

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Provisional Minutes –5th February 2013

For Approval

(Copies of Agendas and Minutes of the Community Council are held at Fife Council's Local Office, St Mary's Place and the Town Library, Church Square. Those from late 1997 on are online at <http://www.standrewscc.net/>)

1. Attendance

Community Councillors

Patrick Marks, Ian Goudie, Ken Fraser, Henry Paul, Marysia Denyer, Penny Uprichard, Kyffin Roberts, Izzy Corbin, Andy Primmer, Carol Ashworth, Ronnie Murphy, Judith Harding, Howard Greenwell, Robert McLachlan, Bernadette Cassidy, Ken Crichton, Henry Cheape.

Students' Association Representatives

Freddie fforde, David Patterson, Ali West

Co-Opted

Stuart Foulkes

Fife Councillors

Keith McCartney, Brian Thomson, Frances Melville

Apologies

Alice Alexander, Callum Corbin, Dorothea Morrison, Lindsey Adam, Catherine Rowe

2. Minutes of Meeting

Page 4 : 4.3.1. Cllr Thomson asked for a correction in a part of his statement on Madras. In the second paragraph on page 4, starting, "Cllr Thomson added that in relation to the Scottish Government being involved, he felt that they would call the application in etc". Cllr Thomson felt that he had actually stated that there was a possibility that the Scottish Government might call the application in, not that that it would.

Page 5, Mr Roberts corrected a statement about the progress of the Martyrs Monument restoration. There has been a small delay due partly to staff illness and inclement weather.

Page 7: 8.1. Mrs Denyer suggested corrections in this item. The first correction being in line three replacing the word, "evidence" with "presentation". She also added that the "Pilgrim Trust" in line 5 should be "Pilgrim Foundation". She also added that there had been an extension to the date for submission of a project until 14th February.

3. Presentations

3.1 – Local Exchange Trading Scheme

Paul White from the Transition University St Andrews project gave an outline of the Transition project and its role as a way to try to get local communities to mitigate the

effects of climate change. He also briefly described various courses the Transition University St Andrews run on the issues surrounding climate change.

LETS he then described as a local alternative for communities to traditional money to help maintain a stable economy in their communities and also provide the opportunity for people to trade and exchange goods and services, particularly when employment opportunities were limited or a shortage of money. The Transition team is trying to set up a LETS. He gave examples of services which could be traded in the form of LETS credits. He felt that it would also help unemployed persons unable to use the skills of their education and training, to both maintain those skills and benefit themselves and the community. In the future he hoped that the scheme would encourage people to skill share and local businesses to become involved. He thought that such a scheme could support small local businesses if they bought into the idea. He hoped that the scheme would help people to begin to have more contact and make new friendships and that the scheme could help build up a more resilient community.

In response to a question from Mr Roberts about a contact address for anyone wanting to be involved, Mr White said that Transition were based at the University Estates Building close to the Gatty. There is also a website and email address.

Mr fforde asked Mr White if the scheme was a currency like the Brixton pound? Mr White replied that it wasn't and he explained the way that that currency operated and how it wouldn't necessarily benefit the local community the way it operated. He thought that LETS tried to achieve a more sustainable and balanced economy, which didn't leave out those less well off if they had skills even at a fairly basic level to contribute towards providing a service. Mr White in response to a query from Mrs Denyer about an exchange system her father used in the 1950s that it was a bit like barter but a bit more sophisticated and organised.

Mr fforde asked about the objective in coming to the meeting. Mr White acknowledged that it was to publicise the scheme and try to build up an awareness of it in the local community.

3.2. Anaerobic Digester

Mr Murphy introduced Dr Roddy Yarr who wanted to make the Community Council aware of this idea, which might be a benefit to the local community in a variety of ways if funding was obtained from CCF. Dr Yarr wanted to get some form of support from the Community Council so that an application could be progressed to CCF demonstrating local community support. Dr Yarr introduced himself as coming as a representative of the St Andrews Partnership of which he is a co-opted director and a resident of the town.

He explained the principles behind the anaerobic digester as a machine into which organic matter was fed and a gas was produced which fuelled a turbine producing electricity and heat for the town. He said that it was both an opportunity and a threat. He viewed it as an opportunity to generate heat and power from this system. He added that there were plans to ban biodegradable waste from landfill. At present Fife Council collect domestic biodegradable waste in brown bins and this goes to a Fife Council digester to avoid landfill. The new threat will be when commercial establishments need to recycle their biodegradable waste. A study has been taking place through the St Andrews Partnership funded by Scottish Enterprise. This study had shown that there was about 60000 tons of such waste produced in this postcode area of St Andrews and peripheral areas on an annual basis. Until now such commercial waste has not been segregated like domestic household waste. He viewed the changes as leading to an opportunity for the community to harness this through a sort of community co-operative venture. The study has said has determined that the feedstock is available and some of it could even be charged a fee

for uplift, creating extra income. If this opportunity was taken up it could mean the generation of heat and power, which could be sold in, to the grid and the heat could also generate an income from the renewable heat incentive, as well as being used for heating purposes depending where it was sited.

St Andrews Partnership has indicated that they'd like to support doing further work on this proposal. However if funding were to be secured to do further work community support would be needed. He thought that it would be good for the Community Council to have a view on the idea. He added that the business community was interested because they viewed the legislation as a threat but also as an opportunity. He also thought that it would be a good way for the community to generate an income with a long term potential particularly in a time of Council cutbacks.

Mr Roberts asked about the scale of the proposed digester. Dr Yarr replied that it would be possibly as big as a storage container, such as might be found on a farm with lots of pipe work and maceration equipment at a farm scale with no odours.

Mr Roberts asked how close to town it would have to be? Dr Yarr replied that it didn't have to be close to town but could be on a farm or in an industrial area.

Cllr Melville commented on the problem, which the changes in legislation are going to bring local merchants and suggested asking an official from Fife Council to come and explain the changes.

Mrs Harding asked about ownership of this facility. Dr Yarr replied that the community could own it if it was done as a co-operative venture, and he supported that route, rather than private ownership.

Dr Yarr added in response to a query from Mrs Ashworth that if it wasn't community owned the waste would possibly be picked up by a private operator, meaning the community wouldn't benefit.

Mr Primmer had two queries. His first query related to the output, which he thought was water essentially and neutral to the carbon footprint. Mr Yarr in reply said that some of the digested material was a valuable fertiliser and the water itself could be treated to be a fertiliser as well. Its value depended upon how much treatment it received. Mr Primmer also asked about the financial value of the 60000 tons of digested material. Dr Yarr replied that the value was in the heat and in the electricity produced, which could be several megawatts of power.

Mrs Corbin asked if the industrial site could be Guardbridge? Dr Yarr said that it could be Guardbridge or a farm site. He felt that the latter might be more appropriate for this machinery. Mrs Corbin queried the size of the site required. Dr Yarr insisted that it would be a farm scale development.

Mr Primmer asked about the initial cost. Dr Yarr thought about £60000 to take the idea to design stage from initial concept. Scottish Enterprise has indicated that they would fund 50% leaving £30000 to be found locally. The total cost to develop could be up to a million depending upon the size.

Mrs Denyer queried what happened to current domestic organic waste. Mr Yarr replied that it was used by Fife Council, but he added that not all householders were as diligent about separating waste so some still ended up in landfill, but from 2013 none could legally go to landfill. At present businesses either macerate waste and it ends up in the sewage system or goes into black bags to landfill.

Cllr Thomson queried about the claim by Dr Yarr that there wouldn't be any odour citing a set up at Glen Farg, which emitted a strong odour. Dr Yarr explained that the Glen Farg machinery was not the same as the anaerobic digester he was talking about in which everything was contained and internalised.

Dr Goudie commented upon Fife Council's current situation and sought clarification as to why Fife Council weren't actively seeking to purchase all commercial waste now, as they owned a digester. Dr Yarr replied that Fife Council would be keen to buy all waste to feed their own machine. He felt however that it would be of more benefit to North East Fife if the waste stayed locally and was used to heat and power the area as well as generating an income for community use. Dr Goudie thought that if Fife Council got less revenue from their waste it could have knock on effects to the local community. Dr Yarr acknowledged that it was something that could occur but added that a commercial operator could undercut Fife Council as well. If the community decided to have its own operation then it would be a way to keep the waste locally as there would be a motivation to have the waste be used in the community digester rather than taken away by Fife Council or a private firm with no local benefits. He felt that a community initiative would be a good thing but there had to be a change of mindset to get the scheme started and successfully running. He acknowledged that such a venture while common on the continent wasn't common practice in Britain.

Mr Roberts thanked Dr Yarr and added that he was requesting an expression of interest from the Community Council to help progress the study into the viability of such a scheme locally. Mr Roberts asked Dr Yarr at what stage he would need this expression of interest? Dr Yarr replied that he was still sounding out local businesses about the idea and at this stage felt that a statement that the Community Council was interested in finding out more would be sufficient.

Mr Roberts asked the meeting if anyone wanted to put up a proposal that the Community Council supported Dr Yarr's request. Mr Paul said he'd support the idea, with Mr Primmer seconding the proposal. Miss Uprichard thought that more needed to be known before committing to any statement of support. Mr Greenwell also thought that he'd like to know more before making any commitment to this request. Mr Roberts then asked if there was a proposal that any firm commitment should be delayed until more was known. Mrs Corbin thought that more needed to be known before making a response. Dr Goudie expressed his uncertainty about why such a scheme should be done in this way, rather than through Fife Council.

Mr Roberts in conclusion informed Dr Yarr that the view appeared to be that more needed to be known before the Community Council could commit itself to adding its support.

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville

4.1.1. Grit Buns

Cllr Melville reported that there was a need for more in North East Fife

4.1.2. Planning – Local Plan Papers Availability

Cllr Melville reported that there wasn't a complete set of papers of the Local Plan in the library. She was chasing this up Development Services to ensure there were as she felt this wasn't acceptable. Development Services were concerned about the cost of full copies, as the maps were expensive. Miss Uprichard commented upon the lack of paper copies of the adopted Local Plan available for inspection. She felt that access by the Internet of this plan was not always reliable. She also commented on the Scottish Government guidance on the matter, which had never intended that the only access to planning papers should be by the Internet. Miss Uprichard commented that

if the public didn't have paper copies there wasn't a permanent record, as she felt that items on the web could be changed or removed or difficult to access.

Mr Greenwell commented that when a determination of a planning application was made on the web all objection files were removed from public viewing. He felt that this was wrong and that objections should remain accessible as part of the public record.

Cllr Thomson thought that the removal of items could relate to a data storage problem, an issue that he could raise with officials. Mr Roberts confirmed that he'd been told that storage issues were the reason for removal from the web but paper copies were still kept.

4.1.3. Planning Committees

Cllr Melville reported that a decision would be announced about the make up of the new Area Planning Committees after the budget for the coming year ahead been announced. There are likely to be three committees for Fife, with North East Fife likely to be one.

4.1.4. Policy Advisory Group on Transportation and Environment

This group was last week. Some of the discussion was about potholes of which Cllr Melville reported there were around 800 in North Fife, with a backlog of some 300 to be repaired. A paper on Public Conveniences had also been discussed. He paper was a starting point but Cllr Melville commented on the limitations and omissions in the paper, which is eventually to go to the Council Executive.

4.2. Brian Thomson

4.2.1. Potholes in St Andrews

Cllr Thomson acknowledged that he'd been receiving a lot of complaints about potholes locally. Following a query from Dr Goudie at the last CC meeting about the material used to repair the holes; he'd spoken to Angus Carmichael from Transportation Services. He'd been told that the majority (70%) of potholes were given what was deemed to be a permanent repair, while the remaining 30% are temporary repairs for a variety of reasons, such as when there are planned road works on a stretch of road with holes or when there is standing water. The Council has had to do a larger than normal number of temporary repairs recently partly due to the bad weather. He then explained the basic process used to do a quality repair, which involved cutting back the joints and putting hot material into the hole and sealed, while a temporary repair uses a proprietary cold material placed into the hole.

4.2.2. Fife Plan

Consultation for this plan started on the 14th January 2013 and runs until the 10th March. Cllr Thomson acknowledged there were issues about the availability of hard copies of the supporting information to the main issues report. The Councillors are chasing up officials in this matter. He informed the meeting about a drop in session at the town hall this coming Wednesday from 15.00 – 19.00.

4.2.3. Madras College Consultation

There is a consultation on the educational merits of the Pipeland site proposal starting on the 21st January to the 8th March 2013. There will be a public meeting on the 12th February at Madras Kilrymont and on the 19th February at the Blyth Hall, Newport, both starting at 18.30.

4.2.4. Sale of St Andrews Police Station & related matters

The Council's Executive Committee is meeting tomorrow at Fife House with a report about the sale of St Andrews Police Station on the agenda. Cllr Thomson acknowledged that despite his attempt to persuade the Council to sell the building for affordable housing, the recommendation would be to sell to a private buyer, Andrea Wagner. The reason being that the Council has to achieve a return which will allow it to cover the costs of the relocation of the police station and help towards refurbishment costs of other police stations across Fife. A sale for affordable housing Cllr Thomson said would not generate enough capital income. Mr Primmer asked that if the money made in the sale of the police station could go towards paying for other police station refurbishment that the money eventually made from the sale of the Madras school sites couldn't be put towards the cost of building a new Madras. He felt that there appeared to be one rule for the police station sale and another rule for the eventual sale of Madras. Mr Primmer couldn't understand why if Fife Council could earmark money from the sale of the police station site before it was sold, the same couldn't be applied to the madras sites. He'd got the impression that money generated from the sale of Madras would go into general Fife council coffers for use across Fife. Cllr Thomson thought that the difference was that fife constabulary was involved in the police station sale, not just Fife Council. Cllr Thomson agreed to look at this matter with Fife Council. He also added that Cllr Poole had stated that if the Madras Project was over budget that some of the receipts from the sale of the school sites could be used towards the extra costs.

Mrs Harding thought that St Andrews was a special case because of the shortage of cheap building land.

Dr Goudie commented that the earmarking was by officials, but wondered whether it was not up to Councillors to say that this wasn't good enough and that due to the shortage of affordable housing in St Andrews that it was perhaps necessary to accept that this was a price which had to be paid to obtain necessary housing. Cllr Thomson acknowledged the scale of the problem regarding affordable housing.

Miss Uprichard reminded the meeting that there had been no affordable housing in St Andrews since 2006 and that the developers had numerous ways of evading their responsibility to build a percentage of such houses in a development. She cited the example of Newpark where the developer had evaded their responsibility by dividing their application to have two applications under the necessary number to require such housing to be built. Cllr Thomson acknowledged that there were loopholes in the affordable housing policy. He cited another loophole in which retirement flats aren't counted in the equation. He hoped to pick up this type of issue with the policy advisory group of Fife Council to request a change on this policy.

Cllr Melville reminded the meeting that the Councillors had been unhappy about the recent Knightsbridge application in relation to the affordable housing element and had sent it back for revision.

Ms West commented upon the lack of mention of the student housing market, which was mostly in the rented sector. She talked about the expense to many students in affording rents in St Andrews.

Cllr Melville reported that there would be a report on the issue of student housing from collaboration between Fife Council and the University. A report by the Centre for Housing Research would be out towards the end of March 2013 with the emphasis of the research being on the needs of postgraduates and students. The results of the research should she added help towards making practical policy decisions on the matter.

Mr Patterson commented on the poor quality of many privately rented properties in the area, with landlords asking between £350 - £500. He recognised that the Council

couldn't investigate the quality of the housing in the rented sector. Mr Primmer as a landlord replied that part of the problem also related to the frequent changes in what Fife Council expected and this was a cost on a regular basis to landlords, which they passed on in the form of increased rents to cover their costs.

Mr Forde commented on how he'd recently given evidence to the Housing Commission and also on issues with the private rental sector and poor quality housing putting students at risk in a recent case. He emphasised that the perception that students had the best quality rented accommodation was wrong.

4.3. Keith McCartney

4.3.1. Street Lights

Cllr McCartney reported that he'd had reports of numerous streetlights malfunctioning in Hepburn Gardens, Craigtoun Road, Logies Lane, Claybraes.

4.3.2. Belisha Beacons Repaired

Belisha Beacons have been repaired between the town hall and Bell Street

4.3.3. Footpath Subsidence

The footpath to Lumbo Den had subsided in one area and is to be fixed in spring.

4.3.4. Flooding Issues in St Andrews

Cllr McCartney had recently had a ward meeting with Fife Council officials to discuss various issues related to flooding in St Andrews. Areas discussed include the dip on Bogward Road, by Lumbo Den to be cleared with high-pressure hoses, the ongoing problem of John Knox Road, the flooding outside trespass in South Street in the disabled parking spaces and the pavement in front of Fatface and Costa in Market Square.

4.4. Dorothea Morrison.

On holiday

5. Planning Committee

5.1. Planning Report

Mr Roberts reported that he had chaired the recent Planning Committee meeting when Mr Greenwell was on holiday. There had been 11 applications, but none had been contentious.

5.2. Main Issues Report

Miss Uprichard started by noting that St Andrews featured only twice in this report. She added that the important document for St Andrews was the Strategic Environmental Assessment, which was not available in paper form. She had noted in this report an indication of two areas for potential future development, one being on the Southern Hillside of 26.6 hectares and one at Craigtoun of 56 hectares. She asked Cllr Melville to explain how three months after the Green Belt had been adopted that these two proposals could go ahead, mainly in Green Belt on prime agricultural land.

Cllr Thomson replied that it was an Issues Report with items put up for discussion. His reading of the document was that those authors weren't putting up any strong case for these to be taken seriously. Miss Uprichard felt that it was bizarre to put up for discussion sites, which it was recognised, were outwith the already identified housing demands for the town.

Dr Goudie was concerned about the ongoing risk to the southern hillside and thought that if it were lost to development the green belt would be a farce. He reminded the meeting of the loss of swathes of land in the western end of town, which in the view of many should have been within the green belt.

5.3. Appeal Visits

Mr Greenwell reported that several appeal visits were taking place this week, with Wonderyears today, the Montessori Nursery on Tuesday and Balone as well.

6. Matters Arising

6.1. Martyrs Monument Update

Mrs Ashworth reported that the completion is a few weeks behind, with completion around the beginning of March and a formal unveiling on the 26th April. There was also a hope of having a VIP to cut the tape.

6.2. Craigtoun Park

Mr Roberts reported that this is still progressing with the plan to have the reopening on 29th March to be opened by the Provost of Fife.

The Friends of Craigtoun have set up a Friends of Craigtoun Ltd as part of the process of progressing towards charitable status. This will allow the Friends to take on employees and trade during the summer months. Fife Council is being very supportive but hasn't given anything to the group in writing, but he hoped this would come soon.

6.3. Botanic Gardens Update

Mr Paul reported about a recent meeting in the Burgh Chambers, which had been full to overflowing. The Friends group now have to produce a business plan, which will be scrutinised by the university at the end of May but with no clear date for an eventual decision.

6.4. Housing Commission

Mr Roberts reported that the Housing Commission has now been taking evidence from a range of organisations, with the CC giving evidence this week. Dr Goudie had produced a statement to put to the Housing Commission. Mr Scott thought that a claim in the submission about the way things was going was incorrect. The submission he claimed had implied that an increasingly artificial community was being created which lacked children and families. He contended that the community was a real community responding to market forces etc. He felt that the submission was doing the CC a disservice by making this suggestion and that what the CC submission was creating was an artificial community, which ran counter to the aspiration.

Mr Crichton asked what Mr Scott meant was artificial. He reminded the meeting of the changes in the past 50 years, with the loss of local shops and a need to go further afield for many goods. He blamed the changes partly on the expansion of the University, creating difficulties in the area of provision of affordable accommodation for students. He also blamed non-resident buyers of property pricing local people out of the property market. Mr Scott in response informed the meeting that St Andrews University provided more accommodation for students than any other Scottish university.

Mr Roberts commented that Mrs Rowe had asked him to make the meeting aware of an elderly couple who had decided to move out of the town because of the

predominance of students in the centre, and Cllr Melville commented on her own parents making a similar decision. Ms West commented that the problem just mentioned was not unique to St Andrews but took place in all towns where universities were a large part of the community. She felt that students were St Andreans as well and had the right to live where they wanted to and pursue their goals. Mr Roberts briefly replied reminding Ms West that St Andrews did have particular issues when around half the population consisted of students whereas cities like Glasgow and Edinburgh didn't have that percentage of students.

6.4. Reports from Representatives

None.

6.5. Any Other Matters Arising

6.5.1. Madras Consultation

Mr Roberts reminded the meeting that the consultation was an education one, although the questions, "Are you in favour of a new school at Pipelands – Yes or No?" could lead a lot of people to believe that the consultation carried more weight in relation to site location as well than it does. Even if there was a strong "Yes" to the idea he reminded the meeting that this was only the first step with a planning application still to be made. He felt that CC members should try to make local people aware of the limitations of the consultation to avoid any misunderstanding. There was until the 8th of March to respond to the consultation.

He thought that the Community Council should respond but how this would take place hadn't been decided. He asked members to give the question serious thought and that a final response would be firmed up at the March meeting of the CC. Mr Roberts added that there wasn't much room for manoeuvre in this consultation with a yes/no answer being sought.

7. Committee Reports

7.1 Recreation Committee

No report submitted

7.2. General Purposes

Mr Roberts gave a verbal outline of the items discussed at the GP meeting – secretary to have report before next CC meeting.

7.3. 200 Club

1st Miss Thomson 2nd Mrs Donaldson 3rd Mrs Hastie

7.4. Health, Education and Welfare Committee

Nothing to report, but Mrs Corbin is still looking for more members.

7.5. StanDen Report

See written report in Appendix B of agenda. Mr Murphy can be contacted for anyone wanting to find out more about items like the Green Deal.

8. New Business

8.1. The Future of the Byre Theatre

Mrs Corbin expressed concern about the loss of the Byre Theatre to the town and its economy. Mr Patterson informed the meeting that the problem wasn't so much the ticket sales, which had been very good this past year, but the closure of the Kingarroch Restaurant at the Byre had left the company running the Byre with a debt of £45000 on top of the shortfall the theatre had. There was some talk of the Byre reopening before the end of August once the initial assessment of the situation had taken place and the funding and management sorted out.

Cllr Thomson reminded the meeting that Fife council owned the building. He added that there were a number of assets, which the Council would have to acquire to allow it to continue as a functioning theatre. The assets included anything moveable from lighting to furnishings, which anyone could purchase from the company running the theatre. Any reopening would be under the auspices of the Fife Cultural Trust an arm of Fife Council. The timescale for the possible reopening will depend upon the time taken to sort out the situation and bring it into the Fife Cultural Trust, a complex process. In further reply to Mr Patterson, Cllr Thomson thought that there was a strong chance the Byre would reopen possibly as a slightly paired down business model.

Mr Roberts commented that he didn't think, that there was a lot that the Community Council could do at this time, other than expressing a view supporting the possibility of the theatre reopening. He didn't think that there was anything practical, which the Community Council could do at this time. He encouraged members of the Community Council to demonstrate their support by signing petitions etc.

Mr Crichton reflected on the view of the Community Council planning committee when the Byre was being redeveloped. The committee had been supportive of the Byre, but concerned about the cost. He also wondered what would happen the money going from the Common Good Fund being given annually to the Byre to support the cost of its development? Mr Roberts acknowledged a need for clarification of the future of this contribution from the Common Good Fund towards the capital costs. Mr Crichton commented that his understanding of the funding was to cover the interest on the million pounds capital costs being repaid by the Byre Theatre when it was redeveloped.

8.2. Honours Leaflet

Mr Roberts asked if anyone had names to suggest from the local community in relation to this process of rewarding worthy individuals for their services in the community. He suggested that members should contact the secretary if they had any ideas.

8.3. Heartstart

The contact from Dr Hamish Tait in relation to the Heartstart project was discussed. It was agreed to invite him along to the next meeting to expand upon his request to discuss how Community Councils could become involved in this project.

9. Reports from Office Bearers

9.1. Chair

Nothing to report apart from items already discussed this evening.

9.2. Treasurer

9.2.1. Treasurers Report

See report circulated by email and online. No major issues. Mr Paul reported that the CC was on course to have around £4000 in the bank. He appealed to members to let him have their expenses claims for this financial year and an idea of future needs so he could try and budget for the coming year.

9.3 Secretary

9.3.1. Correspondence – see Appendix A.

Mr Marks commented upon correspondence received. There

10. Any Other Competent Business

10.1. Market Street Fountain

Mr fforde asked about the situation with the Market Street Fountain. Mrs Corbin replied it was all in hand and that Mr Sangster had managed to secure funding. Cllr Thomson said that there was an issue about ongoing revenue costs in relation to the upkeep of the fountain. Councillors were seeking clarification on this matter. Cllr Thomson acknowledged that Mr Sangster had managed to secure the capital costs for the repair of the fountain but that there was still no clarification about the costs for the upkeep of the fountain. Mrs Corbin offered to get Mr Sangster to clarify the situation in respect of the fountain. Mr fforde explained his reason for raising the issue, saying that he would like the Students Association to try and contribute towards something in the town and the fountain had been something he'd always considered a possible project to assist, but he still had to see what way funding could be sourced.