

Audit & Scrutiny Committee

5 February 2026

Public Questions

Written question 1 from Mr P. Jagutpal, resident of the Borough:

When was the GT Audit received by the Council and why was it published hours before the deadline for public questions?

Response from the Chair of the Audit & Scrutiny Committee:

The final Annual Audit report was received by the council on the afternoon of Tuesday 27th January. The report was published with the agenda on the afternoon of Wednesday 28th January. This was the earliest this report could be made public. Democratic Services publish agendas 5 clear working days before the committee meeting. Agenda dispatch timings are set out under the Local Government Act 1972 and there is a legal requirement to make public the agenda for a committee meeting at least 5 clear days prior to the meeting. This does not include weekends, bank holidays, day of publication and day of meeting.

Written question 2 from Mr P. Jagutpal, resident of the Borough:

The Audit highlights;

Weakness 1: Lack of formal effectiveness review *The Audit and Scrutiny Committee has not undertaken a formal self-assessment of its effectiveness*

Weakness 2: Delays in action completion *Delays in management action on internal audit recommendations are a recurring concern, with several items from 2023/24 still outstanding or only partially implemented*

Weakness 3: Infrequent fraud reporting *Fraud reporting to members occurs only annually, which limits visibility of in-year activity and hinders agile governance responses*

*When can the committee expect the results of a **formal effectiveness review** or self-assessment, and what progress has been made on separating the audit and scrutiny functions as recommended by the LGA Peer Challenge?*

Response from the Chair of the Audit & Scrutiny Committee:

We can confirm that members have decided not to consider splitting the Audit & Scrutiny Committee at this time. This is due to the ongoing Local Government Reorganisation, and it was felt that pursuing structural changes now would not be a good use of resources. In relation to the self-assessment point, we can confirm that this is something we have already progressed and the scope of the assessment is currently being reviewed.