

**MINUTE OF SPECIAL MEETING OF  
BRENT PELHAM & MEESDEN PARISH COUNCIL  
SUNDAY 15 AUGUST 2010  
VENUE: ELECTRONIC CIRCULATION & VOTE**

**INCLUDED:**

Mr W Dimsdale	Chairman
Major Barclay	Councillor (Vice Chair)
Mr Trevor Hughes	Councillor
Mrs Sarah Wootton-Ramsay	Councillor
Mrs Kate Hinch	Councillor
Mr Gordon Livings	Councillor
Mr C Hamilton	Clerk

Minute

Action

**10/037 2009/2010 Audit Submission Remedial Action**

Due to the urgency of response required, the Clerk circulated (by e-mail) a copy of a letter, received from Ben Bradshaw of BDO Stoy Hayward (dated 10-AUG-2010), requesting further information on the 2009/2010 audit submission. This letter raised two points:

- i) Whilst £573 of the £748 difference between years had been explained away, there was still a difference of 10.2% variance which required further explanation as it exceeded the 10% allowed.
- ii) The submission indicated that the Council was trustee, but no charitable concern could be identified.

Within the e-mail, the Clerk went on to explain each of these points.

- i) The major differences arising at the end of the year had been detailed in support of the submission as these were the unexpected items. On looking back over the accounts, the Clerk had remembered that presentation of his invoice for the year 2008/2009 had been deferred due to concerns about legal costs related to Ty Llawen. As a consequence the invoice, in the sum of £160 had not been presented until June 2009. As his invoice for 2009/2010 was then presented in its normal period towards the end of the financial year, 23-JAN-2010, there had been additional expenditure of £160 over the previous period (2008/2009). This would largely match the difference in the £573/£748 figures.
- ii) The Clerk set out that the "Yes" response to the Trustee questions was on the basis of the Council being trustee for Meesden Green. As a consequence of the letter from BDO, and subsequent conversation with Mr Bradshaw, it has become clear that this question can only be answered with a "Yes" if the trusteeship relates to a charitable concern.

As a result of the explanation given, the Clerk asked for approval to:

- a) Respond with the explanation of the difference in monies as described in i) above
- b) Change the response to Section 1/Box 11 and Section 2/Box 9,

as requested by the auditor.

Mr Livings proposed, verbally in person, that approval be given as requested. The Chairman, Vice Chairman Barclay and Councillors Hughes and Mrs Wootton-Ramsay sent e-mail responses supporting the motion presented. With only the non-response of Mrs Hinch (on holiday) the motion was carried.

**Action: Clerk to respond to the external auditor as agreed, making the changes to the audit submission as indicated.**