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Overview of local authority responsibilities

Our measure of revenue and spending excludes several service areas

- Education - not comparable across councils & across time
- Police, fire and rescue, and national park services – usually separate authorities

In this report, focus on net current service expenditure on other services

- Excludes capital expenditure and debt repayment
- Nets off spending funded by sales, fees and charges (SFCs)
- Add in portion of Better Care Fund allocated for social care
More than half of £49 billion in spending allocated to social care
More than half of £49 billion in spending allocated to social care

Net service expenditure by service area (£), 2019-20
[excluding education, police, fire and national park services]

- Adult social care
- Children’s social care

£18.8 bn
£9.1 bn
More than half of £49 billion in spending allocated to social care

Net service expenditure by service area (£), 2019-20
[excluding education, police, fire and national park services]

- Adult social care
- Children’s social care
- Environment & regulation
- Transport
- Central
- Public Health
- Other (culture, housing, and planning)

Budget of:
- £49.4 billion
- £875 per person
Councils revenue comes from three sources
Councils revenue comes from three sources

Contribution of different revenue sources (%), 2019-2020

- Retained business rates: 48%
- Council tax: 29%
- Central grant funding: 19%
- Better care fund: 4%
But, significant changes over past decade
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Real terms spending/revenues (2009-10 = 100)

Cuts to funding have led to falls in revenues and spending per person of more than 20%
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Cuts to funding have led to falls in revenues and spending per person of more than 20%
Cuts to funding have led to falls in revenues and spending per person of more than 20%

Average cut: 1.9% per year
Average increase: +1.5% per year
Cuts to funding have led to falls in revenues and spending per person of more than 20%

AVERAGE CUT: 1.9% per year
AVERAGE INCREASE: +1.5% per year

Why?
→ Increased funding for social care
→ Increased council tax revenue

Real terms spending/revenues (2009-10 = 100)

Aggregate spending
Per-person spending
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1. A less redistributive funding system
More deprived councils spend more
Larger cuts in more deprived areas

Net expenditure per person (2019-20 £)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deprivation Level</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most deprived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least deprived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Larger cuts in more deprived areas

Net expenditure per person (2019-20 £)

- Most deprived: 31% decline
- Least deprived: 16% decline
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Larger cuts in more deprived areas

Why?
→ Deprived councils more grant-dependent
→ Cuts to grants didn’t account for this

31% decline

16% decline

Net expenditure per person (2019-20 £)

Most deprived

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Least deprived

2009-10

2019-20
Despite larger cuts in more deprived areas, system still redistributive – but less so
Despite larger cuts in more deprived areas, system still redistributive – but less so

Spending per person for most deprived councils now 1.3 times level of least deprived (down from 1.6 times that of least deprived in 2009-10)
Interesting patterns in choices made

Cannot say whether current or historical relative funding levels more appropriate without:

• Defining what we expect from councils
• A robust assessment of the relative spending needs of different councils
• And a view on extent to which it is appropriate to redistribute funding

Fair Funding Review will address these questions

• But we don’t observe spending needs - must instead assume them or infer them
• For services aside from social care, typically use relationship between spending and local characteristics like deprivation - but spending patterns changed

Will require subjective decision about whether historical or current spending patterns more closely aligned with differences in spending needs
1. Less redistributive funding system

2. Greater reliance on local revenues
Changes led to increasing reliance on local taxes for revenues

Council tax share of fiscal revenues (%)

Changes led to increasing reliance on local taxes for revenues
Changes led to increasing reliance on local taxes for revenues

Council tax share increased from 34% to 48%
Significant variation in reliance on council tax revenues
Significant variation in reliance on council tax revenues
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Significant variation in reliance on council tax revenues
Significant variation in reliance on council tax revenues

Implications?

→ Local revenues unlikely to keep pace with rising demand and costs

→ Poor councils set to gain less from increases in council tax
1. Less redistributive funding system
2. Greater reliance on local revenues
3. A focus on social care and statutory duties
How has local government delivered the cuts?

Per-person spending changes since 2009-10 (%)

Overall net spending
Adults' SC
Children's SC
Env. & Reg.
Culture
Housing
Planning
Central
Transport
How has local government delivered the cuts?

Overall net spending since 2009-10 (%)

Per-person spending changes since 2009-10 (%)

- Adult's Social Care
- Children's Social Care
- Environment & Regeneration
- Culture
- Housing
- Planning
- Central
- Transport
How has local government delivered the cuts?

Relatively small cuts to social care
How has local government delivered the cuts?

Overall net spending: -23%
Adults' SC: -7%
Children's SC: -24%
Env. & Reg.: -52%
Culture: -52%
Housing: -59%
Planning: -29%
Central: -42%
Transport: -70%

Larger cuts to other services
Sales, fees and charges (SFCs) have helped to mitigate impact of cuts for particular services
Sales, fees and charges (SFCs) have helped to mitigate impact of cuts for particular services.
Same pattern *within* service areas
Same pattern **within** service areas

- Housing
  - Homelessness: 72%
  - Reg. & reg. private housing: -52%
- Env. & Reg.
  - ‘Supporting People’ Programme: -80%
- Transport

Overall spending per-person
Same pattern *within* service areas

### Housing

- Homelessness: +72%  
- Reg. & reg. private housing: +70%  
- ‘Supporting People’ Programme: +80%

### Env. & Reg.

- Coastal & flood protection: +10%  
- Waste: +9%  
- Regulatory services: +49%

### Transport

Overall spending per-person
Same pattern *within* service areas

Taken together, this represents a substantial re-shaping of councils’ budgets.
Tough choices & pressures for social care

Adult social care:

• Demand rising:
  – Requests for older adults increased by 4% between 2015–16 and 2018–19
  – And requests for younger adults increased by 10%

• But number of adults receiving care lower:
  – Fell 27% from 2009–10 to 2013–14, and been broadly flat since.

• Growing demand from younger adults means spending for over-65s down 18% - despite rise in elderly population
Tough choices & pressures for social care

Children’s social care:

- Councils had to cope with more-than-doubling of safeguarding enquiries.
- Meant that over third more children on a protection plan and 17% more ‘in care’.
- Overspending since 2010-11, and overspends averaged 8% since 2015-16.
  - Suggest that even those increases in efficiency achieved so far may have been insufficient to meet demand.
Tough choices & pressures for social care

Why does this matter?

• If further cuts required, may be difficult to make further cut backs to the limited amount of spending on more discretionary services still left.
  – Already, councils that seen larger cuts made larger cuts to social care, rather than other services

• Increasing proportion of councils’ spending goes to services which only relatively small fraction of population benefit directly (e.g. social care)
  – Might affect the willingness of local taxpayers to pay the tax increases needed to meet rising demands and costs.
1. Less redistributive funding system
2. Greater reliance on local revenues
3. A focus on social care and statutory duties
Have councils made different choices?
Choices of how to allocate the cuts do differ significantly across councils.
Choices of how to allocate the cuts do differ significantly across councils

Spending on service cut by LESS than overall cut (or increased)
Choices of how to allocate the cuts do differ significantly across councils

Spending on service cut by MORE than overall cut

Percentage point difference between cut in service area and overall spending cut (%)
Choices of how to allocate the cuts do differ significantly across councils

- Median
- Lower quartile
- Upper quartile

Nearly all councils relatively protected social care
Choices of how to allocate the cuts do differ significantly across councils

Nearly all councils left culture and planning & development relatively unprotected
Choices of how to allocate the cuts do differ significantly across councils

Variation in decisions about:
→ Whether to protect services or not
→ Extent of relative protection or relative cuts
Interesting patterns in choices made

Different types of councils have made different choices
- London: bigger cuts to ASC; smaller cuts to housing and planning & development
- Deprived councils: bigger cuts to social care

Councils prioritising spending on housing
- More councils relatively protected housing over last 4 years (up to 36% between 2016-17 and 2019-20 vs. 16% between 2009-10 and 2015-16)
- But even fewer councils relatively protected cultural and recreational services

But why were different choices made? And what has the impact been?
What is the outlook for funding?
Government has projected a 4.3% real terms increase in ‘core spending power’ next year.

First time general grant funding has not been cut for 10 years.
Government has projected a 4.3% real terms increase in ‘core spending power’ next year.
Government has projected a 4.3% real terms increase in ‘core spending power’ next year.

Raise more in areas with bigger tax bases.
Government has projected a 4.3% real terms increase in ‘core spending power’ next year.

Published forecast change in ‘core spending power’ = £2.9 billion

Partly but not fully offset by grant distributions

Note: not ring-fenced for social care
Government has projected a 4.3% real terms increase in ‘core spending power’ next year.

Around £0.3 billion ring-fenced for ASC and Public Health from the NHS.
Government has projected a 4.3% real terms increase in ‘core spending power’ next year

End of 75% rates retention pilots reduce funding by around £0.3 billion
Some councils will do better than others

Councils with social care responsibilities will see bigger increase

• Extra grant funding and 4% council tax increases without referendum
  – Pressures from and policy focus on social care service costs
• Lower-tier districts will rely on tax base growth for any real-terms increase
  – Still better than previous years when grant funding cut

149 Councils currently piloting 75% retention will see smaller increases

• Currently receiving additional £258 million as a result of pilots
• On average, underlying rates growth of 3% needed to offset loss of this; underlying growth has totalled 10% over last 7 years.
• Little rationale for pilots though – limited learning opportunity
Extra funding could undo up to 1/5th of peak-to-trough fall in spending per person

Real terms spending (2009-10 = 100)

Aggregate spending

Per-person spending
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Extra funding could undo up to 1/5\textsuperscript{th} of peak-to-trough fall in spending per person
Extra funding could undo up to $\frac{1}{5}$th of peak-to-trough fall in spending per person
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But councils could choose to use additional funding to improve reserves position

Smaller increase in spending e.g. if stop planned draw-down of reserves, only 1/7th of spending cuts per person undone.
Longer term outlook is uncertain, but next year could be just a lull in the storm

Rising demands for and costs of service provision – especially social care
## Projections of real-terms increases in spending needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Adults’ social care</th>
<th>Children’s services</th>
<th>Other services</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson et al (2018)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBR (2018) – central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Projections of real-terms increases in spending needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Adults’ social care</th>
<th>Children’s services</th>
<th>Other services</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson et al (2018)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBR (2018) – central</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBR (2018) – lower productivity scenario</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBR (2018) – higher productivity scenario</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projections of real-terms increases in spending needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Adults’ social care</th>
<th>Children’s services</th>
<th>Other services</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson et al (2018)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBR (2018) – central</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBR (2018) – lower productivity scenario</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBR (2018) – higher productivity scenario</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA (2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PwC (2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IfG (2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Projections of real-terms increases in spending needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Adults’ social care</th>
<th>Children’s services</th>
<th>Other services</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson et al (2018)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBR (2018) – central</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBR (2018) – lower</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productivity scenario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBR (2018) – higher</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productivity scenario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA (2018)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PwC (2019)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IfG (2019)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Longer term outlook is uncertain, but next year could be just a lull in the storm

Rising demands for and costs of service provision – especially social care

Local tax revenues unlikely to keep pace with these pressures
Plan is to move to 75% business rates retention in 2021-22 and abolish general and public health grants
Council tax and business rates will make up vast bulk of funding
Under OBR central projection, adult social care will take up growing share of local taxes...

Note: Assumes adult social care costs increase by 3.4% a year in real terms – in line with OBR central projection
With improved productivity performance, still need significant council tax increases

Still implies falling amount for other service areas

Need improved productivity and big tax rises for local taxes to be sufficient for sector as a whole

Note: Assumes adult social care costs increase by 2.0% a year in real terms – average of LGA and PwC projections
Billions in additional grants likely needed to top up existing local taxes

In order to stop spending on other services falling as % national income:

Note: Assumes adult social care costs increase by 3.4% a year in real terms – in line with OBR central projection
Figures are just to maintain current system

More generous system and/or reversing cuts to numbers receiving care would cost billions more on top

Conservative leader has promised a ‘clear plan’ to ‘fix the crisis in social care’

Labour have announced free personal care for the over 65s

- Cost £6 billion in 2020-21 according to Health Foundation & Kings Fund
- At least £8 billion by 2030-31
So what to do?

Improve productivity performance significantly or accept councils can do (even) less.

Raise more revenues either nationally or locally.

Raise nationally if prioritise redistribution and consistency.

Raise locally if prioritise incentives and discretion.
Tax devolution options

100% business rates retention would transfer £6 billion to councils
Administratively straightforward
But narrow and unbuoyant tax base

1p flat-rate local income tax would raise about £6 billion for councils
Administratively more complex – though less so than VAT, Corporation Tax
But a range of desirable properties – buoyancy, accountability, incentives
Revenues from a local income tax would be unevenly distributed across England

A degree of redistribution of revenues would be required (like council tax and business rates)...

But how much?
Trade-off between redistribution & incentives

More redistribution, weaker incentives

Stronger incentives, bigger divergences

Fundamental question about the nature of English governance

How much should where you live affect the taxes you pay and services you receive?
BRRS and NHB use funding as an incentive

BRRS means councils retain a proportion of real-terms increases and falls in local business rates revenues
Initially 50% retention, but since 2017-18 pilots of 75% and 100% retention

NHB pays additional grant funding to councils for several years for each empty home brought back into use and each new build home in their area
Initially 6 years, now 4 years and only for homes above a 0.3% increase

Reforms to both are planned/considered for 2021-22 – so what about the impact so far?
Councils are retaining growing pot of above-inflation growth in rates revenues

£5.9 billion in total since 2013-14, with £1.9 billion in 2019-20

75% and 100% pilots account for £1.8 and £0.7 billion of this, respectively

Retained growth varies significantly across councils
Deprived areas done about as well as less deprived areas, on average
Councils are retaining growing pot of above-inflation growth in rates revenues

£5.9 billion in total since 2013-14, with £1.9 billion in 2019-20
75% and 100% pilots account for £1.8 and £0.7 billion of this, respectively

Retained growth varies significantly across councils

Big differences between lower- and upper-tier councils
District councils’ share amounts to 5% of fiscal revenues since 2013-14
Counties’ share amounts to 0.6% of fiscal revenues since 2013-14
Reflects counties higher budgets but also districts higher allocations of growth
NHB payments amount to £8.4 billion since 2011-12, but vary significantly across country

Higher in the South than in the North
£207 per person in London, compared to £110 in North West

Higher in less deprived areas than more deprived areas
Driven partly by payments being higher for properties in higher council tax bands

Big differences between lower- and upper-tier councils
District councils’ share amounts to 9.3% of spending power
Counties’ share amounts to 0.5% of spending power
Reflects fact districts get 80% share of NHB payments
We know very little about impact of schemes on behaviour and outcomes

No evaluation of BRRS

But previous research showed little growth between growth in business rates and local economic growth

Evaluation of NHB focused on council knowledge and attitudes

31% of senior planning officials said led to more strategic approach to housing

Only 6% said almost always taken into account when considering planning applications

Only 16% said funding channelled towards supporting housing development
Big decisions are being taken next year

Reviews of both the BRRS and NHB ongoing

Difficult to make key decisions without evidence on impact of incentives

May be benefits of allocating more business rates growth to upper-tier counties in future

Reduce funding divergences that are arising between lower-tier districts – counties’ bigger areas and budgets mean less divergence arises

But transition would be important given some districts’ reliance on these revenues for a significant proportion of their budgets.
Summary
Three key trends with implications for the future

1. A less redistributive funding system
2. Greater reliance on local revenues
3. Budgets increasingly focused on social care and statutory duties

What about the outlook for funding?

• Funding for 2020-21 should outpace in-year spending pressures
• But local taxes unlikely to keep pace with future costs in longer term

Some areas for further research: council choices; impact of incentives.
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