

DITTON PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER AT DITTON COMMUNITY CENTRE ON WEDNESDAY 28TH JUNE 2017

PRESENT: CLLRS. M J PORTER [Chairman], A PIPER [Vice-Chairman], P DALTON,
R PRICE & MRS A THROSSELL
MRS N GREENAWAY [Clerk of the Council]

112. **OPENING OF MEETING**

The Chairman opened the meeting at 2.30pm.

113. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were **RECEIVED** from Cllrs Beadle, Mrs Beadle and Mrs Thwaites. The previously notified reasons for absence were recorded in the absence book ref. 361 and **ACCEPTED** and **APPROVED**.

114. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

115. **FINANCE**(a) **End of Year 2016/17**(i) **Financial Analysis Month 12**

The Financial Analysis for Month 12 which had previously been **CIRCULATED** was **READ** and **NOTED**.

Queries were raised and explanations given about the overspend on items 4051 (vehicle repairs) – make good repairs on old vehicle when returned at end of lease term; 4021 (telephone) – half of this expenditure should have been within the community centre budget and 4028 (computer support) – this is because of the change to the hosted desktop system and the additional work involved in the set up.

(ii) **Budget Management Month 12 & Comparisons**

Information previously **CIRCULATED** was **READ** and it was **NOTED** that overall the Council had finished the year well within its budgets.

(b) **Financial Analysis Month 1 & 2**

The Financial Analyses for Months 1 & 2 which had previously been **CIRCULATED** were **READ** and **NOTED**. Members asked why budgets 4057 (Audit Fees) and 4203 (Chairmans Allowance) showed a “minus” figure in actual year to date. The clerk explained that this is not a minus as it has not been spent but “slipped forward” from last year’s budgets to this years budget and the minus is shown because it is being added to the expenditure account not the income account – overall these budgets have been increased by these amounts for the year (not reduced). Some members questioned why these items are shown in such a way as it would not be obvious without explanation. Discussion took place on the accounts system and how the figures are presented.

RESOLVED to invite this Council's accountant to a meeting to give an explanation on how the accounts system works and answer any queries that the members have.

(c) Budget Management – Month 2

READ and **NOTED**.

116. **REVIEW OF FINANCIAL REGULATIONS**

The current financial regulations, which had previously been **CIRCULATED** were **READ**. It was **NOTED** that it was no longer a requirement to have three signatures plus the clerk for cheques.

RESOLVED the Clerk will check if there have been any further updates to the NALC model on which this Council's Financial Regulations are based. If there are no updates to **RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL THAT THE ONLY AMENDMENT TO THE REGULATIONS WILL BE THAT ONLY TWO MEMBERS SIGNATURES PLUS THE CLERK'S ARE REQUIRED FOR CHEQUE AUTHORISATION**.

117. **INVESTMENT**

(a) Report

Details of the account values and the end of year statement at 31.03.2017, which had previously been **CIRCULATED**, were **READ** and **NOTED**.

(b) Release of Funds for Roof Repair Costs

It was **NOTED** that the additional roof repairs have now been completed and paid for, therefore it is necessary to draw on the investment to replace the precept income used. Discussion took place on which account to draw funds from. As it was a new roof plus improvements it could be considered a capital item. Discussion took place and it was **NOTED** that there were many other maintenance/repair issues that may require use of the interest fund (which can be used for running costs) such as the car park and CCTV and items on committee Five Year Plans.

RESOLVED to draw the funds (£54,390.00) for the cost of the roof repairs from the UBS capital account.

118. **CCTV REPLACEMENT**

Quotations from 3 companies were **CIRCULATED** along with a price comparison grid. The Clerk advised that the quotes were not all like for like as one company had quoted for PTZ (panning) cameras and the other two had quoted for static cameras. She explained that the existing PTZ cameras often missed vital footage that is why static cameras were thought better. Two of the companies had not quoted for the addition of a camera at NRRG.

RESOLVED to obtain more information to ensure the quotes are comparable and to ask for contacts at sites already using CCTV supplied by these companies to enable information to be obtained from existing users of the equipment. Confirmation of the distance of night vision and use of existing cabling will also be sought.

119. **CLOSURE**

The meeting closed at 4.10pm.