



Epsom and Ewell Council transparency disputes revisited

14 November 2025



The Audit and Scrutiny Committee of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council met on 13th November, with long-running disputes about transparency once again overshadowing its agenda. Questions from the public and exchanges between councillors highlighted continuing disagreements over how openly the Council has handled its governance issues and its dealings with external auditors.

Public challenge over unrecorded meetings with auditors

Resident Previn Jagutpal opened the meeting by questioning the Council’s claim to have established “a very open dialogue” with its external auditors, Grant Thornton. He noted that a Freedom of Information response confirmed that no minutes were taken of the Chief Executive’s first meeting with the auditors. He suggested that unrecorded, closed-door discussions were difficult to square with recent criticisms of the Council’s transparency.

Committee Chair Cllr **Steven McCormick** (RA Woodcote and Langley) replied that not all internal meetings were minuted and that the quality of discussions with auditors did not depend on the existence of formal notes. He maintained that the sessions were appropriate and did not represent secrecy.

Jagutpal pressed further, but the Chair repeated that such meetings were professional exchanges and were not inconsistent with openness.

“Culture of secrecy” dispute resurfaces

Jagutpal’s second question revisited an earlier controversy over whether the Local Government Association peer review team had used the phrase “culture of secrecy” when assessing the Council’s decision-making. In September, Chief Executive Jackie King told the Committee she had an email from the peer-review lead



saying they did not recall using that wording.

Jagutpal said that a fuller email chain disclosed under FOI showed that the LGA lead was “not present at every discussion”, leaving open whether the phrase had surfaced elsewhere. He accused the Council of selectively presenting the peer review comments. Cllr McCormick rejected any suggestion of misrepresentation and said the full email would be circulated to members and attached to the minutes of the meeting.

Clash over what may be discussed in public

Labour councillor **Chris Ames** (Court) then raised a formal point of order. He said councillors had been told they could not discuss certain matters in public that related to the 2023 changes to the Scheme of Delegation — the very subject that led auditors to conclude there was a “significant weakness” in governance. He argued that restricting discussion created the impression that matters were being “stitched up behind the scenes”.

The Chair and the Monitoring Officer both insisted that exempt-information rules applied and that certain details could only be taken in a private session. Ames protested that this prevented transparent scrutiny, but the Chair declined to widen public discussion further.

Disputed minutes and calls for further scrutiny

During approval of the September minutes, councillors and officers agreed to make a minor correction to a sentence summarising the Chief Executive’s comments. The amendment was adopted without dissent.

The meeting’s most heated exchange followed when Ames asked the Committee to add a future agenda item examining why the external auditors had not been informed earlier about changes to the Scheme of Delegation. Cllr McCormick initially resisted, saying the matter had already been covered by previous meetings.

Ames said that earlier discussions had been “stage-managed” and that the Committee had not been allowed to probe key issues. Liberal Democrat councillor **James Lawrence** (College) supported bringing the item back, saying members simply wanted clarity on when and how auditors were informed.

After a prolonged exchange, the Chair agreed that the subject could be added to a future agenda. Officers, not councillors, will prepare a report to support that discussion.

Wider business proceeds quietly

Following these debates, the Committee turned to counter-fraud matters, financial monitoring, and internal-audit progress reports. These items attracted few comments and passed without controversy — in contrast to the extended disputes over transparency that continue to dominate the Committee’s work.



Transparency remains the unresolved issue

Once again, the meeting demonstrated that the central challenge facing the Council is not simply the content of audit recommendations, but the competing interpretations of what “transparency” requires in practice. With further reports now expected, the question of how openly Epsom and Ewell Borough Council takes and explains its decisions seems set to return to the Committee table in the months ahead.

Sam Jones - Reporter



Related reports:

Epsom and Ewell Council CEO contests ‘culture of secrecy’ claim and outlines fixes

RA councillor replaces Independent member as scrutiny row erupts at Epsom Town Hall

“Audit and Scrutiny” under scrutiny

Image: Audit and Scrutiny Committee get ready for the meeting. Epsom and Ewell Borough Council YouTube.

Epsom and Ewell Times timeline on Council transparency tussle

How the Council’s transparency dispute unfolded

The debate over transparency at Epsom and Ewell Borough Council has stretched across several meetings of the Audit and Scrutiny Committee. What follows is a clear timeline of how concerns first surfaced, how councillors reacted, and how the Council’s leadership has responded.

March 2024 - Peer review flags concerns

An LGA Peer Review identifies weaknesses in decision-making processes, warning of confusion among councillors and raising concerns about the Council’s use of confidential sessions. It calls for clearer, more transparent explanations of how decisions are made under the committee system.

February 2025 - External auditors find a “significant weakness”

Grant Thornton reports a “significant weakness” in the Council’s governance arrangements, citing both the peer review and the lack of transparency over 2023 changes to the constitution and Scheme of Delegation.



The Council disputes the auditors' interpretation, arguing that it is already operating transparently.

March 2025 - Committee requests Chief Executive attendance

Audit and Scrutiny calls for Chief Executive Jackie King to attend its July meeting to explain management responses to the auditors' findings. Concerns centre on whether officers properly informed auditors about the delegation changes.

May 2025 - Governance statement controversy

A draft Annual Governance Statement presented to the committee is criticised for downplaying the auditors' "significant weakness" finding. Members send it back for redrafting, saying it fails to give an honest account of the issues raised.

17 July 2025 - CEO absence sparks anger

At the July meeting, members express frustration that the Chief Executive is absent despite earlier requests. Labour councillor Chris Ames repeatedly raises objections, accusing the Council of stalling accountability. The Chair says the CEO will instead attend the September meeting.

30 September 2025 - CEO gives evidence and defends actions

Chief Executive Jackie King attends and answers questions for the first time. She denies that the peer review described the Council as having a "culture of secrecy", saying the LGA peer-review lead did not recall using the phrase. She outlines changes to reporting practices, including splitting public and confidential papers and providing plain-English explanations for exemptions.

Councillors, including Liberal Democrat James Lawrence, challenge the Council's transparency record, citing confusing urgent-decision processes, late information at the May AGM, and the need for clearer oversight of how auditors are kept informed.

The Committee receives the officers' report but signals that further scrutiny will be needed.

Early November 2025 - FOI reveals fuller peer-review email chain

A resident obtains an email chain via Freedom of Information showing that the LGA lead was "not present at every discussion" during the peer review, raising questions about whether the term "culture of secrecy" may have arisen elsewhere. This adds fuel to concerns about whether the Council has selectively interpreted criticism.



13 November 2025 - Transparency dispute dominates meeting

Two public questions challenge the lack of minutes for meetings between the CEO and auditors and question whether the Council has “filed” peer-review comments. The Chair defends the Chief Executive’s position, saying not all professional meetings require minutes, and promises to append the full email to the minutes of the meeting.

A tense exchange follows when Cllr Chris Ames raises a point of order, arguing councillors are being prevented from openly discussing matters central to the auditors’ “significant weakness” finding. The Chair and Monitoring Officer insist some discussions must remain exempt.

Ames calls for a future agenda item explaining when and how auditors were told about the delegation changes. With support from Cllr James Lawrence, the Chair eventually agrees that officers will prepare a report for future consideration.

Routine business proceeds quietly, but the transparency issue clearly remains unresolved.

Looking ahead

With further reports pending and the Committee determined to revisit key questions, the transparency debate shows no sign of easing. How openly Epsom and Ewell Borough Council explains its actions, documents its decisions, and engages with auditors is likely to remain at the heart of future Audit and Scrutiny meetings.