



# Annual Audit Letter

*Year ending 31 March 2018*

---

Torrige District Council

16 August 2018



# Contents



## Your key Grant Thornton team members are:

Geraldine Daly

Associate Director

T: 0117 305 7741

E: [geri.n.daly@uk.gt.com](mailto:geri.n.daly@uk.gt.com)

Mark Bartlett

Audit Manager

T: 0117 305 7896

E: [mark.bartlett@uk.gt.com](mailto:mark.bartlett@uk.gt.com)

Peter Brereton

Executive

T: 0117 305 7888

E: [peter.d.brereton@uk.gt.com](mailto:peter.d.brereton@uk.gt.com)

## Section

1. Executive Summary
2. Audit of the Accounts
3. Value for Money conclusion

## Page

3  
5  
9

## Appendices

- A Reports issued and fees

12

# Executive Summary

### Purpose

Our Annual Audit Letter (Letter) summarises the key findings arising from the work that we have carried out at Torridge District Council (the Council) for the year ended 31 March 2018.

This Letter is intended to provide a commentary on the results of our work to the Council and external stakeholders, and to highlight issues that we wish to draw to the attention of the public. In preparing this Letter, we have followed the National Audit Office (NAO)'s Code of Audit Practice and Auditor Guidance Note (AGN) 07 – 'Auditor Reporting'. We reported the detailed findings from our audit work to the Council's Audit and Governance Committee as those charged with governance in our Audit Findings Report on 24 July 2018.

### Our work

---

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Materiality</b>                        | We determined materiality for the audit of the Council's financial statements to be £739k, which is 2% of the Council's gross revenue expenditure. |
| <b>Financial Statements opinion</b>       | We gave an unqualified opinion on the Council's financial statements on 30 July 2018.  |
| <b>Whole of Government Accounts (WGA)</b> | We completed work on the Council's consolidation return following guidance issued by the NAO.  |
| <b>Use of statutory powers</b>            | We did not identify any matters which required us to exercise our additional statutory powers.   |

---

### Respective responsibilities

We have carried out our audit in accordance with the NAO's Code of Audit Practice, which reflects the requirements of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 (the Act). Our key responsibilities are to:

- give an opinion on the Council financial statements (section two)
- assess the Council's arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources (the value for money conclusion) (section three).

In our audit of the Council financial statements, we comply with International Standards on Auditing (UK) (ISAs) and other guidance issued by the NAO.

---

# Executive Summary

---

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Value for Money arrangements</b> | We were satisfied that the Council put in place proper arrangements to ensure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources. We reflected this in our audit report to the Council on 30 July 2018.   |
| <b>Certification of Grants</b>      | We also carry out work to certify the Council's Housing Benefit subsidy claim on behalf of the Department for Work and Pensions. Our work on this claim is not yet complete and will be finalised by 30 November 2018. We will report the results of this work to the Audit and Governance Committee in our Annual Certification Letter. |
| <b>Certificate</b>                  | We certify that we have completed the audit of the accounts of Torridge District Council in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Audit Practice.  |

---

## Working with the Council

During the year we have delivered a number of successful outcomes with you:

- An efficient audit – we delivered an efficient audit with you in July, delivering the audit before the new deadline of 31 July
- VFM - we provided you with assurance and feedback on your arrangements for delivering efficiency, effectiveness and economy.
- Sharing our insight – we provided regular audit committee updates covering best practice. We also shared our thought leadership reports
- Providing training – we provided your team with update training on financial accounts

We would like to record our appreciation for the assistance and co-operation provided to us during our audit by the Council's staff.

**Grant Thornton UK LLP**  
**August 2018**

---

# Audit of the Accounts

## Our audit approach

### Materiality

In our audit of the Council's financial statements, we use the concept of materiality to determine the nature, timing and extent of our work, and in evaluating the results of our work. We define materiality as the size of the misstatement in the financial statements that would lead a reasonably knowledgeable person to change or influence their economic decisions.

We determined materiality for the audit of the Council's accounts to be £739k, which is 2% of the Council's gross revenue expenditure. We used this benchmark as, in our view, users of the Council's financial statements are most interested in where the Council has spent its revenue in the year.

We also set a lower level of specific materiality for senior officer remuneration of £5k.

We set a lower threshold of £37k, above which we reported errors to the Audit and Governance Committee in our Audit Findings Report.

### The scope of our audit

Our audit involves obtaining sufficient evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements to give reasonable assurance that they are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or error. This includes assessing whether:

- the accounting policies are appropriate, have been consistently applied and adequately disclosed;
- the significant accounting estimates made by management are reasonable; and
- the overall presentation of the financial statements gives a true and fair view.

We also read the remainder of the Statement of Accounts and the annual governance statement published alongside the Statement of Accounts to check they are consistent with our understanding of the Council and with the financial statements included in the Statement of Accounts on which we gave our opinion.

We carry out our audit in accordance with ISAs (UK) and the NAO Code of Audit Practice. We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our opinion.

Our audit approach is based on a thorough understanding of the Council's business and is risk based.

We identified key risks and set out overleaf the work we performed in response to these risks and the results of this work.

# Audit of the Accounts

## Significant Audit Risks

These are the significant risks which had the greatest impact on our overall strategy and where we focused more of our work.

| Risks identified in our audit plan   | How we responded to the risk  | Findings and conclusions   |
|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Management override of controls</b><br/>Under ISA (UK) 240 there is a non-rebuttable presumed risk that the risk of management over-ride of controls is present in all entities.<br/>We identified management override of controls as a risk requiring special audit consideration.</p>  | <p>As part of our audit work we:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reviewed accounting estimates, judgements and decisions made by management</li> <li>• tested journal entries</li> <li>• reviewed unusual significant transactions</li> </ul>  | <p>Our audit work did not identify any issues in relation to the management override of controls.</p>            |
| <p><b>Valuation of property, plant and equipment</b><br/>The Council revalues its land and buildings on an quinquennial basis to ensure that carrying value is not materially different from fair value. This represents a significant estimate by management in the financial statements.<br/>We identified the valuation of land and buildings revaluations and impairments as a risk requiring special audit consideration.</p> | <p>As part of our audit work we:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reviewed management's processes and assumptions for the calculation of the estimate, the instructions issued to valuation experts and the scope of their work.</li> <li>• reviewed the competence, expertise and objectivity of any management experts used.</li> <li>• discussed with the Council's valuer the basis on which the valuation was carried out, challenging the key assumptions.</li> <li>• reviewed and challenged the information used by the valuer to ensure it was robust and consistent with our understanding.</li> <li>• tested revaluations made during the year to ensure they were input correctly into the Council's asset register</li> <li>• evaluated the assumptions made by management for those assets not revalued during the year and how management satisfied themselves that these were not materially different to current value.</li> </ul> | <p>Our audit work did not identify any issues in relation to the valuation of property, plant and equipment.</p> |

# Audit of the Accounts

## Significant Audit Risks (continued)

These are the significant risks which had the greatest impact on our overall strategy and where we focused more of our work.

| Risks identified in our audit plan  | How we responded to the risk   | Findings and conclusions  |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Valuation of pension fund net liability</b><br/>The Council's pension fund asset and liability as reflected in its balance sheet represent a significant estimate in the financial statements.</p> <p>We identified the valuation of the pension fund net liability as a risk requiring special audit consideration</p> | <p>As part of our audit work we:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identified the controls put in place by management to ensure that the pension fund net liability is not materially misstated and assessed whether those controls were implemented as expected and whether they were sufficient to mitigate the risk of material misstatement.</li><li>• Reviewed the competence, expertise and objectivity of the actuary who carried out the Council's pension fund valuation.</li><li>• Gained an understanding of the basis on which the IAS 19 valuation was carried out, undertaking procedures to confirm the reasonableness of the actuarial assumptions made.</li><li>• Reviewed the consistency of the pension fund net liability disclosures in notes to the financial statements with the actuarial report from your actuary.</li><li>• Obtained assurances from the Pension Fund auditor at Devon County Council.</li></ul> | <p>Our audit work did not identify any issues in relation to the valuation of the pension fund net liability.</p> |

---

# Audit of the Accounts

## **Audit opinion**

We gave an unqualified opinion on the Council's financial statements on 30 July 2018, in advance of the national deadline.

## **Preparation of the accounts**

The Council presented us with draft accounts in accordance with the national deadline, and provided a good set of working papers to support them. The finance team responded promptly and efficiently to our queries during the course of the audit.

## **Issues arising from the audit of the accounts**

We reported the key issues from our audit to the Council's Audit and Governance Committee on 24 July 2018.

## **Annual Governance Statement and Narrative Report**

We are required to review the Council's Annual Governance Statement and Narrative Report. It published them on its website in and alongside the Statement of Accounts in line with the national deadlines.

Both documents were prepared in line with the CIPFA Code and relevant supporting guidance. We confirmed that both documents were consistent with the financial statements prepared by the Council and with our knowledge of the Council.

## **Certificate of closure of the audit**

We are also required to certify that we have completed the audit of the accounts of Torridge District Council in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Audit Practice.

---

# Value for Money conclusion

## Background

We carried out our review in accordance with the NAO Code of Audit Practice, following the guidance issued by the NAO in November 2017 which specified the criterion for auditors to evaluate:

*In all significant respects, the audited body takes properly informed decisions and deploys resources to achieve planned and sustainable outcomes for taxpayers and local people.*

## Key findings

Our first step in carrying out our work was to perform a risk assessment and identify the key risks where we concentrated our work.

The key risks we identified and the work we performed are set out overleaf.

As part of our Audit Findings report agreed with the Council in July 2018, we agreed a recommendation to address our findings:

- The Council must continue to develop robust savings plans to bridge the budget gap in the medium term, with regular monitoring and reporting to members.

## Overall Value for Money conclusion

We are satisfied that in all significant respects the Council put in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources for the year ending 31 March 2018.

# Value for Money conclusion

## Key Value for Money Risks

| Risks identified in our audit plan  | How we responded to the risk  | Findings and conclusions  |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Financial sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council has recently refreshed its Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). This shows that the Council will need to draw on its reserves to balance the budget in 2019/20 to 2022/23, with the Transition in Government Funding and Business Rates Reserves projected to have been exhausted by 2022/23 if further savings are not identified</li> </ul> | <p>We reviewed the Council's latest MTFS, including the assumptions and the savings plans reflected within in it. We also considered the projected savings from the Transforming Torridge Program, which had been excluded from the latest MTFS due to changes and delays in the program.</p> <p>The latest MTFS was presented to Council and approved in February 2018. The Council has got a robust strategic financial planning process in place, which is consulted on and involves members. Planning assumptions are reported as part of the decision making process and the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) is subject to regular review to reflect changing events. The assumptions included within the detailed MTFS have been considered and appear reasonable and based on the latest information available to the Council.</p> <p>It shows a balanced budget for 2018/19 but the need to draw on reserves in 2019/20 to 2022/23. The budget report stated that with no remedial action the budget gap in 2022/23 would be £413k with two key reserves having been exhausted.</p> <p>The budget gap in 2019/20 is £388k, with gaps of £514k, £502k and £432k in 2020/21, 2021/22 and 2022/23 respectively. The savings from the Transforming Torridge Program have been temporarily removed from the MTFS due to delays and changes to the program. This will be reviewed in 2018/19 for inclusion in future years.</p> | <p>The Council's MTFS shows that a balanced budget position can only be achieved by the use of reserves over the next four years. The Council must develop realistic savings plans to bridge the budget gap.</p> <p><b>On that basis we concluded that while the level of savings needed represents a significant challenge for the Council, the risk was sufficiently mitigated and the Council has proper arrangements in place for planning finances effectively to support the sustainable delivery of strategic priorities and using appropriate cost and performance information to support informed decision making.</b></p> |

# Value for Money conclusion

## Key Value for Money Risks

| Risks identified in our audit plan  | How we responded to the risk  | Findings and conclusions   |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Delivery of Transforming Torridge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Transforming Torridge Program is a significant project for the Council and is critical to the way it will deliver its services in the medium term</li> </ul> | <p>We reviewed the progress being made on this key project for the Council, which cuts across the VFM sub-criteria. A Programme Board was recently introduced and we reviewed how the revised governance and reporting arrangements are working. This included the monitoring of the project, and the reporting to members to inform decision making.</p> <p>The Programme Board is now in place and considers updates on specific projects with highlight reports on giving a RAG rating of the project progress against plan.</p> <p>Full written reports are now presented to Full Council, where it is a standing item, rather than verbal updates.</p> | <p><b>Governance and reporting arrangements around the Transforming Torridge Programme are now much more robust with formal reporting to all members on a regular basis and the introduction of the Programme Board to concentrate specifically on this key area. This will need to be a continuing area of focus for the Council.</b></p> |

# A. Reports issued and fees

We confirm below our final reports issued and fees charged for the audit and provision of non-audit services.

## Reports issued

| Report                | Date issued   |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Audit Plan            | February 2018 |
| Audit Findings Report | July 2018     |
| Annual Audit Letter   | August 2018   |

## Fees

|                                     | Planned<br>£  | Actual fees<br>£ | 2016/17 fees<br>£ |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Statutory Council audit             | 41,288        | 41,288           | 41,288            |
| Housing Benefit Grant Certification | 8,220         | 8,220*           | 8,444             |
| <b>Total fees</b>                   | <b>49,508</b> | <b>49,508</b>    | <b>49,732</b>     |

The planned fees for the year were in line with the scale fee set by Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA)

\* This is the scale fee for 2017/18. The final fee will be confirmed in the Annual Certification Letter.

## Fees for non-audit services

| Service   | Fees £ |
|---|--------|
| <b>Audit related services</b>   |        |
| - None  | Nil    |
| <b>Non-Audit related services</b>   |        |
| Productivity Plan for the Heart of the South West LEP - The work was commissioned and billed to Somerset County Council. We are obliged to inform you of this work. | 35,750 |

## Non-audit services

- For the purposes of our audit we have made enquiries of all Grant Thornton UK LLP teams providing services to the Council. The table above summarises all non-audit services which were identified.
- We have considered whether non-audit services might be perceived as a threat to our independence as the Council's auditor and have ensured that appropriate safeguards are put in place.

The above non-audit services are consistent with the Council's policy on the allotment of non-audit work to your auditor.



© 2018 Grant Thornton UK LLP. All rights reserved.

'Grant Thornton' refers to the brand under which the Grant Thornton member firms provide assurance, tax and advisory services to their clients and/or refers to one or more member firms, as the context requires.

Grant Thornton UK LLP is a member firm of Grant Thornton International Ltd (GTIL). GTIL and the member firms are not a worldwide partnership. GTIL and each member firm is a separate legal entity. Services are delivered by the member firms. GTIL does not provide services to clients. GTIL and its member firms are not agents of, and do not obligate, one another and are not liable for one another's acts or omissions.