AGENDA ITEM: 2b)

AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 11th June 2019

Time: 2.00 pm – 4.10 pm

Place: Kris Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillors: S Crawford (substituting for Councillor Kavanagh) P Hudson M McGuire, T Rogers (Vice Chairman), M Shellens, (Chairman), and J Williams

Apologies: Councillors, N Kavanagh and D Wells

187. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

188. DEBT RECOVERY – LEVEL OF OUTSTANDING DEBT UPDATE REPORT

This report introduced by Robin Bates the LGSS Head of Revenues and Benefits who had taken over the responsibility for the Service updated the Committee on actions being taken to control and manage debt. It provided an update against the tables and metrics agreed in January 2019 which would be revised for future meetings to provide better visibility of debt management.

It was highlighted:

- That all 2019 debts were following the debt management procedure provided at Appendix A to ensure that they were all in a managed position and that no debt remained inactive for long periods.

- All aged debts were being reviewed to ascertain the stage of recovery and to move them into a fully managed position. A key process of cleansing data had been carried out in the previous two months.

- A new service using existing Collection Agents was supporting debt management. Collection was based on 0% commission to ensure value for money for CCC. Previously outside agents charged 15% which was a charge on the payment sought.

- The top 20 overdue accounts totalled £8.6m of the £20.3m outstanding, some being the result of income delay and a proportion were old debts. *(Post meeting Note: The figure in the report of £20.3m also included LGSS Law which was being looked at separately and therefore the more appropriate figure for outstanding debt was £16.8m)*

- Approximately £1.5m of bad debts were likely to be identified for write off in 2019/20. Since April the service had identified £75,523 worth of write offs on the grounds that the debt was uneconomical to pursue, or the customer was deceased, and that all methods of recovery available to the service had been considered.

- After a period of significant turnover, the team in The Octagon was now at full establishment, with newer members of staff reaching the end of their training period and further staff development to be undertaken to improve skills and knowledge.

- Tables in the report listed:

    - Debts over 1 year old and the debt recovery stage as at on the 31st March 2019.
    - Adult Social Care invoices (ASC) Invoices Raised & Cleared 2018/19
    - Sundry Invoices Raised & Cleared 2018/19

  The tables demonstrated that the large majority of invoices raised during the year were being collected, with the report setting out details of the Improvement Plan which aimed to resolve issues at the income collection stage.

- On key performance indicators for those agreed at Committee in September 2018 and reviewed in January 2019, Adult Social Care had missed its target by £1.54m and all other sundry debt by £1.71m. Progress was also provided on those identified as safe debtors for the two categories. Steps were underway to resolve any disputed outstanding balances. A further illustration was provided showing the impact if the method of assessing bad debts and associated reduction were to be applied. This method better reports the position and would have seen the targets met.

- Key Performance indicators for the service were currently being agreed, including an indicator to monitor the % of debt in fully managed stages, moving away from focusing just on the value of outstanding debt. Additional measures would provide demand figures alongside the traditional value outstanding as detailed in the report.

With the Team better resourced and an improvement plan in place, it was estimated the overall outstanding debt level by the end of December 2019 could be reduced to around £12m against the existing outstanding debt level of £16.8m. Some of this would be through better reporting of bad debt, as well as overdue debt, that was in the process of being revised and reviewed

Issues raised in discussion included;

- **The need to see targets for the collection agents and the metrics of success on collecting certain types of debt. Action: R Bates**

- Querying social care debtors including whether some self-funding care packages and other supported packages had the ability to pay. On direct payments the Council paid the client into their bank account and it was their responsibility to pay the care provider. Financial assessments were regularly re-assessed to ensure the level of support was still appropriate with the whole process having a high degree of complexity. Social care non-payment was treated as a debt and reminders were sent out to try to prevent the debt building up.
- Page 6 tables showing invoices raised and cleared - **a query was raised on whether the % shown by volume was invoices processed that month or due that month? ACTION: Robin Bates** agreed to look into this, as he would have more interest in the value of invoices. *(Post meeting note: It can be confirmed that this does relate to % of invoices raised that have been fully cleared)*
- A question was raised regarding how much use was made of organisations such as Citizens Advice and other community organisations to help manage debt. It was explained that the Adult Social Care Team had officers to help provide payment advice, with additional support also provided by social workers. In many cases of social care debt, the money was available in the clients account, but the client had difficulties accessing it.
- It was suggested what would be useful was comparison benchmarking data on key performance indicators from other LGSS partners or the CIPFA family responsible for adult social care. The Service did previously partake in CIPFA benchmarking exercises and once the current data cleansing had been carried out, the intention was to partake in benchmarking activity. Currently the level of debt would be an issue, but service costs were low compared to other authorities.
- As a follow up to it being a low cost service, a question raised was whether staffing levels were sufficient to carry out the job? The lead officer was of the view that the Service currently did have sufficient resource but this was being assessed in terms of non-debt related activity also undertaken by the Team,
- **It would be useful in future reports to identify debts which were of a seasonal nature and those regarded as safe debtors, in order to help identify if they were distorting the true level of outstanding debt. Action R Bates**
- On a question regarding who the main eight debtors were, they included the NHS, organisations such as Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG's) who would be considered reliable payers. Also included were Section 106 agreement disputes which centred around whether a development had started. A suggestion made was to seek an initial payment on some of the larger debts.
- Whether the ERP Gold system was working for or currently hindering the Service. In reply there was already a need for some enhancement for write off activity and there had been issues with standard letters which had now been resolved. The officer however emphasised that the system was fit for purpose and some of the difficulties experienced were a result of unfamiliarity with the system, rather than the system

itself and also highlighted the large scale of the system migration and implementation. .

- In answer to a question on whether the administration cost of reminders and final notices was added to the debt charge, the costs, including printing, were charged back to the authority.
- There was a request for the January report to include an expansion of reasons for non-payment and whether these had increased in certain categories. **Action: R Bates**
- In terms of the wider Council a question was raised with the Deputy Section 151 Officer on whether the Council settled its invoices in a timely manner. In reply it was explained that there had been some capacity issues in ERP in the previous year but these had now been resolved and the prompt payment record was now good.

It was resolved:

a) To note the actions and approach being taken to manage income collection and debt recovery.

b) Agree that a further update will be provided to the January 2020 Committee.

c) Note the outputs and outcomes the service was aiming to achieve over the next 6 months.

CHANGE IN ORDER OF THE AGENDA

As the lead officer had to attend a meeting in Norwic later in the afternoon and as they had been included on the original agenda despatch, the Chairman agreed to take agenda Item 4 'Draft Annual Governance Statement 2018-19' and agenda item 5 'Internal Audit Draft Annual Report t 2018-19' as the next items on the agenda.

189. DRAFT ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT 2018-19

The Council is required to include as part of the Annual Statement of Accounts an Annual Governance Statement (AGS) summarising the extent to which the Council is complying with its Code of Corporate Governance and details any significant actions needed to improve the governance arrangements. This report presented the AGS for 2018-19 for consideration by the Committee in order to ensure that it reasonably reflected the Committee's knowledge and experience of the Council's governance and control, prior to its sign off by the Chief Executive and the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee.

Attention was drawn to the following extracts on pages 20- 22 of the agenda (pages 7-9 of the AGS) which read as follows:

"The review of the effectiveness of the Governance Framework has provided a satisfactory level of assurance on the effectiveness of the Council's governance arrangements. Arrangements in place comply with the CIPFA Statement on the Role of the Chief Financial Officer in Local Government.

The Annual Governance Statement process allows the Council to identify any significant governance issues that have been identified, and the associated actions it is proposing to undertake to enhance its corporate governance arrangements. However, there are no such actions requiring specific mention in the 2018/19 Annual Governance Statement.

CONCLUSION

"*Based on the work that has been completed, assurance can be taken that the Governance arrangements at Cambridgeshire County Council are fit for purpose.*

Cambridgeshire County Council is committed to ensuring the implementation of all actions that are planned to strengthen the organisation's governance arrangements. Implementation of these actions will be monitored through the next annual review".

The satisfactory rating was a reduction from the previous year's good rating and reflected on-going work in some areas, including ERP Gold.

In discussion a Member asked the affect FACT/ HACT had, had on the AGS. It was explained that while it might be a reputational issue for the Council, it was not a governance assurance issue and did not affect the governance assurance.

That having considered the AGS at Appendix A to the report,

It was resolved:

> That it was consistent with the Committee's own perspective on internal control within the Council and the definition of significant governance and control issues given in paragraph 3.2. of the report.

190. INTERNAL AUDIT DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT 2018-19

The Public Sector Internal Audit Standards requires that the Chief Internal Auditor presents an annual report for consideration by its relevant Audit Committee so that it can be made aware of the Chief Internal Auditor's opinion on the state of the Internal Control Framework. The Annual Internal Audit Report forms part of the evidence supporting the Authority's Annual Governance Statement 2018 -19. The final version of the report would be submitted alongside the Annual Governance Statement to the July Committee.

The Chief Internal Auditor's opinion was set out in the report as follows

*On the basis of the audit work undertaken during the 2018/19 financial year, an opinion of **satisfactory** assurance is awarded. The internal control environment (including the key financial systems, risk and governance) has been subject to significant changes during the year with the introduction of ERP Gold and there have been areas and periods where compliance with these new procedures and systems has required improvement. Although there are currently no outstanding significant issues arising from the work undertaken by Internal Audit, there are important recommendations contained in the key financial systems' audits that will be followed up in 2019/20.*

It should be noted that no system of control can provide absolute assurance against material misstatement or loss, nor can Internal Audit give that assurance. Although the level of assurance has decreased from 2016/17 there have been significant change to key systems within the year and management has responded positively to recommendations made by Internal Audit to strengthen identified areas of concern.

The officer in his presentation explained that in terms of the implementation of Internal Audit recommendations, compliance in 2018-19 should be a source of comfort to the Committee with none rated red, and only eight out of fifty six outstanding at the end of the year, none of which were a cause for concern. There had also been a very good response to the Internal Audit recommendations in respect of the 66 actions in the PKF Report. Nothing was coming out of individual Internal Audit reviews which would change the satisfactory rating given.

Issues raised in discussion included:

- A request for a definition of 'satisfactory'. This was set out in the report on page 30 and read: "*There are some control weaknesses that present a medium term risk to the control environment."* Primarily issues in respect of ERP Gold, debt issues and contract issues were those which had contributed to the Chief Internal Auditor's opinion of satisfactory assurance.
- One Member suggested that major highways and other contracts was where the focus needed to be. Following up from this the Chairman asked what additional resource needed to be included in the Internal Audit Plan to address such concerns. The Head of Internal Audit explained that officers were working with contractors and organisations and that no additional days were required as there were already 200 extra audit days. **The next Internal Audit Progress Report to the July meeting would set out the work undertaken with regard to contracts. There was a request to ensure this included Highways**

purchasing Action: Mairead Claydon (*Post meeting clarification note: the Highways Contract was in the Audit plan for next year and therefore it would only be an update on progress* at the July meeting)

- With reference to paragraph 4.24 reading:

  "In quarter four, the key systems were subject to a final audit and the opinions below are based on the systems at that review although organisational impact is assessed on the impact on the Council at year end. This work has not been fully completed at the time of writing this report although emerging opinions have been considered and have informed the overall Chief Internal Auditor opinion. There will also be a number of new recommendations emerging from these final reports that will be added to the summary shown in table 1, 4.1.3 of this report. Internal Audit will include a summary of these reports at the appropriate Audit & Accounts Committee following completion".

  In reply to the Chairman's query on when the above report would come forward, it was confirmed it would be included in the July Internal Audit Progress Update Report **ACTION Mairead Claydon**

- Referencing Paragraph 4.2.5 the Chairman asked for a list of the key financial control system and recommendations referred to. They would also be included in the July Report update **ACTION Mairead Claydon**
- Paragraph 4.2.6 and the table on pages 33-34 there was a request for an explanation of the 'satisfactory' rating for Payroll and others in the table when previously they had been given substantial assurance. This would be provided in the July Report update **ACTION Mairead Claydon**.
- With reference to the Whistleblowing Survey the Chairman hoped that this would be repeated. It was confirmed that this was an annual exercise.
- Paragraph 4.7.1 information and Communications Technology (ICT) and Information Governance – reading "*Internal Audit work is ongoing in this area and outcomes will be reported to the Audit & Accounts Committee as soon as possible".* This would also be included in the July Report update **ACTION Mairead Claydon**
- Explanation on the table on page 41 for the audit title 'Fees and Charges Policy and Compliance' – that showed a compliance rating of only 'limited assurance'. The Review was included in the 2019-20 Audit Plan.
- Whether ERP Gold was fit for purpose. The Deputy Section 151 Officer stated that the underlying system was ok and as previously mentioned, the disruption was staff getting used to the system which it was conceded was a training issue, but was also common when a completely new system was introduced in an organisation. The savings

by the introduction of ERP Gold would be in the region of £9m over a number of years across the LGSS Councils.

Having considered its contents It was resolved:

To note the draft Annual Internal Audit Report.

191. DRAFT CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (CCC) STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS 2018-19

As this report had not been finalised in time for the original agenda despatch, the Chairman agreed to take this under the Chairman discretionary powers given under the Local Government Act 1972.

Reasons for Lateness - Officers were unable to finalise the report at the time of the agenda despatch due to a significant amount of work involved in migrating fixed asset date from Oracle Projects to the ERP Gold Fixed Assets Module with the data cleansing exercise having taken longer than expected. For 2018/19 the external audit started on the 28 May 2019. Whilst the first week of the audit focussed on the audit set up and some specific areas, the need to have some of the audit requirements in place ahead of the audit meant that the production of the accounts and delivery of some of the audit requirements had to be done concurrently. This had created additional pressure on the closedown timetable.

Reasons for Urgency – Whilst not a statutory requirement, providing the report to this meeting allowed the Committee an early opportunity to review the draft accounts and make suggested changes that could then be included in the final version to be submitted for sign-off at the July Committee meeting.

Before the officer introduction, the Chairman sought an update on the position of the previous External Auditor, BDO's review of the objections received on the previous two years accounts' and the challenge on the Council providing value for money. Until resolved, this was preventing the issue of a final certificate with respect to the 2017-18 and 2016-17 audits and the value for money opinion in relation to 2017-18 1 and was also impacting on the current External Auditor's ability to carry out their Value for Money audit assessment. It was explained that as various indicative timetables for a final opinion had not been met, that latest target date from the outgoing External Auditor to provide a value for money opinion had been 7th June with the aspiration for the outcome of the objections to the Accounts having been extended to the end of June. The 7th June date had passed without an opinion being received which remained a significant concern to the Council. However, BDO had the right to require additional time in order to be satisfied that a full review of all the points raised had been undertaken. From the Council side, there was no outstanding documentation still to be provided to BDO. Public Sector Audit

Appointments Limited (PSAA) had been notified regarding the Council's concerns at the lack of a resolution.

In reply to a question regarding the impact of the lack of a final conclusion by BDO on the current set of accounts, Ernst and Young (EY) LLP the Council's current External Auditors confirmed that they could not commence work on providing a value for money opinion until BDO had completed their audit and provided a final opinion. However, this would not stop work on being able to provide an audit opinion on the Council's financial statements unless BDO's final opinion suggested there had been a material impact on those previous sets of accounts.

Moving onto the Accounts report, the Chairman wished to record his appreciation of the superhuman effort undertaken by officers to produce the set of accounts currently in front of the Committee. He indicated that he would need a further opportunity to review the document due to the short time that the document had been made available. At the suggestion of Rob Sanderson, the Democratic Services Officer, the Chairman sought and received agreement to a delegation for the Vice Chairman and himself to further review the document following the meeting (which would also take into account any suggestions that other members might make on further reviewing the document) and to then meet with officers and suggest any additional changes in advance of the Accounts coming back to Committee.

It was explained that the draft accounts (included as Appendix A to the report) presented the financial position of the Council as at the 31st March 2019 but were currently unaudited and also required updating for some minor narrative amendments provided by the Section 151 Officer. The next stage following the current meeting was for the accounts to be audited with a final version being presented back to the Committee (with the original intention for sign off at the revised 29th July Committee meeting) after consideration of the External Auditor's report.

Issues highlighted included:

- In his introduction Jon Lee placed on record his thanks to the hard work undertaken by his team in providing a draft set of accounts for the current meeting under extremely challenging conditions which had included the one and a half full time equivalent posts officers working very long hours with additional support from Cambridgeshire's Finance team. He apologised that in order to publish a version for Members the previous week, some tables were uncompleted. He was also grateful to EY for their pragmatic approach to help keep the Audit alive. However he highlighted, and this was confirmed by Mark Hodgson the EY External Audit lead that it was highly unlikely that an audit opinion would be achieved by the time of the 29th July Committee meeting and that a later meeting might be required to receive and agree the final statements. EY confirmed that they would keep their team on site at the current time but were now two weeks behind schedule and could not drop in additional resources. The Chairman recognised that this was a similar position all over the country and was not unique to Cambridgeshire.

- ERP Gold had been very beneficial to the process as it was now possible to produce the accounts document more quickly through enhanced reporting from the system. However this had been the first 'year end' with the new system. The issues that had arisen where more to do with set up and migration of balances and staff lack of familiarity with a new system and that the delays highlighted would be a one-off.

- As an update he was able to report that there had been no changes to the core statements with the exception of the Cashflow Statement, so any changes between the Committee draft and the draft published on the Council website were limited.

- There had been no changes to Accounting Policies in 2018-2019.

- The Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 required that the accounts and other related documents had to be made available for public inspection for 30 working days including the first 10 working days of June. As this had not been achieved the intention was to start the 30 days public consultation from the date of this meeting. The Council was also dealing with an inspection report received prior to the publication of the Accounts.t

- There had been changes to the way that financial instruments under IFRS 9 needed to be accounted for as detailed in the report.

- The accounts for 2018/19 had been prepared on a going concern basis.

- In addition to the Council's single entity accounts, the Council was required to prepare Group Accounts alongside its own financial statements where it had material interests in subsidiaries, associates, and / or joint ventures. The Council's Group Accounts consolidated the accounts of the This Land Group (comprising of This Land and all of its associated subsidiaries).

- With reference to page 38 the Comprehensive Income and Expenditure Statement, attention was drawn to the Cost of Services figure of £361.2m which was broken down by directorate. It was highlighted that these figures were prepared on an accounting basis, including items such as depreciation figures, valuation gains and losses. Therefore they would differ to the figures in the Council's monthly management accounts. The total comprehensive expenditures was noted at £15.2m.

- For the year ended 31 March 2019 the Council had experienced a revenue budget pressure of £3.2m which required an equal draw down from the General Fund and Earmarked Reserves of £3.2m to balance the financial position for 2018/19. The Council would restore the

General Fund reserve to its planned level as part of its annual business planning. The Movement in the Reserves Statement was provided on page 39.

- The Councils Earmarked Reserves reduced by £2.73m during the year to £64.06m as at the 31st March 2019. Total usable reserves stood at £124.6m and unusable at £612.3m.

- Page 40- the Other Long term Liabilities figure of £-701,920k was to do with Pension Movements.

- Page 40 set out the Balance Sheet. The Council had Net Assets as at 31st March 2019 of £736.8m. The figures for Property, Plant and Equipment had increased due to revaluation **gains**. There was a query on why Long term investments had risen from £400K from March 2018 to £12660k in March 2019**.** ***Post Meeting note:*** *The Long Term Borrowing increase was linked to 'This Land' investment. The last line showing the total reserves was in order to match liabilities. The increase in the Long Term Investments was due to a £10.3m investment in CCLA (a property fund) and equity in This Land of £1.9m a decision endorsed by the Commercial and Investment Committee in February.*
- On the presentation there was a request to **insert an additional blank line between net assets and the usable reserves line to make the distinction clearer**. **Action Jon Lee / Martin Savage (MS)**

- The Net Asset position was predominantly due to the value of Long Term Assets at £2,067.2m, and within that the value of Plant, Property and Equipment being £1,864.0m. Current assets totalled £169.5m.

- The Council's Liabilities (both current and long term) totalled £1,499.8m with the largest components both being long term liabilities related to the Pension Fund liability (£588.1m) and Long Term Borrowing (£470.7m).

- The sum of the total assets and total liabilities provided the Net Asset position of the Council which was matched by the total reserves comprising Usable Reserves of £124.6m and Unusable Reserves of £612.3m.There was a query on what made up unusable reserves. Later in the meeting it was confirmed that this information was included on page 72.

- The pension liability calculated by the actuary had increased by £81m in 2018/19. Movements in the Pension Fund liability did not affect the Council's General Fund or other Usable Reserves.

Going through the pages the following issues were raised:

- **Page 6 - Request that the diagram which was no longer produced in colour on printed agendas due to cost should be changed to**

dots / hatch lines so it showed up in black and white. Action JL / MS

- **Page 7 – add to text in the line reading "As our resources come under increasing pressure……" Make specific reference to the loss of Government support grant. Action J L / Martin Savage (MS)**

- **Page 8 last line 22 being red rated required more explanation Action T Kelly**

- Page 17 Explanation on Cambridge and Peterborough Combined Authority - there were material changes in terms of levy and grant which was why it had been included. Officers were asked to review if it was required. **Action: T Kelly**

- Page 27 last paragraph reference to "… declining revenue support grant …." **it should be made explicit that this is being taken away by Central Government. Action Jon Lee (JL) / MS**

- No reference in narrative to Shire Hall move, LGSS, BDO, Guided Bus - officers to consider whether any should be made. **Action JL / T Kelly**

- Page 41 Cash Flow Statement Line explanation required for:

    - 'Impairment and downward valuations 'goes from -£12,142k to £114,246
    - Increase / decrease in Debtors large variation
- those lines having a figure in 2018 and showing 0 in 2019. **Action to look at. MS**
    -

- Page 49 - Surplus in brackets and then no more references. **Action to look at. MS**

- Page 55 - Line on Capital Grants and Contributions change from £48m to £87m - question raised - was this as the Government decreased RSG it was increasing Capital Grants? - Part of this was explained by Basic Needs Grant for Building Schools for which £25m had been received from Government.

- Page 56 - the Chairman did not understand how the reference to the Section 75 agreement related to the line above. It was explained that this related to £15m in the NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough CCG line which was not required to have been transferred to the County Council as the note explained. The two 0 figures at the foot of the table were the overspend and underspend on the budget.

- Page 59 and 60 Officers remuneration - the Chairman queried whether on Shared Officers to which, Combined Authority or the single authority, was the limit applied to determine whether an officer's name should be revealed. The table showed total remuneration and also the County Council proportion of the cost.

- Page 65 explanation required for the Dedicated Schools grant deficit carried forward and the in-year adjustments showing a ten fold increase. This was due to issues with the High Needs Block which was one of the most serious budget issues the Council faced and was the subject of the footnote. It was hoped that the spending review would address this.

- Page 75 – opening balance adjustment £26,180 – explanation required for this. **Action JL**

- Page 78 and 79 top left hand text reading "cost of valuation" – this was confusing. **Action JL to check whether this was an accounting code requirement.** *(Post meeting Note: This should simply read 'cost or valuation' and would be amended in the final statements***.**)

- **Page 87 Public Works Loans Board (PWLB)**
  - **Fair value hierarchy for financial liabilities – top line query on why fair value amounts were both showing -£391,618 Action: JL**
  - **Second sentence text not clear why the Council should be paying additional interest - explanation required if PWLB loans were meant to be cheaper than market rates. Action JL**

- Page 88 long term Debtors – in answer to a question it was confirmed that this included LGSS Law

- Page 92 table required to be filled in. **Action: JL / MS**

- Page 93 - ditto above - for short term creditors. **Action: JL / MS**

- Page 93 why was cash equivalents 0 in 2019? **Action: JL / MS**

- Page 95 Revenue Support Grant line showing £3915 for 2018-19 explanation - this was the last year it would be received. It would show zero in next year's accounts.

- Page 101 top table - depreciation line showing large fall between the year – this was linked to the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) model and year end accounting entries associated with the unitary charge.

- Page 114 Pension Scheme assets - cash and cash equivalent halved – there was no Pensions' officer present to explain this. **Action: J Lee to find out reason**

- Page 117 In reply to a question it was confirmed that the Teachers' Pension Scheme was separate from the Local Government Pension Scheme and was paid over to the Department of Education in the same way as the Police and Fire Services.

Group Accounts

- Page 127 The Cromwell Museum - the note made no reference to value - this required explanation **Action: JL / MS**
- Page 128 – Civic Regalia – as had been raised in previous years, the explanation that items value was not known was queried as there must be a value that could be obtained as they would have a value if they required to be replaced. Officers explained the policy set out in the accounts for heritage assets that it was not economic for the Council to seek valuations purely for the purposes of the accounts. Regarding the Arts Collection – there was a query regarding whether all the paintings had a similar value as the text referred to having a general £300 per painting value. It was explained that the valuable paintings e.g. the LS Lowry, had already been sold and those left were of an insignificant value.

Having commented,

It was resolved:

a) To note the report

b) To agree to delegate to the Chairman and Vice Chairman the authority to engage with officers outside of the meeting to suggest further minor changes prior to the Accounts being presented for sign off to the next meeting of the Committee.

CHAIRMAN
29th JULY 2019