

Fisherrow Harbour and Waterfront Feasibility Study Summary

1 Introduction

This assignment was commissioned by East Lothian Council on behalf of the Musselburgh Area Partnership.

This document is a summary of the draft final report which will be presented to a group of interested stakeholders on 2nd February 2017 at the Brunton Hall. This will provide an opportunity for discussion and feedback on the findings/conclusions, the suggested strategic approach and the proposed Action Plan. Thereafter the draft report will be presented to the Musselburgh Area Partnership.

The aim of the assignment was to:-

“develop a strategic approach to Fisherrow Harbour and Waterfront area, along with an action plan for future development.”

The focus has been on how to capitalise on the opportunities presented by the leisure market. Sailing, and other water-borne leisure activity have been considered, as well as the dry tourism and visitor facilities around the harbour area. An audit and appraisal of existing use and facilities have been undertaken, including connectivity and accessibility. Fisherrow has been considered in the context of the Forth and the East Coast sailing in general and comparisons have been made with other harbours. There has been widespread consultation with a range of relevant bodies and organisations and with local community groups, as well as an on-line survey to secure input from the wider local community.

Arch Henderson has developed an Engineering Appraisal based on available documentation and a visual survey, which provides the basis for the development on a Maintenance Plan. Arch Henderson has also given preliminary consideration to the potential scope for dredging, the installation of an 87-pontoon berth development and the installation of a landing pontoon.

2 Findings and Conclusions

Fisherrow Harbour and Waterfront as Local Assets

There are no estimates of user numbers or user profile, but it is clear from consultations that Fisherrow Harbour and the Waterfront area are highly regarded as valuable local informal recreational assets to be enjoyed by all sections of the community. Their appeal is far wider than just direct users and there is a core of regular users who visit the area several times a week.

Ownership of Fisherrow Harbour

Fisherrow Harbour and the surrounding beach areas have been confirmed as being within the Musselburgh Common Good portfolio. No real desire to establish a harbour trust has been expressed or identified during this assignment and, indeed, some consultees view Common Good ownership as the preferable situation to harbour trust status

Condition and Maintenance of the Harbour

Fisherrow Harbour has been assessed in the Engineering Appraisal as being in reasonable condition for its age, but it has been maintained on a reactive basis only over many years. ELC has no maintenance plan, or maintenance budget for Fisherrow Harbour and the last condition survey was undertaken in 2000.

The Engineering Appraisal outlines a long list of issues and defects and, although none are classified as urgent, many are highlighted as *“deteriorating conditions that could lead to a structural problem or maintenance issues if left unchecked”*.

It is strongly recommended that ELC should use the Engineering Appraisal to facilitate a proactive and structured approach to maintenance of Fisherrow Harbour. Key to this will be a Maintenance Plan, which should detail routine maintenance activity and inspection/monitoring of known issues, as well as one-off repairs that are required over the short, medium and longer term. It should also provide indicative costs and identify aspects that do not comply with current regulations and how these will be addressed.

Management of the Harbour

The Harbour Master is in charge of the harbour on a day to day basis. However, there is little cohesion or cooperation within ELC regarding Fisherrow Harbour and its ongoing management and maintenance. Operational staff appear to have the no power or budget to move projects forward and the Harbour User’s Committee is assessed by many as being ineffective. There are several local groups with an interest in the harbour and waterfront, but currently little sense of common purpose.

It is recommended that operational staff need to have more autonomy over maintenance activity. The fact that the Common Good Fund may be able to fund maintenance activity in future and the recommended development of a structured Maintenance Plan will be extremely helpful in this context.

If ELC genuinely wishes to involve users in the management of the harbour, then it is recommended that consideration is given to an alternative management arrangement and the establishment of a new group.

Use of the Harbour

In recent years there appear to have been 40-50, mainly leisure craft, berthed in the harbour and a few vessels that pay launch fees only, including the 2 rowing club skiffs. There is currently one commercial fisherman but little other activity as far as can be ascertained. The limited tidal window may be a dis-incentive for potential new berth holders and other potential users may be put off by the locked slips and/or the lack of information, or feel priority is given to berth holders.

Fisherrow Harbour has designated visitor berths but welcomes very few visiting vessels, perhaps 2-3 a year according to the Harbour Master.

Income at the harbour over the past 5 years is just under £11,500 on average and it is suspected that income does not currently cover even the direct operating expenditure associated with staff and the Harbour Office.

Fisherrow Harbour is not at capacity but it is challenging to find any information about it on the ELC website. It is recommended that a more pro-active approach is taken to marketing the harbour to potential berth holders, and to attract more regular and occasional users and more visiting vessels.

Facilities at Fisherrow Harbour

Fisherrow Harbour has relatively few dedicated facilities for berth holders and water-based leisure users, but it does benefit from ample free parking and good quality, all year round toilets at the Back Sands. Several consultees indicate that additional water and electricity points are required and increased security is desirable, as well as an area where berth holders could work on their vessels. The issues surrounding berth holders being responsible for installing and maintaining their own mooring chains has been raised by consultees. A project to replace ladders is progressing although is understood to be more complex and costly than originally anticipated.

Constraints at Fisherrow Harbour

In common with most other Forth and East Coast Harbours, Fisherrow is tidal and suffers from a build-up of mud, sand and silt. Many consultees advocate dredging as a way of increasing the tidal window. Arch Henderson's preliminary calculations indicate that it might be possible to secure an additional 37 minutes per high tide by removing 0.5 metres of mud. However, this would be an expensive project and would require a detailed technical assessment to assess what might be possible and appropriate, given that lack of data about the harbour and the structural damage that occurred during the last dredging activity.

Fisherrow in Comparison to Other Local Harbours

Fisherrow is one of the cheaper and most tidal berthing locations locally on the Forth. Locations locally that have pontoon berths achieve a premium rate for berthing and most of these report waiting lists. The numbers of visiting vessels to harbours on the Forth are generally fairly modest. Anstruther reports 100 a year and it is thought that Port Edgar may welcome many more but the operators declined to provide a number. Port Edgar undoubtedly has the best supporting infrastructure, and Anstruther Harbour is the most integrated into its town centre, hence has good scope to secure economic spin off.

Dry Tourism Facilities

Fisherrow Harbour and Waterfront are reasonably well served in terms of dry tourism facilities and present an attractive town beach destination. Aspects that could enhance visits are suggested as the provision of cycle racks, more seating/picnic tables, step free access to the Back Sands, the provision of shelter, additional information and interpretation, improved soft landscaping, a clear and safe pedestrian/cycle route linking through the car park and a wider range of spending opportunities.

Fisherrow Harbour and Waterfront enjoy a frequent public bus service and have good links to cycling and walking networks but access by train is less good as it involves a walk of around a mile. There is an aspiration of providing a safe off-road link from Fisherrow to Portobello and beyond but this could prove expensive and is likely to be a longer term project.

The Back Sands is a designated bathing water beach but the quality has been poor over recent years and efforts must be made to secure an improved rating to ensure the beach is attractive to users. The Back Sands is not included in the East Lothian award beaches and again efforts should be made to ensure it can comply with relevant criteria and included in the award scheme, if possible.

The beaches and Waterfront are valuable local assets and efforts should be made to increase awareness and use through more active PR and marketing. Efforts should also be made to gain a better understanding of user numbers and their profile to benchmark current use, as this will be helpful when making a case for funding.

It is perhaps unlikely that potential visitors will choose to visit Fisherrow in preference to Gullane, North Berwick or the beaches around Dunbar. However, encouraging more Musselburgh residents, including those from the large proposed new housing developments, to use the beaches and Waterfront for an inexpensive day or afternoon beach or informal recreational visit may be the key to achieving more year round use. Similarly, for Edinburgh residents (and those in the wider local area of Musselburgh) without a car, Fisherrow could prove an attractive, accessible and affordable day out to the beach and an alternative to Portobello which it is understood can be very busy.

Fisherrow in a Strategic Context

The Musselburgh Town Strategy seeks to strengthen the appeal and performance of the Town Centre, including through events and markets. Fisherrow Harbour and Waterfront are not within the designated town centre and this may act to make the location less appealing and less strategically important for markets and events.

The coast and its beaches are key attractors for East Lothian from a visitor perspective and the proximity to Edinburgh is a key strength. Tourism in Musselburgh is relatively low key, although it does have a number of attractions and would benefit from a more proactive and cohesive approach to marketing.

The projected housing/population growth in Musselburgh provides opportunities to encourage more use of the Harbour and Waterfront area.

The Scottish Marine Tourism Strategy is welcome and is being pursued but there is little emphasis on the East Coast and much of the activity that is being progressed appears focussed on the West and developing the more established sailing destinations. The East Coast of Scotland is generally considered to be intrinsically less attractive for sailing than the West Coast, mainly due to its tidal restrictions and drying harbours but also due to the lack of islands and sea lochs which provide attractive berthing and destinations. The relative lack of supporting infrastructure and marina type facilities compounds this, and the East Coast suffers from comparison with the West Coast which is the focus for sailing activity.

From a leisure sailing perspective, it is unlikely that Fisherrow Harbour will be able to effect significant change in isolation, regardless what capital investment might be able to take place. The best case scenario for visiting vessels might be similar to Anstruther which attracts around 100 visiting vessels annually. However, the Forth and the East Coast still have some way to go in terms of improved infrastructure and awareness, if they are to grow the number of visiting vessels. A market that is worthy of more consideration is resident vessels travelling between local harbours, rather than thinking mainly of attracting visitors from further afield. Growing this market might involve the development of marketing materials and recommended/themed routes, more emphasis on events and some improvements to on-shore infrastructure and would best be taken forward through a partnership approach with other local harbours/clubs and/or local authorities around the Forth.

It is recommended that the scope for co-operation and joint marketing with other harbours within East Lothian, the Forth and/or the East Coast is pursued. This was a key recommendation in the Strategic Study of Fife Harbours but does not seem to have progressed as yet.

Estimated Economic Impact

The current economic contribution of the Fisherrow Harbour and Waterfront is estimated as £250,900 - £431,500. However, as there is a lack of data on user numbers and profile for the Waterfront, this is based on very broad assumptions and should be regarded as indicative only.

3 The Strategic Approach

The suggested strategy is designed to direct and guide future development and provide the supporting context for funding applications.

The suggested vision for Fisherrow Harbour and Waterfront area is as *“an attractive, well connected place, popular with residents and visitors, who congregate to take part in a variety of activities and informal recreation and to enjoy the facilities on offer at the beach, harbour and waterfront”*

The suggested overall aim is to *“increase the profile and use of Fisherrow Harbour and Waterfront area”*.

In order to move towards achieving the vision and overall aim, it is important to set out clear supporting objectives which have a good chance of being achieved. These are suggested as:

- To ensure the historic harbour is safe, fit for purpose, well maintained and well managed
- To increase use of the harbour and make it more accessible to a wider range of users
- To ensure the waterfront is attractive, accessible, well connected and provides a range of facilities to service and attract residents and visitors
- To improve the profile, awareness and marketing of the waterfront area and harbour, including increasing awareness and appreciation of Fisherrow’s rich cultural heritage
- To secure community and economic benefits and improve long term sustainability, including through stimulating investment to attract more and a wider range of users

An Action Plan is under development and this outlines short, medium and longer term projects, along with broad cost estimates and lead bodies under each of the 5 objectives. This is currently a draft and has not been approved/adopted by the Area Partnership or ELC. Further, apart from those projects which are currently being progressed, there is no funding in place at this present time to take the Action Plan forward and it is likely that funding will have to be sought on a project by project basis. Although Musselburgh Area Partnership and the Common Good Fund are suggested as potential funding sources for many projects in the Action Plan, their resources are limited, with Musselburgh Area Partnership having £100,000 in its general fund annually to target a range of priorities in Musselburgh and the surrounding local area.

The suggested starting point is to make sure Fisherrow Harbour benefits from a proactive approach to maintenance, operates at near capacity and that the harbour managers adopt a more proactive and welcoming approach to increasing use. Improving the water quality at the Back Sands and ensuring the beach participates in the Beach Award scheme should be regarded as of high priority, as beach users represent a

much bigger user group than direct harbour users. The general amenity and accessibility of the waterfront area is assessed as good, although a programme of relatively small scale improvements is desirable. Improving the profile of Fisherrow Harbour and Waterfront from a visitor perspective should be instrumental in increasing use, as should increasing the profile of Musselburgh overall. Other potential development projects should be viewed as building on this important consolidating activity.

Projects within the Harbour

Although there are several local groups with differing objectives, there is a degree of commonality in terms of the type of future actions they would like to see at the harbour. In general terms these relate to ensuring the harbour is safe and fit for purpose so aspects such as replacement ladders, an access/landing pontoon, more seating, improved security, more information and interpretation and more water and electricity points all have good support, as does adopting a more proactive maintenance regime and improved communication.

Pontoon Berths

There are two concepts for pontoons in Fisherrow Harbour, the original concept is to provide a large scale pontoon development of around 87 pontoon berths and the second is to provide a landing pontoon on the west wall which would improve access and accessibility for all users.

There are very mixed views about the scope to install 80-90 pontoons berths in the harbour. Some view this as definitely the way forward to generate more use of and income from the harbour. Others are concerned about the technical feasibility, the cost, the challenge of raising the funds required, the likely increased cost of berthing and whether such investment might detract from the very ambiance that people currently enjoy. There is, however, good support for the concept of installing a landing pontoon.

The pre-feasibility report undertaken by Arch Henderson for both of the pontoon project concepts for Fisherrow Harbour concludes that the wave height in the harbour is assessed as too high for the installation of pontoons and wave attenuation measures will be required, suggested as a floating breakwater pontoon estimated as costing £350,000 ex VAT. However, due to the sheltered environment of the proposed landing pontoon location and the way it is likely to be used, wave attenuators might not be required.

The budget costs for the works associated with the two pontoon proposals have been estimated by Arch Henderson based on available information and comparator projects as:

- Landing pontoon: £61,000 ex VAT
- 87 Berthing Pontoon Development: £810,000 ex VAT

The above costs include pontoon installation, the floating breakwater pontoon, some site investigations and other costs to enable the pontoon design and installation. Due to the number of current unknowns associated with the pier structures, the geotechnical and the environmental elements, the above are considered to be Class 3 Preliminary cost estimates.

It is clear that those harbours with pontoon berths can charge premium berthing rates, are at capacity and most report waiting lists. Thus, it is to be assumed that if it was possible to install say 80-90 pontoon berths at Fisherrow then these would command a premium price and probably be filled quickly.

The current berthing rate at Fisherrow is just under £35 per metre and the current income is around £11,500 based on 44 vessels paying berthing fees. If it is assumed that berthing charges are doubled to £70 per metre and berthing capacity is doubled to 88 then income could increase to around £46,000 annually, although this does not include those that are free of charge. This is a very broad calculation and takes no account of the size and type of vessels that might be attracted to use the harbour or the services such as electricity that might be provided.

If the cost of installing the pontoons, including the breakwater and preparatory technical studies is £810,000, then the payback period would be 23.5 years (assuming additional income each year of £34,500). This does not take account of any other costs that would be incurred such as maintenance and management costs. Typically, floating pontoon berths have a life of 25-30 years but those in tidal drying harbours may experience a shorter life. Thus, the payback period may well extend beyond the expected life of the pontoons, meaning it is not a financially attractive proposition.

The economic output associated with 88 pontoon berths, including indirect and induced effects, could be almost £420,000. This assumes berth holders all spend £2,840 annually i.e. the mid East Area spend derived from the Sailing Tourism in Scotland Report 2016.

Some other points to bear in mind, include that winter storage might be an issue, although many of the vessels may stay on pontoons if these are judged as safe for all year round mooring. There will be a maintenance cost associated with the pontoons, especially as they age and there may also be a cost associated with dredging. Finally, it may prove challenging to secure external funding for such a pontoon project. Some sources such as Coastal Communities Fund could be worth further investigation but this source only provided funding of up to a maximum of £300,000 in the 2016 round.

The economic impact associated with the landing pontoon is less easy to estimate but it could result in berth holders using their vessels more frequently throughout the year, taking more family members and friends as passengers, with scope for them to spend locally on food and drink, etc. Whilst there is no real way of estimating what the impact of this might be, if it is assumed to increase overall current spend by 20% (45 vessels) then this would mean additional direct spend of £11,000 - £23,300 and total increase in economic output of around £18,500 - £39,160

annually. Potential funding sources for the landing pontoon might include Musselburgh Area Partnership, and the Common Good Fund, plus it may be possible to secure funding from other sources such as Viridor, if the Common Good is an eligible applicant.

The Arch Henderson report concludes that the landing pontoon should be the concept that is considered further. The scope to provide the full pontoon system is included in the Action Plan but stakeholders may conclude that the likely scale of costs, long payback period and relatively limited benefits mean this is unlikely to be pursued.

Boat House Concept

Eskmuth Rowing Club has aspirations to develop a modest building in the vicinity of the harbour to service harbour users and act as a focus for water-based activity. It is envisaged that such a building could serve as a boat house for its own use, for use by other groups associated with the harbour such as the Sea Cadets and berth holders, and other wider local community use. This appears to be a concept worthy of further consideration and could have a positive impact on the harbour and waterfront, particularly in terms of attracting and servicing new users.

The boat house is currently envisaged as a fairly modest building in the Back Sands car park, and would reduce car parking capacity by 7 spaces. Our view is that the current suggested scale of the building may not be able to accommodate all of the suggested uses/users. Use/user groups need to be considered in more detail at this stage before the concept is developed much further and perhaps it would be preferable to consider a larger building in a different location (as yet undefined) to ensure the boat house can function as the flexible multi-use space envisaged by the proposers. The financial viability of the space needs to be considered as although it will perhaps have few direct costs, energy could represent a major cost. Access and security also need to be considered i.e. how will users access the building, perhaps using a key pad system to minimise any janitorial costs.

The potential reduction in car parking is also an issue as this may restrict any further suggested reductions i.e. as a result of creating the safe pedestrian link route and/or the scope to create an attractive seating area.

The broad estimated costs of the boat house based on the current modest building are £100,000 and possible sources of grant funding might include Big Lottery, Musselburgh Area Partnership and the Common Good Fund.

Beach Wheelchair Station

North Berwick Harbours hosts a beach wheelchair station providing specialist wheelchairs and other equipment to enable those with mobility issues to enjoy the beach and is operated by a local voluntary group. There is no cost to hire the equipment but donations are welcome and the service must be pre-booked. This group's website indicates that it has had over 100 bookings since it started in July 2015.

During consultations there has been interest in offering such a service at the Back Sands although the nucleus of a group to operate it has not yet been established and it is understood that the specialist wheelchairs are expensive at up to £4,000 each. The equipment required to offer such a service at Back Sands could possibly be accommodated within the proposed boat house or it might be possible to build a small extension onto the toilet block to provide accommodation.

An allowance of £10,000 has been made in the Action Plan and it is hoped that such a project would find it relatively easy to raise the required funding from a variety of sources including Big Lottery, Musselburgh Area Partnership, Common Good Fund and business sponsorship. Accommodation should be of a suitable size to accommodate up to 4 wheelchairs, a local voluntary group needs to be established to take the project forward and step free access needs to be provided from the Back Sands car park to the beach to enable this project to proceed.

Commercial Activity

The Fisherrow Waterfront Group and others quite rightly point out that improvements and projects at the harbour and waterfront should be instrumental in securing increased economic impact.

Fisherrow Waterfront Group is keen to see monthly farmer's markets and similar types of selling events hosted at Fisherrow and this concept also found favour in the on-line community survey. However, such a project is being pursued at an area in the town centre where it can be argued that the scope for economic spin off is far greater than at Fisherrow Harbour. Thus, it is suggested that such events are unlikely to take place regularly at Fisherrow and hence there is no need to have a dedicated space for this type of function. Fisherrow might still host such events/markets occasionally in the future but it is suggested that this could be facilitated by cordoning off areas rather than developing a specific area that might only be used very occasionally.

Fisherrow Waterfront Group has also suggested the scope for pods similar to those at Amble Harbour Village to enable the stimulation of more commercial activity. There are 15 pods at Amble Harbour, each 3 sqm hosting a variety of types of businesses, mainly arts/crafts and food/drink, with the Northumberland Seafood Centre being housed in a larger building and acting as the anchor tenant.

North Berwick Harbour Trust is hoping to pilot a similar type of project next summer albeit on a more modest scale, and will be providing 6 beach huts each around 2 sqm at the harbour for use by local groups and charities.

Something similar has been suggested for Fisherrow and suitable locations for beach huts/pods could possibly be:

- in the Back Sands car park, adjacent to Sizzlers but this would reduce parking capacity

- along the east Promenade, although residents may object and structures might have to be dismantled in the winter due to storm damage risk
- on the grassed area next to Clarks, which is understood to be owned by the garage

The scope to encourage more commercial activity at Fisherrow is suggested as a longer term potential project but efforts should be made to identify a suitable location for a small number of seasonal outlets to help boost the economic contribution of the area and provide more reasons to visit.

Other than encouraging more mobile vendors and possibly seasonal outlets in the longer term, it is challenging to see where else commercial development might happen at Fisherrow Waterfront. There are no empty commercial premises and there are no disused/derelict buildings that could be converted for a new use.

Master Planning

From the consultations, it is clear that there is no common view regarding the scope to reduce parking. The lack of data about car parking use compounds this as it is unclear if all parking is well used all year or if there is some scope to reduce capacity. There is, however, an expressed desire to have a safe pedestrian/cycle route linking the beaches and for a variety of other relatively small scale infrastructure improvements.

It is suggested that the best way forward is firstly to undertake a parking survey to ascertain how well used parking is and secondly to undertake a master planning exercise for the area that comprises the area around the Back Sands car parking and harbour parking, possibly extending onto the Promenade in the east. This needs to fully encompass:

- Car parking required for harbour and beach users
- Space required at the slip for harbour users to launch and recover vessels
- Whether it may be appropriate to reserve certain areas of parking for harbour users only, as is common at other harbours
- Improved traffic management arrangements to ensure pedestrian safety
- Winter vessel storage, possibly with a revised configuration
- A safe, attractive seating/picnic area i.e. not in the middle of a car park
- A safe route for pedestrians/cyclists linking the east and west beaches
- A shelter or number of smaller shelters
- Locations for information and interpretation
- Locations for benches
- A location for the suggested boat house concept
- A location for the suggested beach wheelchair station

- An area suitable for vendors and pop up shops – possibly in the Back Sands car park close to Sizzlers, the grass area close to Clarks, or perhaps along the east Promenade
- The use of retractable bollards, or similar to create a space suitable for hosting events and functions in one or both car parks
- Better delineation of the road and east Promenade areas at the harbour end, making it more pedestrian friendly and discouraging vehicular use
- The availability of and/or requirement for water and power

It is suggested master planning might cost £10,000 - £15,000 and then implementing the recommendations might cost in the region of £100,000 - £150,000 but these are very broad estimates and will depend on what is ultimately to be progressed. The most likely source of funding would be from Musselburgh Area Partnership and it is likely that there would need to be a phased approach, with the whole project delivered over several years.

John Muir Way

The extension of the John Muir Way to Helensburgh and its recent designation as a Great Trail of Scotland should represent a new opportunity for Fisherrow Harbour and Waterfront, with more users and having a higher profile than the previous shorter East Lothian route. Efforts should be made to ensure that there is current information at Fisherrow Harbour and Waterfront and that local businesses are participating in available marketing and PR opportunities associated with the route.

Passenger Services

One of the concepts that has been put forward is the scope for passenger services out of Fisherrow as a way of increasing visitor interest and activity.

During the course of this assignment contact was made the operator of the Maid of the Forth, and Seafari which operates services mainly out of South Queensferry and North Berwick. The advice is that operating out of tidal harbours is challenging and that passengers have a limited understanding of why it is not possible to operate a regular service every day at the same time. The operator of the Maid of the Forth indicates that he occasionally offers a service out of Fisherrow. He has also tried to run a regular service from Newhaven but issues with tides and weather mean operating anything other than an occasional service has been difficult. He cannot see Fisherrow offering any potential for passenger vessel operations given the tidal restrictions and the low pedestrian traffic.

The operator of Braveheart at North Berwick provides a bespoke, pre-booked charter type service for diving, fishing, wildlife, and photography rather than a regular timed passenger service. She thought there might be scope for this type of operation at Fisherrow but it would depend on

an operator identifying the potential. She also raised a good point about the need for a destination within a reasonable distance and with something to provide interest. South Queensferry has the Bridges and Inchcolm with its Abbey and North Berwick has the Bass Rock.

The development of a passenger service is not included within the Action Plan but it is recommended that if a potential operator approaches the harbour managers, then they should be encouraged even if it is only possible to provide occasional trips.

Fisherrow Harbour and Waterfront Action Plan			
SHORT TERM PROJECTS			
Objective 1: To ensure the historic harbour is safe, fit for purpose, well maintained and well managed			
	Lead	Estimated Cost	Potential sources Funding
Deliver new ladders at the harbour – in progress	ELC	Costs in development	Common Good Fund
Develop a costed Harbour Maintenance Plan to include recurring routine activity, monitoring of known issues and necessary one-off projects or investment. To include harbour structure and all other elements including Harbour Office, seating, weed control, litter, safety equipment, etc. To include a review of all aspects to identify and address non-compliance with current regulations.	ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure	£5,000 – one of cost to develop the plan	Common Good Fund
Confirm with ELC how ongoing maintenance will be funded, possibly through the Musselburgh Common Good Fund and also confirm whether an annual allowance will be available or if will need to be sought on a project by project basis	ELC	n/a	n/a
Confirm whether income from the harbour, and possibly any from the surrounding area, should accrue to the Musselburgh Common Good Fund	ELC	n/a	n/a
Investigate and progress ways of improving security at the harbour with reference to Health and Safety in Ports Handbook	ELC	£2,000 for fees. Sum for physical implementation – to be determined	ELC and/or Common Good Fund

Progress with the installation of a small crane/davit on the west wall to assist commercial loading/unloading	Michael Fairnie	£1,000	EMFF 50%, private 50%
There is an immediate requirement for ELC to undertake a risk assessment associated with berth holders installing and checking their own mooring chains – if it does not already have one. In future ELC should consider employing a contractor to install and check individual mooring chains.	ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure	To be determined	Mooring fees to be increased to cover this cost
An alternative management arrangement should be established by forming a new grouping to enable the community to take an active role in the management of the harbour. See Section 10.3	ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure and interest groups	n/a	n/a
Improve communication with existing harbour users through undertaking more communication/more regular communication by e-mail and having named contacts at ELC. Provide named contacts on harbour notice board, Harbour Office hours and include positive environmental messages.	ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure	n/a	n/a
Objective 2: To increase use of the harbour and make it more accessible to a wider range of users			
	Lead	Estimated Cost	Potential Funding sources
Progress with the investigation and installation of a landing pontoon on the west wall. Planning and listed building consent will be required. See Section 10.3	ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure	£61,000	Common Good Fund and Musselburgh Area Partnership
Instigate technical study to assess the scope for dredging the harbour, to include sampling and analysis – but the scale of broad costs may be considered prohibitive and this project may not proceed.	ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure	Estimated as £75,000 - £150,000	Common Good Fund
Instigate detailed technical study to assess the scope for 80-90 pontoon berths within the harbour, including an environmental impact assessment – but the scale of broad costs may be considered prohibitive and this project may not proceed.	ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure	Estimated as £35,000 - £40,000	Common Good Fund
Improve the profile of Fisherrow Harbour on the ELC website, by providing comprehensive information to make it easier to find out about how to get a berth, and how to visit. Or possibly consider a	ELC	n/a	If new website, then QM Uni students may be able to assist with design and

separate website – Queen Margaret University students may be able to assist with such a website			development
Work with other local harbours, clubs and council areas to establish a Forth or East Coast grouping to better promote and develop a coordinated approach to marketing the area and its harbours. A lead partner needs to be identified – possibly Fife Council as it owns many harbours	ELC	To be determined	Possibly part funded through Fisheries Local Action Group (FLAG)
Objective 3: To ensure the waterfront is attractive, accessible, well connected and provides a range facilities to service and attract residents and visitors			
	Lead	Estimated Cost	Potential Funding sources
Instigate a user/visitor survey at the beach/waterfront area to benchmark user numbers and profile	ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure	£5,000 - £10,000	Musselburgh Area Partnership, scope to involve QM University?
Instigate a parking survey at harbour and Back Sands to ascertain how well used parking is and if there is scope for some rationalisation to create a public space, picnic area, etc.	ELC Roads Service	To be determined	Musselburgh Area Partnership
Participate in the partnership to improve the bathing water quality at Back Sands	SEPA	n/a	n/a
Establish why the Back Sands is not included within the Scotland's Beach Award scheme and seek to ensure it can comply with the criteria	ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure	To be determined	Musselburgh Area Partnership
Provide step free/ramped access from the Promenade to the Back ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure Sands	ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure	£2,000	Musselburgh Area Partnership
Provide access from Murdoch Green to the Back Sands as part of a longer traffic free pedestrian route along the Promenade towards Portobello – links to Coastal Connections project. Engineering feasibility study currently underway.	ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure	£25,000	Musselburgh Area Partnership is funding feasibility study
Develop a grass verge along the sea side of the Promenade at the East beach – grass cutting to be included under normal maintenance regime and no increased revenue cost implication.	ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure	£5,000	Musselburgh Area Partnership

Litter and beach cleaning – ensure bins at harbour and waterfront are fit for purpose and large enough and if not consider replacing. Consider increasing beach cleaning activity.	ELC Countryside Leisure	Sport and	To be determined	Musselburgh Partnership	Area
Take steps to cover and/or lengthen drainage pipe at Back Sands to improve the appearance of the beach	ELC Countryside Leisure	Sport and	To be determined	Musselburgh Partnership	Area
Objective 4: To improve the profile, awareness and marketing of the waterfront area and the harbour, including increasing awareness and appreciation of Fisherrow’s rich cultural heritage					
	Lead		Estimated Cost	Potential sources	Funding
Harbour – improved presence and information on ELC website or develop own website	ELC Countryside Leisure	Sport and	n/a	If new website, then QM Uni students may be able to assist with design and development	
Beach – inclusion on www.visiteastlothian.org and similar websites and publications	ELC Development	Economic	n/a	n/a	
4 new interpretation boards installed along the beach and Promenade area – project underway and should be installed in early 2017	FWG		Funding already allocated from Musselburgh Area Partnership	n/a	
Fisherrow Harbour to participate in local Doors Open Day – as per Dunbar Harbour	Local groups, new harbour group		£200 for banners – reusable	Musselburgh Partnership	Area
Encourage local businesses to participate on the John Muir Way website – Section 8 Prestonpans to Edinburgh - where to eat, what to do, where to stay	ELC Development	Economic	n/a	n/a	
Continue and develop an annual beach family fun day	FWG		£1,000	Musselburgh Partnership, possibly other sources and local sponsorship	Area
Objective 5: To secure community and economic benefits and improve long term sustainability, including through stimulating investment to attract more and a wider range of users					
	Lead		Estimated Cost	Potential	Funding

			sources
Adopt a more relaxed attitude to awarding licences and/or temporary planning permission for vendors who wish to locate at the waterfront.	ELC Estates and Planning	n/a	n/a
Undertake feasibility study for suggested boat house concept, including identifying users, costs, funding sources and financial viability. See Section 10.3	Eskmuthe Rowing Club and/or FWG	£5,000 - £10,000	Awards for All or Investing in Ideas
Establish whether the owners of the area next to Clarks fish shop (thought to be the garage) would be willing to make this area available for pop up shops, beach huts, etc.	ELC Estates	n/a	n/a
MEDIUM TERM PROJECTS			
Objective 1: To ensure the historic harbour is safe, fit for purpose, well maintained and well managed			
	Lead	Estimated Cost	Potential Funding sources
Instigate the Maintenance Plan – costs noted are based on comparator projects and are very broad estimates from Arch Henderson and will depend on what is implemented. Works may extend into the longer term depending on the scope of works and the availability of funding.	ELC and new harbour group	£100,000-£500,000 – in total over a period of years	Common Good Fund, HES, Viridor
Investigate and progress the installation of an electricity point on the East Pier and external water point at Harbour Office	ELC	£5,000	Common Good Fund
Objective 2: To increase use of the harbour and make it more accessible to a wider range of users			
	Lead	Estimated Cost	Potential Funding sources
Actively market the harbour to try to ensure it operates close to its theoretical capacity of around 60 – use press releases, FYCA, adverts in harbour notice board	New harbour group	n/a	n/a
Consider revising the Harbour Rules and By-laws as appropriate to make the harbour more accessible and welcoming for a range of users	New harbour group	n/a	n/a
Consider having a more relaxed regime for slips/launching	New harbour group	n/a	n/a
Develop a more inclusive approach to encourage users other than berth holders to use the harbour	New harbour group	n/a	n/a

Fund raising for dredging – depending on the outcome of the technical study if it proceeds	New group	harbour	n/a	n/a
Fund raising for pontoon development – depending on the outcome of the technical study if it proceeds	New group	harbour	n/a	n/a
Reinstate bench seating and have a rolling programme to replace and increase seating in the harbour – possibly through the commemorative bench scheme – costs will depend on the type of seating to be used	ELC		To be determined	Common Good Fund, Musselburgh Area Partnership, Commemorative Bench Scheme
Objective 3: To ensure the waterfront is attractive, accessible, well connected and provides a range facilities to service and attract residents and visitors				
	Lead		Estimated Cost	Potential Funding sources
After the parking survey, develop a master plan for the whole area – to include the best location for seating area, picnic tables, safe route linking beaches, winter boat storage, some kind of shelter, cycle racks, etc. See Section 10.3	ELC Countryside and Leisure	Sport and	£10,000 - £15,000	Musselburgh Area Partnership
Implement the master plan	ELC Countryside and Leisure	Sport and	£100,000 - £150,000	Musselburgh Area Partnership
Back Sands included in Scotland's Beach Award scheme	ELC Countryside		To be determined	To be determined
Back Sands secures a "sufficient" water quality designation	SEPA and others		To be determined	To be determined
Improve grading of the East beach to prevent water gathering next to East Pier	ELC Countryside and Leisure	Sport and	£20,000	Musselburgh Area Partnership
Designated dog toilet area at East beach, and more dog bins and advisory signage across the waterfront area	ELC Countryside and Leisure	Sport and	£3,000	Musselburgh Area Partnership
Develop a beach wheelchair project – each wheelchair costs up to £4,000 plus there is a need for secure accommodation, a hoist and local volunteers to get involved. See Section 10.3	FWG and/or other local groups including Beach Wheelchair Project		£10,000	Musselburgh Area Partnership, Common Good Fund, Awards for All, local sponsorship

Establish and encourage an In Bloom type of organisation to take an active role at the harbour and waterfront, providing and maintaining soft landscaping to make the area more attractive	ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure with local groups	£1,000 capital and £500 recurring revenue cost	Musselburgh Area Partnership
Provide increased/improved seating throughout the waterfront area in the same style – through a rolling replacement programme and partly through the Commemorative Bench Scheme – costs will depend on the type of bench to be used and include foundations and 15 years of maintenance	ELC Sport Countryside and Leisure	£1,000 - £1,500 for each bench plus £175 for maintenance	Most through the Commemorative Bench Scheme and remainder from Musselburgh Area Partnership
Objective 4: To improve the profile, awareness and marketing of the waterfront area and the harbour, including increasing awareness and appreciation of Fisherrow’s rich cultural heritage			
	Lead	Estimated Cost	Potential Funding sources
Ensure that up to date information and interpretation boards about the extended John Muir Way are provided at Fisherrow Waterfront	ELC and CSGN	£1,500	Musselburgh Area Partnership
Explore the potential for a local tourism group to help raise the profile of Musselburgh	ELC and local attractions and businesses	n/a	n/a
Develop a number of regular summer beach activities, aimed at local residents, with one larger family fun day event	FWG with ELC	£1,500	Musselburgh Area Partnership, possibly other sources and local sponsorship
Objective 5: To secure community and economic benefits and improve long term sustainability, including through stimulating investment to attract more and a wider range of users			
	Lead	Estimated Cost	Potential Funding sources
Fund raising for and delivery of the boat house project concept	Eskmuth Rowing Club and/or FWG	£100,000+	Viridor, Common Good Fund, Big Lottery
LONG TERM PROJECTS			
Objective 1: To ensure the historic harbour is safe, fit for purpose, well maintained and well managed			
No Projects			
Objective 2: To increase use of the harbour and make it more accessible to a wider range of users			

	Lead	Estimated Cost	Potential sources	Funding
Implementation of dredging - depending on the outcome of the technical study – costs are a broad estimate only and need much more detailed consideration. Marine licence and planning consent will be required	ELC and/or new harbour group	£80,000 - £100,000 plus £50,000 mobility costs Plus licencing and planning costs	Common Good Fund	
Installation of pontoons - depending on the outcome of the technical study. Planning and listed building consent will be required.	ELC and/or new harbour group	£770,000 Plus planning costs	Coastal Communities Fund and others possibly including Viridor	
Objective 3: To ensure the waterfront is attractive, accessible, well connected and provides a range facilities to service and attract residents and visitors				
	Lead	Estimated Cost	Potential sources	Funding
Back Sands secures a “good” water quality designation - this should be regarded as aspirational as it may prove challenging and costly	SEPA and others	To be determined	To be determined	
Projects to develop an off-road link from Fisherrow Waterfront to Portobello progressed – possibly through a staged process	To be determined	£250,000	To be determined	
Objective 4: To improve the profile, awareness and marketing of the waterfront area and the harbour, including increasing awareness and appreciation of Fisherrow’s rich cultural heritage				
	Lead	Estimated Cost	Potential sources	Funding
Musselburgh to have developed and be promoting a more cohesive tourism/visitor offer	ELC and local businesses	£10,000	Musselburgh Partnership and businesses	Area local
Continue to offer a number of regular summer beach activities, aimed at local residents	FWG with ELC	£1,500	Musselburgh Partnership, possibly other sources and sponsorship	Area local
Seek to develop the family fun day into an annual harbour festival or similar – aimed at local residents and visitors. Needs to have a USP –	New harbour group and FWG	£10,000	Musselburgh Partnership,	Area Awards for

possibly links to the arts, the heritage of Fisherrow, etc.			All, local sponsorship
Objective 5: To secure community and economic benefits and improve long term sustainability, including through stimulating investment to attract more and a wider range of users			
	Lead	Estimated Cost	Potential Funding sources
Seek to replicate North Berwick's beach hut project if a suitable area can be found and serviced	FWG	To be determined	To be determined

Fisherrow Harbour and Waterfront Action Plan – Estimated Costs	
Short Term Projects	£222,200 - £312,200
Medium Term Projects	£353,000 - £808,500
Long Term Projects	£1,171,500 - £1,191,500
Estimated Total Cost*	£1,746,700 - £2,321,200

*with many costs still to be determined