

Parliamentary Budget Office - Election Policy Costing

NSW Parliament • Parliament House, Macquarie Street Sydney NSW 2000

Referred By: Coalition Proposal No: C003

Date Referred: 13/02/2015 Date Published: 23/03/2015

Proposal Title: SOCIAL HOUSING COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT FUND

Cluster: Family and Community Services

General Government Sector Impacts

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	4 Year Total
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Expenses (ex. depreciation)		6,000	6,150	8,405	20,555
Depreciation					-
Less: Offsets					-
Revenue					-
Net Operating Result:	-	(6,000)	(6,150)	(8,405)	(20,555)
					_
Capital Expenditure					-
Capital Offsets					-
Capital Expenditure:	-	-	-	-	-
					_
Net Lending/(Borrowing)	-	(6,000)	(6,150)	(8,405)	(20,555)
					_
Net Financial Liabilities:	-	6,000	12,150	20,555	
Total State Sector Impacts					
Net Financial Liabilities:	-	6,000	12,150	20,555	

Notes and costing assumptions

The policy proposes to improve the liveability and amenity of social housing communities. The policy provides a Social Housing Community Improvement Fund capped at \$20.6 million (\$20 million escalated for inflation) starting July 2015. NSW Treasury has estimated the \$20.6 million will be spent from July 2015 to June 2018.

Under the policy, Local Councils, community non-profit groups and private sector organisations are able to apply for funding of up to \$50,000 per project. Funding will be granted to approved applicants where projects improve community infrastructure or facilities, enhance open spaces, improve open safety, increase accessibility or facilitate integration between social housing and the broader community.

Staff related costs to administer the program are assumed to be met from the \$20.6 million. Based on similar infrastructure grants five full time staff are needed to administer the program. Any administration costs required after the three year program timeframe is assumed to be met from existing resources.

Ongoing maintenance costs of projects funded are assumed to be met from existing resources of bodies responsible for the infrastructure. The costing assumes the policy work required to align these grants with social housing policy objectives and with community needs will be met by agencies. These assumptions appear reasonable.