


Melton Borough Council HRA Reform Briefing

Steve Partridge
Director
25th June 2010

www.cih.org


Introduction

- HRA Prospectus: headlines and key issues
- The national position
- The Melton position
- Discussion and debate...




HRA proposals in summary

- Essentially...
 - Proposal to dismantle the system and replace with a ‘one-off’ adjustment of housing debt
 - Keep rents and RTB receipts locally – revenue flexibility
 - But ... control over capital expenditure and capping borrowing



National position


- Nationally the subsidy system is destined for massive surplus
 - As rents increase faster than allowances
- Nationally, the ‘surplus’ would be £13-14bn over 30 years if nothing changes
- The ‘deal on the table’ – in principle response
- The ‘deal’ is to ‘split’ the surplus between central and local government
 - Broadly, between £3-5bn ‘extra’ debt in return for keeping rents and receipts locally
 - Locally, more money over the long term – and for many, the interplay of assumptions means more money from day one...



National position: revenue and capital


- Since 1990, the HRA and HRA subsidy system has been characterised by increasing revenue constraints
- Over the last 20 years, the massive constraints on capital expenditure have been gradually released
- To 2010: Capital freedom but with no revenue to exercise it
- From 2011: Revenue freedom but not with capital?

REVENUE FLEXIBILITY : CAPITAL CHALLENGE




Big issues nationally: the numbers

- Nationally, the proposed debt allocation is £25.1bn
 - Based on assumed increased allowances and an interest rate (discount factor) of 7%
 - Compares to projected debt at 31/3/2011 of £21.5bn
 - Lower discount rate (6.5%) leads to higher debt – the debt is kept lower in prospectus and linked to headroom for new build
- Nationally
 - ALMO decent homes -> capital grants – and nothing for anyone else; £3.2bn vs research suggesting is £6bn
 - Cap on borrowing causing concern because limits investment which might actually be more efficient




Big issues nationally: some technicals (for info)

- Technically...
 - An HRA Balance sheet
 - Clarification needed on depreciation and debt repayment
 - Separation of debt
 - HR ring fence
 - Unintended impacts on General Fund




Progress nationally

- Responses by 6th July
- Three uncertainties
 - What if a proportion say 'no'
 - What if policy priorities shift
 - What could be the impact of the autumn Spending Review
- Who might say 'no' and why?
 - Backlogs and significantly adversely affected authorities
- Timetable to implementation
 - Run up to April 2011




Local position: Melton 'in subsidy'


- Out of all the rent income to be collected over the next 30 years
 - £110m (37%) potentially goes out in negative subsidy
- HRA pressures build from the start
 - Heading for deficit without real savings in day to day costs
- But... the full capital needs cannot be met
 - Long term needs est. at £29k/unit over 30 years – critical information subject to upcoming stock survey
 - Shortfalls are c£30m out of cash spending need of £90m
 - Or... the equivalent in today's terms of £2.4m a year needed in the long term...
 - ...vs MRA of £1.6m per year and reducing revenue



Melton in (negative) subsidy




- Proposal is to replace the negative subsidy with a one-off debt increase
 - THINK: '*rent to mortgage*'...
 - Have debt... the net income stream, 100% of the receipt if the asset is sold





Local position: proposed settlement

- Proposed debt allocation is £30.6m
 - As current subsidy-debt is £5.6m, the debt increase (take on) would be c£25.0m
 - For historical reasons, the actual debt is currently £3.6m – so start self financing at £28.6m (£2m below cap)
 - At the lower settlement: allocation is £29m
- In the first year
 - Projected negative subsidy would have been... £1.7m
 - Additional interest on £25m ... a max of c£1.5m
- In future years
 - No further withdrawal of subsidy surplus
 - All future rent increases available to the HRA business plan




Melton in 'self financing'




- Revenue not shown as in surplus all years
- Capital needs can be met in the short and long term...
 - Small amount of borrowing in the early period to meet the 'up front' needs and minor re-phasing needed
- Debt able to be brought to zero by year 23

Shows viability: would not need to reduce debt




Issues and implications: HRA and GF

- A potentially positive future for the HRA – **WHY?**
 - Rent increases – the HRA not the government gets the benefit
 - M&M spending within the assumptions made in the settlement
 - Debt headroom below the cap by £2m
- Implications for General Fund
 - CLG prospectus talks of ‘offering mitigation’ although the form and extent to be determined
 - Ring fence guidance between GF and HRA
 - Unintended consequences for ‘with debt’ authorities
 - Local issues?
- Risk, reward and... opening the settlement?



Summary areas of debate for Melton

- Settlement results in a net debt take-on of £25m
- Net interest vs withdrawal from subsidy -> revenue surpluses to finance interest and debt payments
- Melton could repay within 23 years but could refinance
- HRA remains viable throughout with balances accruing
- Estimated capital profiles have some 'up front' needs -> would be able to borrow and re-phase - but subject to revised stock survey
- HRA financial position under self-financing therefore improved
- Potential for new build and long term asset management



Formulating a response: 6 questions

1. What are your views on the proposed methodology for assessing income and spending needs under self-financing and for valuing each council's business?
2. What are your views on the proposals for the financial, regulatory and accounting framework for self-financing?
3. How much new supply could this settlement enable you to deliver, if combined with social housing grant?
4. Do you favour a self-financing system for council housing or the continuation of a nationally redistributive system?
5. Would you wish to proceed to early voluntary implementation of self-financing on the basis of the methodology and principles proposed in this document? Would you be ready to move to self-financing in 2011/12? If not, how much time do you think is required for implementation?
6. If you favour self-financing but do not wish to proceed on the basis of the proposals in this document, what are the reasons?

