

Reasons for call-in – KD 5357, Meridian Water Security Budget Extension:

1 - Case is not made for expenditure in terms of costs of the alternatives, ie to clear site or deal with consequences of not enacting security. It is not clear why stronger physical measures would not be sufficient, or the costs to rectify damage done to the site for example.

2 - Insufficient clarity is provided in the report as to a scale of costs for elements of the security, either as levels of service or by breakdown of services provided. Expenditure of £800,000 warrants significantly greater detail to explain and justify its expenditure. Paragraph 21 information should set out in greater detail, including staffing numbers, quantified security activities, numbers of cctv cameras etc.

3 - Further consideration of tendering in order to achieve better value for money is insufficiently documented in this decision. Due diligence should include a comparison of commercial rates.

4 - The insufficient time argument in paragraph 49 implies that this decision was not dealt with in good time. An explanation of why the decision was not made earlier should have been included.

5 - I note a cost saving strategy dependent on police presence is included (paragraph 6). Apart this appearing entirely unrealistic, it is not clear how this could be a strategy to reduce costs as security costs, as police involvement would be likely to be linked to criminal activity.

I ask that it is referred back to Cabinet Member.