realistic, it may be noted that a $1.75 \%$ offer has been rejected, and this amount can now be regarded as a 'floor' for the settlement.

It is now likely that a multi-year deal on pay will eventually arise and the budget for 2022/23 assumes an increase on the 2020/21 salary scales of around [3\%]. This represents the central case for the MTFS projections, which further assume year on year payrises of $1.5 \%$ for subsequent years, an assumption that pay increases will be somewhat below prevailing inlation.

In the OPTIMISTIC scenario salaries grow from the 2022/23 budget at $1 \%$ year on year, reflecting increases below likely inflation rates. In the PESSIMISTIC scenario, the budget for 2023/24 proves insufficient (by 2\%) and then increases for 2023/24 of $3 \%$ and 2024/25 of $2 \%$, representing forecast inflation rates at the end of calendar years 2022 and 2023 respectively.

Figure 11: Payroll cost assumptions

| (Amounts £000) | $2022 / 23$ | $2023 / 24$ | $2024 / 25$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (percentage increases are versus the 2022/23 budget) | Budget |  | $\mathbf{+ 1 . 5 \%}$ |
| Wages and salaries - central case | $\mathbf{+ 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{+ 1 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 , 1 9 0}$ |
| Wages and salaries - OPTIMISTIC | $\mathbf{1 3 , 7 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 , 9 8 3}$ | $+1 \%$ |
|  | $+0 \%$ | $+1 \%$ | 14,059 |
| Wages and salaries - PESSIMISTIC | 13,779 | $+2 \%$ | $+3 \%$ |
|  | 14,187 | 14,329 | 14,472 |

Indexation cost increases in major contracts
The Council is party to many contracts for goods and services at any particular point in time, including - for example - those for IT licences, stray dog kennelling
and putting up the Christmas lights. However, the largest contracts (excluding HRA contractors) are:

- Environmental Services
- Approximate annual cost (per 2022/23 budget) - $£ 5.9$ m
- Indexation - RPI
- Also, standard variation applied for additional properties
- Open Spaces
- Approximate annual cost (per 2022/23 budget) - £1.3m
- Indexation - RPI; but capped at $2 \%$
- Revenues \& Benefits
- Approximate annual cost (per 2022/23 budget) - £2.6m
- Indexation-CPI

Current inflation rates and the associated indexation is essentially reflected in the 202/23 budget, but the central case, and OPTIMISTIC and PESSIMISTIC indexation scenarios are tabulated below:

Figure 12: Major contracts - cost indexation scenarios

| (Amounts £O00 - increases versus 2022/23 budget) <br> (percentage increases are versus the 2022/23 budget) | $2022 / 23$ <br> Budget | $2023 / 24$ | $2024 / 25$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Major contracts - central case | $+0 \%$ | $+5 \%$ | $+4 \%$ |
| Environmental Services | 5,945 | 6,242 | 6,492 |
| Open Spaces | $+0 \%$ | $+2 \%$ | $+2 \%$ |
|  | 1,346 | 1,373 | 1,400 |
| Revenues \& Benefits | $+0 \%$ | $+3.5 \%$ | $+2 \%$ |
|  | 2,583 | 2,673 | 2,727 |
| Summary YoY increase | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 5}$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Major contracts - OPTIMISTIC | $+0 \%$ | $+3 \%$ | $+2 \%$ |
| Environmental Services | 5,945 | 6,124 | 6,246 |
| Open Spaces | $+0 \%$ | $+2 \%$ | $+2 \%$ |
| Revenues \& Benefits | 1,346 | 1,373 | 1,400 |
| Summary YoY increase | $+0 \%$ | $+2.5 \%$ | $+2 \%$ |
|  | 2,583 | 2,647 | 2,700 |
| Major contracts - PESSIMISTIC | 0 | 270 | 473 |
| Environmental Services |  |  |  |
| Open Spaces | $+0 \%$ | $+7 \%$ | $+5 \%$ |
| Revenues \& Benefits | 5,945 | 6,361 | 6,680 |
| Summary YoY increase | $+0 \%$ | $+2 \%$ | $+2 \%$ |
|  | 1,346 | 1,373 | 1,400 |
|  | $+0 \%$ | $+5 \%$ | $+4 \%$ |
|  | 2,583 | 2,712 | 2,820 |
|  | 0 | 572 | 1,026 |

## 9. Transformation and Efficiency plans

Charnwood has embarked on a programme to achieve financial sustainability. This programme is ongoing and has a number of elements as outlined below:

- Service reviews
- Assets and fixed costs
- Commercialisation and income generation
- Procurement
- Regeneration and economic growth
- Other - Technical and tactical approaches

The initial results of the programme were reflected in the savings and income generating opportunities identified and reflected in the budget for 2021/22 and totalling a net $£ 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$. Of these initiatives all were essentially realised other than:

- Essential Car User allowance - a saving of $£ 0.2 \mathrm{~m}$ was assumed within the 2021/22 budget but delays in implementation will not result in savings within the 2021/22 financial year; implementation is now underway and a reduced level of savings is included within the 2022/23 budget
- Biggin Street toilet closures - only half of the planned saving of £20k proved realizable; the reduced level of savings is adjusted within the 2022/23 budget

Total savings and additional income generating opportunities identified for the 2022/23 budget comprise $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$. The detailed list of savings is included within the budget papers, but principal elements comprise:

Figure 13: Principal savings and income generation opportunities - 2022/23 budget

| (Amounts £000) | 2022/23 <br> Budget | 2023/24 | 2024/25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income generation |  |  |  |
| Increase in garden waste charges | 300 | 300 | 300 |
| Increase in bulky waste charges | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Other income generation | 84 | 84 | 84 |
| Staffing efficiencies - various services |  |  |  |
| Deletion of vacant posts or vacant hours - No service changes required | 231 | 231 | 231 |
| Service changes |  |  |  |
| Reductions in grant - housing partner | 40 | 75 | 75 |
| Customer Services - reduced opening hours | 121 | 121 | 121 |
| Review of town centre facilities - shop mobility | 34 | 34 | 34 |
| Reduction - other grants | 32 | 32 | 32 |
| Efficiency savungs |  |  |  |
| Garden waste collections - stationery saving | 45 | 45 | 45 |
| Other efficiency | 73 | 73 | 73 |
| TOTAL GENERATED | 1,010 | 1,043 | 1,043 |

For the purposes of the MTFS projection it is assumed that savings and income generation identified in respect of the budget year 2022/23 will carry forward into future years, being specific actions and initiatives, and with a high level of probability that these can be delivered and sustained into the medium term.

It is recognized that further savings and / or income generation will be required in 2023/24 and 2024/25 to address the financial challenges identified within the MTFS projections. As such it is important to note that the projections above are arithmetic in nature rather than predictions of a likely outcome in terms of savings that will be achieved in future years,

## 10. Existing financial resources and use of prudential borrowing

Currently, the Council retains a number of reserves on its balance sheet, representing amounts that the Council may use to deliver or enhance Council services. Broadly, these are of three types:

- The General Fund balance that can be used to fund any type of expenditure
- Balances that may be used to fund any type of expenditure but which have been earmarked for specific uses by the Council
- Balances that are restricted in use by Government regulation that can be used to fund only specific types of expenditure, usually of a capital nature

There are also other balances on the Council's balance sheet created as a result of Government regulation or accounting rules. These balances are not available to fund expenditure of any type.

In recent years Charnwood has continued to invest in service delivery and the MTFS assumes that:

- The General Fund balance will be maintained at a level of not less than £2m in line with good practice
- Other reserves will be utilised or created during the period of the MTFS as appropriate; additionally, transfers between reserves may be deemed appropriate

As will be seen from the financial projections the Council reserves levels are reasonable (with a working balance of some $£ 4.5 \mathrm{~m}$ projected at 31 March 2023) but the significant risk with the latter two years of the MTFS period in particular, does not give room for complacency.

It is clear from the projections (Section 11) and identified risks (Section 12) that further action is required to address the projected net funding deficit across the period of the MTFS.

In addition, the Council could consider utilising reserves in the short term in order that services can be restructured in a cost effective and efficient manner giving a sustainable base for the future.

## Growth Support Fund and Capital Plan Reserve

The Growth Support Fund has been established to support growth throughout the Borough. This fund is a revenue reserve and can be used for a variety of purposes, both revenue and capital. In addition, a Capital Plan Reserve has been created so that the Council can supplement its level of usable capital receipts. This reserve
is designed to be used for General Fund capital items only but it is not constrained and could also be used to fund general fund revenue expenditure.

## Usable Capital Receipts Reserve

The Usable Capital Receipts Reserve represents the proceeds of asset sales available to meet future capital expenditure. The use of this reserve is restricted for application on items of a capital nature.

The Council has a well-established process exists for the management of the capital plan. For the purposes of the MTFS we are therefore able to assume that sufficient resources exist, or will be generated, to finance all uncompleted schemes within the current Capital Plan. Funding required beyond this point will rely on the Council's ability to generate new receipts from asset sales, or funding from revenue and/or reserves or Prudential Borrowing, which is discussed below.

## Use of Prudential Borrowing - General Fund

Historically, Charnwood has been able to avoid the use of borrowing but in the 2020/21 financial year undertook Prudential Borrowing to finance the acquisition of commercial properties for investment purposes (some £22m) and to part finance the purchase of the new environmental services fleet. Further prudential borrowing of $£ 2 m$ was undertaken in 2021/22 to fund development of the Enterprise Zone.

Additional detail of this is set out in the Capital Strategy 2022/23.

## Use of Prudential Borrowing for Housing

The Council will externally borrow, if necessary, to undertake works in line with its Housing Capital Investment Programme and 30 -Year Housing Business Plan. Where feasible it will 'internally borrow' from the General Fund provided there are surplus amounts available for this purpose. These internally borrowed amounts will be at similar interest rates to those offered by the government's Public Works Loan board (PWLB). The Council retains all its Council dwellings rental income in order to service the HRA debt, pay for repairs and maintenance of the housing stock and for its housing operations generally. This borrowing, and any additional borrowing as mentioned above, is segregated from General Fund borrowing and so does not directly impact on the MTFS. Further details regarding the HRA are set out in the section covering the Housing Revenue Account.
11. Financial Projections 2022-2025

Figure 14 MTFS financial projections - General Fund

|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 2022/23 } \\ £ 000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 2022/23 } \\ £ 000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2023 / 24 \\ £ 000 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expenditure |  |  |  |
| Baseline Net Service Costs | 18,508 | 18,151 | 19,038 |
| Ongoing Service pressures | 184 |  |  |
| Ongoing additional savings / income | $(1,010)$ |  |  |
| Net Service Expenditure | 17,432 | 18,151 | 19,038 |
| Commerial property interest and provisions | 729 | 729 | 729 |
| Interest payable | 240 | 240 | 60 |
| Interest receivable | (300) | (300) | (300) |
| Collection fund and reserve adjustments | 322 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 18,423 | 18,820 | 19,527 |
| Savings to be determined 2022/23 | (250) |  |  |
| Total Borough Expenditure | 18,173 | 18,820 | 19,527 |
| Funding |  |  |  |
| Council Tax Receipts | 7,981 | 8,381 | 8,791 |
| Loughborough Special Levy | 1,346 | 1,392 | 1,440 |
| Revenue Support Grant | 174 | 0 | 0 |
| NNDR | 5,200 | 5,400 | 5,600 |
| New Homes Bonus | 1,631 | 0 | 0 |
| Lower Tier Services Grant | 1,112 | 0 | 0 |
| Core Spending Grant | 296 | 0 | 0 |
| Government Grants - non specific | 0 | 2,398 | 1,582 |
| Collection Fund Surplus/(Deficit) | 122 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 17,863 | 17,571 | 17,413 |
| Projected use of Working Balance | 311 | 1,248 | 2,114 |

The implication of the above projections is that to bring the Council's finances back into a sustainable position (ie. where expenditure is restricted to match funding) is that by 2024/25 the Council will need to remove around £2.1m from its projected cost base over and above savings identified and income generation created to date. Critically, this assumes that funding due (or likely to) fall away from 2023/24 is at least partially replaced - which is a highly uncertain proposition at this time.

The impact of these projections on the Council's revenue reserves is set out below:

Figure 15: Projected movement on Working Balance

|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 2022/23 } \\ £ 000 \end{gathered}$ | $2022 / 23$ | $2023 / 24$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund working balance |  |  |  |
| Balance brought forward | 4,970 | 4,614 | 3,366 |
| Collection fund surplus | 122 | - | - |
| Replenishment Reeinvestment Reserve | (167) |  |  |
| Use of balance in year | (311) | $(1,248)$ | $(2,114)$ |
|  | 4,614 | 3,366 | 1,252 |

The above projection shows that without action to address the financial challenge projected, the Working Balance would fall below the minimum level of $£ 2 \mathrm{~m}$ (as recommended by the Section 151 Officer) by the end of the MTFS period; further, although the projections do not extend into $2025 / 26$, it is clear that the working balance would be completely depleted if no action was taken and the Council in effect becoming insolvent.

Figure 16: Other Revenue Reserves (year end position)

|  | 2022//23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Other Revenue Reserves |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Capital Plan Reserve | 2,233 | 2,233 | 2,233 |
| Other Revenue Reserves | 2,215 | 2,215 | 2,215 |
|  | 3,183 | 3,183 | 3,183 |

(Movements in other reserves are typically not directly connected to revenue expenditure but will in practice diminish through utilisation over the MTFS period)

Note on Collection Fund: In any year the amounts of council tax or business rates actually collected will differ from that budgeted due to additions or removals of properties from the register, or non-collection of amounts billed. These surpluses or deficits are managed through the collection fund and (effectively) reflected in adjustments to precepts in subsequent years.

## 12. Risk and sensitivities

## Government funding

The delay in the Funding Funding review and another one-year 'sticking plaster' local government financial settlement (historically there are little or no changes between the provisional and final settlements - which is usually communicated in mid-February) means that there is a high level of uncertainty around future funding in the latter years of this MTFS and a very wide range of plausible funding outcomes. The most obvious risk area is the New Homes Bonus funding stream where some $£ 1.6 \mathrm{~m}$ receivable in $2022 / 23$ is due to cease, but other funding streams are also earmarked as 'one year only' and generally, funding received in 2022/23 will be subject to potentially adverse redistribution effects in future years.

## Inflation

The current inflation outlook is discussed previously in this MTFS but the less benign outlook clearly gives rise to additional risk; in broad terms each additional $1 \%$ increase on payroll and major contract costs adds $£ 0.25 \mathrm{~m}$ to the Council's annual expenditure.

## Environment Act 2021

The financial impact of the Environment Act 2021 has also been discussed previously. Based on the significant lead time required to implement the aspects of the Act directly impacting local government it is assumed that the Regulations that will set out the detailed implementation timetable will not result in any material adverse financial impact to the Council over the period of the MTFS. However, earlier adoption of the requirement to offer a free garden waste collection in particular could give rise to a significant loss of income.

A sensitivity analysis for the above areas is included within previous Sections. The following areas are also areas of risk and / or opportunity.

## Supported living

The projections assume these costs remain at around $£ 0.7 \mathrm{~m}$ across the period of the MTFS. Based on current information around supported living units existing and planned, it is possible that costs could exceed $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$. However, should either the Council be successful in lobbying the Government about the impact of this situation, or the main providers in Charnwood achieve Registered Provider status then the cost to the Council could fall significantly.

In the OPTIMISTIC case the main providers in Chranwood both achieve Registered Provider status (or fall under an RP umbrella) such that costs reduce to an annual $£ 0.1 \mathrm{~m}$ from 1 January 2023. In the PESSIMISTIC case costs exceed the budget
amount by $£ 0.2 \mathrm{~m}$ in 2022/23 and increase by this amount year on year, as set out below.

Figure 17: Supported living - sensitivies

| (Amounts £000) | $2022 / 23$ <br> Budget | $2023 / 24$ | $2024 / 25$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Supported living - central case | 650 | 650 | 650 |
| Supported living - OPTIMISTIC | 650 | 525 | 100 |
| Supported living - PESSIMISTIC | 850 | 1,050 | 1,250 |

## Income streams

The Council generates around $£ 12 m$ annually from various fees and charges. These include:

- Planning fees are known to be cyclical in nature and given the substantial nature of some individual planning fees a variance (adverse or negative) of $£ 0.25 \mathrm{~m}$ around the budgeted figure would not be unusual
- Leisure centres - it is assumed that the Council will successfully complete the contract extension for the leisure centre provider with income receivable being stable across the period of the MTFS at contracted levels
- Markets - it is assumed income levels will recover from pandemic lows but then plateau towards a new lower normal in 2023/24 reflecting the loss of some existing traders and permanent changes in shopping habits
- Town Hall - shows and room hire will continue to operate at below prepandemic levels through 2021/22 but it is assumed that the key shows will be able to run in line with pre-pandemic operations from 2022/23 and in subsequent years.
- Car parking - income is assumed at $85 \%$ of pre-pandemic levels across the MTFS period; underpinning assumptions are that economic activity will near normal by late spring 2022 (with works around Bedford Square being completed and the temporary free car parking offer ceasing) but that permanent changes in shopping and commuting habits will restrict income recovery; budgeted income for 2022/23 is set at prior year levels with potential shortfalls (based on current run rates) being offset by the periodic rate increase which is due.

In total, income may be plus or minus $£ 0.5 \mathrm{~m}$ versus the budgeted figure, as reflected in the table below.

Figure 18: Income - sensitivies

| (Amounts £000) | $2022 / 23$ <br> Budget | $2023 / 24$ | $2024 / 25$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increases / (decreases) versus the 2022/23 budget) | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Income - central case | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| Income - PESSIMISTIC | $(500)$ | $(500)$ | $(500)$ |

COVID-19
The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has been considered within the MTFS projections set out in previous paragraphs assuming a general scenario where social restrictions on day-to-day life are minimal and society recovers towards a new normal.

Should a major reoccurance of COVID-19 arise such that major restrictions on day-to-day life have to be introduced for an extended period of time this would materially impact the Council's income and expenditure patterns. None of the projections in this iteration of the MTFS are based on this scenario and - as was the case in 2020/21 such an event would likely require updated versions of the budget and MTFS to be produced.

Summary of sensitivities
A summary of the sensitivities - differences to the central case - are tabulated below for both OPTIMISTIC and PESSIMISTIC scenarios.

Figure 19: Sensitivities - OPTIMISTIC SCENARIOS

| (Amounts £000) | $2022 / 23$ <br> Budget | $2023 / 24$ <br> MTFS | $2024 / 25$ <br> MTFS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Council Tax | - | 166 | 80 |
| NDR retention | 700 | 800 | 1.000 |
| Other government grants | - | 813 | 1,613 |
| Investment income (non-commercial property) | 50 | 100 | 200 |
| Environment Act 2021 | - | - | - |
| Payroll costs | - | 68 | 131 |
| Major contract indexation | - | 145 | 273 |
| Irrecoverable Housing Benefit - supported living | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| Income streams | 1,250 | 2,717 | 4,347 |
| BEST CASE SCENARIO | - |  |  |

Figure 20: Sensitivities - PESSIMISTIC SCENARIOS

| (Amounts £000) | $2022 / 23$ <br> Budget | $2023 / 24$ | $2024 / 25$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Council Tax | - | $(48)$ | $(50)$ |
| NDR retention | $(300)$ | $(500)$ | $(700)$ |
| Other government grants | - | $(400)$ | $(600)$ |
| Investment income (non-commercial property) | - | $(20)$ | $(50)$ |
| Environment Act 2021 | $(800)$ | $(1,700)$ | $(1,700)$ |
| Payroll costs | - | $(346)$ | $(282)$ |
| Major contract indexation | $(200)$ | $(157)$ | $(281)$ |
| Irrecoverable Housing Benefit - supported living | $(500)$ | $(400)$ | $(600)$ |
| Income streams | $(2,208)$ | $(4,071)$ | $(4,763)$ |
| WORST CASE SCENARIO |  |  | $(500)$ |

It should be noted in practice that is highly unlikely that variations to the central case would be entirely positive or negative; however, the scale of individual elements within the above table do indicate that significant variation from the budget or MTFS projections is very possible.

## 13. Note on the Housing Revenue Account

The Housing Revenue Account (or HRA) is a ring-fenced set of transactions that sit within the wider financial records of the Council. It had budgeted gross income of $£ 22.3 \mathrm{~m}$ in $2022 / 23$ of which $£ 21.4 \mathrm{~m}$ was dwelling rents. Expenditure on management and repairs amounted to $£ 12.2 \mathrm{~m}$ whilst depreciation was $£ 3.6 \mathrm{~m}$. A further $£ 2.7 \mathrm{~m}$ was required for interest payments on its debt.

There is a surplus or deficit on the HRA each year which is added to the brought forward HRA balance. This balance should always be in surplus and at 31 March 2022 it was $£ 0.6 \mathrm{~m}$ equating to its target balance of that amount. There is an additional $£ 11.2 \mathrm{~m}$ in the Housing Financing Fund, the purpose being to help mitigate potential financial pressures that national policy may place on the HRA in the medium-term and also ensure debt repayments can be met in the short and medium term. There is $£ 3.2 \mathrm{~m}$ in the Major Repairs Reserve which has restrictions on its use to capital expenditure and the repayment of loans.

Rental levels are largely controlled by central government and there are certain other restraints on how the Council may manage its housing stock. The most recent 30 Year Housing Business Plan, which effectively represents the MTFS for the HRA, was approved by Council in November 2014. The Business Plan is now being refreshed and a new version should be complete within the 2022/23 financial year.

## 14. Reserve Strategy

As outlined above, from 2023/2024 onwards grant funding from central government remains highly uncertain. The Council's strategy is to maintain a minimum of £2.0m in the working balance.

The Council's reserves were adversely affected by COVID-19 (such an emergency is precisely why the Working Balance reserve is maintained) and concerted efforts will need to continue in order to meet this objective and ensure the Council remains financially sustainable.

The budget proposed for 2022/23 would leave the Working Balance at $£ 4.5 \mathrm{~m}$, above the $£ 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ minimum.

## 15. Monitoring, Delivery and Review

There are well established processes for the monitoring of budgets which include regular outturn reports to the Performance Scrutiny Panel and Cabinet. For example, Revenue and Capital Plan outturn reports are usually presented to Cabinet in the July following completion of the financial year. Internally, budgets are monitored on a regular basis with regular Senior Leadership Team review whilst a series of 'Boards' chaired by the Council's Directors are in place to drive through the financial sustainability agenda.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ English local authority Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019 （ IMD average ranks－File 10；latest result available，updated October 2019）

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ The CTB 1 return, on which the council tax base is calculated, is completed in the October preceding the relevant financial year

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Although not included within the budget, RSG of $£ 168 \mathrm{k}$ was subsequently received

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ The results of appeals, quantum and timing of s31 grant receipts and incidence of empty property relief may result in a better than expected position for 2022/23; the final outcome is not known until after the 2022/23 year end

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ BoE - MPC report November 2021

[^5]:    ${ }^{6}$ Use of cash holdings held to satisfy future liabilities - which may not crystallise for some years

[^6]:    ${ }^{7}$ Including the proposed increase in charges, garden waste income is budgeted at $£ 1.7 \mathrm{~m}$ in 2022/23
    ${ }^{8}$ Consumer Price Index - strictly $\mathrm{CPI}(\mathrm{H})$ which includes housing costs

