

Crosby Coastal Park Vision: A Joint Response by local community groups representing a significant number of people who live near the Coastal Park.¹

Foreword

This response to the consultation process has been compiled by community based groups and individuals who represent people who work in or live adjacent to Crosby Coastal Park. We share a very strong commitment to the area and a desire to ensure that any changes and developments both protect and enhance the incredible value of the Park. In presenting this response we reflect the tension inherent in this exercise— protection versus development. We represent local residents, many of whom are wary of change and development, and who see protection and preservation of the area as the priority. We also represent people in the area who want to encourage its regeneration through a significant promotion of the visitor economy.

By presenting this joint response we believe we have attempted to bridge the divide between protection and development. We believe the intrinsic value of the Park can be protected if the regeneration of the area is not imposed but managed appropriately with full community engagement and support. We support the right developments of the best quality in the most appropriate locations.

We have one key question about this process, what will happen to the Vision when, after consultation closes, it is revised and finally published? What is the status of the Vision and what difference will it make?

It is easier to be a critic than an artist.

It is easier to criticise the Vision than to create one. Nonetheless in our view the Vision is too vague and unambitious. In what follows we set out our joint response to its proposals and offer a supplementary Vision of our own.

Positive.

The Council have followed up the work they began with the Sefton Coast Plan and provided an opportunity for residents and visitors to discuss with them the future of Crosby Coastal Park until 2030. Through talking to representatives and officials we are persuaded that there is genuine idealism and goodwill behind the exercise. The proof will be revealed by the outcome.

Negative.

The document does not indicate what the boundaries of Crosby Coastal Park are, and some of us were surprised to read that Hightown beach is part of this Park. Shorn of its introductory passages, the essence of the Vision appears in the sections on the six Zones. There the proposals appear to us to be anodyne. It is difficult either to agree or disagree with 'better this' and 'enhanced that' without knowing what is involved. It took repeated visits to the Drop-In sessions and Guided Walks, and a well attended Open Meeting held by SRAG, to unpack what we were told may only possibly be implied by the wording. In some respects there is less to it than meets the eye, particularly as several of the same proposals recur, possibly in different guises, for each Zone. Worse, there are competing alternatives within the same Zone lying within the generalised wording.

¹ **Seafront Residents Action Group (representing 78 members) Friends of Waterloo Seafront Gardens (representing 70 members) the committee of Friends of Crosby Beach (representing 7 members) and two individuals who are members of Crosby and Waterloo Coastal Community Team**

Zone A (Hightown to north of Hall Road West).

This Zone is not near to residences except at its border with Hightown. We think the overriding aim for Zone A should be to avoid development. The green space of the Park here is nearly all registered land and it is divided between thirteen separate Titles. Nine are freehold and four are leasehold. We have not yet incurred the expense necessary for further research because the proposals for this Zone appear to be relatively uncontroversial.

Taking them in order:

'A defined and designated nature reserve...' We fully support this excellent proposal. We understand the Council have recently acquired ownership of the land comprised and many of the green protections are already in place.

'More robust sea defences...' These are necessary and timely. We fully support this initiative.

'On site interpretation to educate visitors and Park users about the cultural and natural heritage within the zone and encourage positive behaviours to conserve this heritage.'

It is not clear whether this would require a building or shelters or other permanent installations. If what is envisaged is attractive and explanatory signage perhaps in a hide or shelter this aim might be achieved without undue development. But we thought it would be preferable to open a Cafe/Visitor centre at the northern ends of Zones A or B, or near the southern end of Zone C, and/or in Zone D. A total of two Visitor Centres in the entire Park would probably suffice to cater for the demand for them.

We were therefore delighted to discover a development in Zone A that has come to fruition since the Vision was drafted. Volunteers in Hightown have taken the initiative to establish a Community Cafe in the former Scout/Young Persons/Rangers Building. The Council have granted them a lease at a peppercorn rent for five years. The Cafe is uniquely well placed next to the Coast Path near the entrance to the Park in this Zone. It opened three weeks ago. At present it offers wrapped food, drinks and much needed toilet facilities. The Cafe will prosper from word of mouth. SRAG advertised its existence in its October Newsletter. It deserves official signage and advertising. The entrance to the Coast Path has an attractive wooden sign, but it is easy to miss and needs refreshing to attract attention. In due course to emphasise the Cafe's existence the exterior of the building would benefit from the type of wooden cladding which weathers attractively in a seaside location, and its garden could be developed for outside accommodation in good weather.

We have also discovered an exciting opportunity for a Cafe/Visitors Centre at the Coastguard Station in Zone B. Please see our remarks below.

'Better links to public transport, cycling and walking networks and other green spaces'.

It is not clear what is currently deficient about these links in this Zone.

There is no obvious or desirable way to improve links to public transport, which are already good at each end of the Zone. Hightown Railway Station is a mere 2/10ths of a mile away from the northern entrance to the Park in this Zone and Hall Road Railway Station is only 3/10ths of a mile from the seawall at the south end of the Zone. Perhaps what is envisaged is a more frequent bus service to Hightown, which should be spelled out to avoid misunderstanding.

At the Drop-In sessions it was suggested consideration should be given to running a shuttle bus service from the railway stations to the respective ends of the zone.

There are already clear links to cycling and walking networks here because the Sefton Coast Path (likely soon to double as the England Coast Path) and the National Cycle Network run through the zone from south to north and vice versa. It would be unnecessary and undesirable to introduce any cycling and/or walking links east to west. If all that is meant is that the existing

links to these routes will be improved away from this zone, to the north of Zone A and to the south of Zone F, the proposal should be explained as such, or omitted.

Which are the other green spaces that should be connected up to Zone A? If they lie south or north of the existing link, well and good. Otherwise what is intended?

[Note: We understand that the northern boundary of Crosby Coastal Park and of this Zone is the estuary of the river Alt at Hightown, and not the top edge of the shaded area of the illustration provided for Zone A in the Vision.]

Zone B (Hall Road West to Burbo Bank Road).

This Zone abuts a residential area which is currently free from commercial development. We support only limited and appropriate development in Zone B. The Council own the freehold of the three registered Titles which comprise the open land of the Park here, but it is subject to restrictive covenants in favour of the Crosby Hall Estate, or any of their successors in title. The Secretary of State for the Environment owns the freehold of the Coastguard Station. SRAG have set out the requirements of these covenants elsewhere in their Paper on the Legal status of the Land.

Taking the proposals in order:

‘Enhanced visitor facilities such as toilets and cafe facilities, accessible to all’.

We contend that currently the visitor experience is poor. There are toilets and cafe facilities at present, but the six linked stand alone cubicles (one disabled) are something of an eyesore, partly because they stick up as a blot on the landscape. There is no cafe, simply concessions for two mobile catering vans. These are clearly better than no provision at all, but it would be easy to complement them and provide a better offer to visitors.



An apparently obvious and desirable improvement would be a low-lying permanent and accessible cafe building in which the public could sit and shelter, take refreshment, and use one of several toilets, which should include disabled facilities. It would enable the public to enjoy the view in all weathers and could cater for anyone not travelling by car. Were it to be coupled with, or double as, a visitor centre it could offer interpretation of the natural environment at this point between the nature reserve to the north and this northern end of *‘Another Place’*. But it would be an enticement to greater footfall, because at present the majority of visitors arrive by car, not by train, on foot or by cycling.

The cafe should be sited to take advantage of the vista which includes the Iron Men, the passing ships of varied types and the distant coast and mountains of North Wales. It could be near to the renewed seawall, although it must be remembered that at this point on the Sefton coast the sea will continue on occasion to overtop even the new wall. Although there appears to be space for such a cafe/centre beyond the current site used for the RNLI cubicle, that would probably be too close to the seawall. But there is land to the north of the perimeter of the Coastguard Station which might be suitable, subject to the covenants and Sefton’s planning policy on Nature.

However, the ideal location would be in the Coastguard Station itself due to its location and the fact that it would require little or no new building, particularly at its south facade where the ground floor windows already offer a view which takes in the marine vista. As it happens our enquiries have established that the Marine and Coastguard Agency are currently advertising to let their offices at this Coastguard Rescue Station in Crosby, on the south facing ground floor and on the mezzanine floor above. The offer comprises a total of 312 square metres. We have urgently communicated with their Estates Section, the Council and local entrepreneurs to advise them of this opportunity which should not in our view be missed.

The educational opportunities of the Visitor Centre could include the coastal environment, the local flora and fauna, the shipping, the Artwork, the role of the Agency and the RNLI, and so forth. It could also offer relevant merchandise.

[Caution: we have now received details from the Land Registry of the restrictive covenants that apply to the relevant Title for the Coastguard Station and part of the covenants would need to be addressed by the Council and the Marine Agency if this building were to be developed as we suggest. Restrictive covenants similar to others in the vicinity were imposed by the Crosby Hall Estate when the land was conveyed to Crosby Council in 1948, but by a deed in 1981 it appears that these covenants were expressed to be released. Shortly afterwards however the land was conveyed by Sefton MBC to the Secretary of State, subject to fresh covenants imposed by Sefton which principally require the relevant land to be used only for a Maritime Rescue Sub-Centre by HM Coastguard and *for no other purpose*. There are also requirements of Sefton's Planning Policy on the natural environment to be considered as the Coastguard Station is listed as a Local Wildlife Site. Please see the section below on the Influence of Planning Law.]

The principal attraction here used to be quiet enjoyment of the exposed seascape and the light of the spectacular sunsets. There is not much of historical or cultural interest nearby, in contrast to Zones D to F, although there is increasingly some interesting modern domestic architecture and the Iron men. There is scope to explain the Artwork, the view of North Wales, the natural riches of the Reserve, and of the dune system beyond the Park. This visitor centre could focus on nature and the Artwork. A second Centre at, say, Crosby Leisure Centre, or the Crosby Lakeside Adventure Centre, or near the Radar Tower, could focus on nature and also act as a guide to the historic built environment nearby in those zones.

'Public open space and outdoor events space.'

There is already an abundance of grassed public open space here, but no specific space for outdoor events. At the SRAG Open Meeting it became apparent that this aspect of the Vision is inchoate. The suggestion to establish an outdoor events space gives no indication of its size or layout, or the nature or frequency of the proposed events. None was given at the meeting. There was strong hostility to the concept of any permanent events space here.

'Better links to public transport, cycling and walking networks, including well designed signage and information provision.'

Our remarks for Zone A apply equally here at the northern end of Zone B. There seems no need to focus on bringing further public transport to the Coastal Park in the remainder of this Zone, which essentially has a fully residential border. But well designed signage would be beneficial.

'Enhanced car parking and cycle storage'.

This vague statement means different things to different people. A Councillor was certain that there was no such proposal in the Vision, but it is specified as above for this Zone and for Zone C. A lot turns on what is meant by 'enhanced'. One version at the Drop-Ins meant extending the car park southwards and by implication increasing its capacity. Another was similar, but narrowing it to one line of parked cars without increasing capacity, thereby doubling it in length. Doing so would impinge on the covenanted land as noted elsewhere, but it could enhance the environment by hiding it from sight lines west from Burbo Bank Road North.

Cycle storage probably requires some form of framework or shelter, but we accept it need not be inimical to the landscape and agree it would be a desirable new facility. A shelter can be made more attractive by keeping it low rise in a dipped base, growing vegetation up the structure, and by providing a green or living roof. One supplier advertises sea-hardened sedum living roofs. But this is a particularly exposed and often windy environment and may prove unsuitable. A grass roof or even solar panels might be a viable alternative.

‘Better on site interpretation’.

We agree. It could be through a visitor centre as suggested above, or at least by attractive well protected signage.

‘A new sea wall to protect properties from coastal erosion.’

Excellent. Consultants have been appointed and we believe that preparatory work is advancing as consultants were appointed some time ago and we assume they are already engaged in preparatory designs.

We are aware of numerous examples of complete makeovers of sea fronts when sea defences have had to be renewed. Imaginative art work and furniture can make an enormous difference and the contouring of promenades makes for a more pleasing experience for visitors. We are disappointed that our requests for community engagement even at this early stage have not been taken up.

Opposite: New promenade at Cleveleys.



‘Safe and fully accessible viewing points to see Antony Gormley’s ‘Another Place’ and complementary artwork on the new sea wall’.

These are desirable proposals. We were told that the new seawall is constrained by the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) designation for the beach so that it will probably have to follow the line of the existing wall. These viewing points will be bays that do not impinge on the beach, whilst the multi-use path will curve inland to pass by them. The artwork in other coastal locations outside Sefton shows what imagination can achieve. In Sefton it could feature sea birds, Natterjack toads, sand lizards and some of the rare species of plant that are hiding in plain sight in the Park.

Zone C (Burbo Bank Road to Crosby Baths).

This Zone is next to a residential area which is also free from commercial development, which begins at its southern border. In this Zone some of the land of the Park is unregistered and the remainder is split between five registered Titles for which we have yet to receive details. We are pursuing enquiries with the Land Registry.

‘Better links to public transport, cycling and walking networks, including well designed signage and information provision’.

Our remarks above apply equally for this Zone, though we should highlight ‘information provision’ which may mean signage, but could imply the possibility of an information centre in Zone C.

The seafront is within about 3/10s of a mile from the bus stop for the No. 53 bus, although it is about 4/10s of a mile from Blundellsands and Crosby Station. It is only 3/10s of a mile down Blundellsands Road West from the Station to the scrub grassed area in front of the sea wall, but the shore is hidden below the horizon. There is no follow-up signage here to direct people to ‘Another Place’, or the Leisure Centre, or to toilets. A robust wooden sign post is urgently required, whatever integrated signage may be planned for the Coastal park by 2030.

‘Enhanced car parking and cycle storage’.

There is already car parking here and uniquely now for Sefton’s seafront it remains free of charge. Our previous remarks equally apply again. What precisely is contemplated? Could the existing car park to the north of the Centre be extended east and north without infringing any restrictive covenants, or affecting the amenity of Burbo Mansions and Weston Court?

One aspect that emerged at the Open Meeting was the traffic congestion and consequent pollution experienced round the Leisure Centre and on Mariners Road, of particular concern as the area is often frequented by children. It even appears that Sefton waste lorries park in front of the swimming baths with their diesel engines running for extended periods. This practice ought to stop.

‘On site interpretation to educate visitors and park users about the cultural and natural heritage and encourage positive behaviours to conserve this heritage’.

This proposal again appears to envisage a visitor centre, but it is unclear where it would be sited in Zone C.

‘Safe viewing points to see Antony Gormley’s ‘Another Place’, accessible where possible’.

This proposal is like the similar one above for Zone B and so we assume the viewing points would not impinge on the beach and as such are welcome.

‘Improved visitor facilities which are accessible to all’.

Detail ought to be provided because we are not aware that anything has been said by way of further explanation. There is clearly scope for an improved cafe. The cafe in the Leisure Centre provides basic food and drink, which is probably all that the general public require. But the cafe accommodation is cramped and split into two small sections. An accessible extension better protected from the swimming pool atmosphere, as in Formby Baths, would be a desirable enhanced facility.

The existing toilet facilities which are free for the public to use are appreciated by visitors, but they are not adequately sign posted and they are not available when the baths are closed. A suite of stand alone public toilets near to the promenade and tailored to the marine environment would be a valuable further provision. Danfo provide the existing cubicles for Sefton and have developed a variety of attractive designs of this type to blend into differing environments, some featuring living roofs, aesthetically finished, or looking like garden sheds.

We are concerned about the run off of effluent and the detritus deposited on the beach when the sewage system periodically becomes overloaded. It is not clear whether the Council formally communicates with United Utilities about it. We would have expected United Utilities to issue warnings each time they have to discharge raw sewage onto the beach. United Utilities are a major stakeholder in the Coastal Park, and indeed the whole of Sefton’s coastline.

Zone D (South of Crosby Baths to north of Marine Lake/South Road).

This Zone is next to a residential area with pockets of commercial development, which begin with what has developed into a predominantly food and drink offer at its southern border. It is fronted by the heritage assets of Waterloo Conservation Area. It includes much of the Marine Park created by the 'seaside improvements' between 1969 and 1973, the remainder comprising Zone E.

'Better links to public transport, cycling and walking networks, including well designed signage and information provision'.

Again it is difficult to see a need for better links to public transport. It is only 2/10s of a mile down South Road from Waterloo Railway Station to the entrance to the Park. It is an even shorter distance to the Park from the several bus stops down Mount Pleasant and Oxford Road, and only slightly longer from Mersey View and Bridge Road. What more is needed?

Better links to cycling and walking networks are unnecessary here. Cycling and walking access is easily gained at the ends of Great Georges Road, South Road, Blucher Street, Harbord Road and the roads to its north. Currently quite a lot of cyclists ride along Marine Crescent, Adelaide Terrace and Beach Lawn, and enter the Park at Harbord Road. The only necessary improvement is to enforce the 20mph speed limit which applies to these roads.

'Better on site interpretation'.

There is a clear potential role for the CLAC to provide a Visitor Centre with on site interpretation and sales of suitable merchandise. The environmental riches of the Sefton Coast and the history of the heritage assets of the built environment can be explained. The Waterloo Heritage Trail, prepared by FoWSG and Sefton in conjunction with English Heritage, can be promoted. There is scope to add to existing publications, most of which are of interest to visitors and residents. Waterloo's historic links not only with the owner of the White Star Line but also with the Titanic's gallant captain and crew deserve to be publicised. SRAG have published a leaflet.

'Safe viewing points to see 'Another Place' and alternative access to the beach'.

Our previous comments apply to 'safe viewing points'.

We are not aware of what is involved in 'alternative access to the beach', except perhaps for *restrictions* to current east/west pathways. We know that the various east/west paths have numbers to identify them, but the numbers were somewhat uncertain at the Drop-ins. This proposal needs to be spelled out. We are concerned to protect and preserve existing pathways and openings to the beach.

The main second southern route through the Park to the beach (Path 2?) runs from the South Road entrance to the Park round the edge of the large saltwater lake and then between it and the smaller fresh water lake and upwards through the dunes. This route is relatively direct and popular, and should be preserved and kept clear. When the Three Queens or the Tall Ships visited, thousands of visitors used it. In good weather at weekends it is the principal route. We may have misunderstood at one of the Drop-In sessions where it seemed to be suggested that this path could be abandoned. We trust not, because if so it would be highly detrimental to amenity.

The offshoot path from Path 2 round the western edge of the large lake was expensive to install, has been covered in sand and abandoned. The similar one round the western edge of the small lake should be cleared of sand and kept clear to join the green path at its northern end.

Too much of the Vision is predicated on lack of resources to fulfil desirable maintenance that used to be undertaken as a matter of course. The necessary resources ought to be found if the Council and other regional bodies intend to continue to promote the Coastal Park as a place of resort.

The clearing of other more northerly paths has already been abandoned. We were advised that the path to the north of the Marine Park between Westward View and the promenade was no longer cleared following agreement with Councillors for Blundellsands Ward.

At the Drop-Ins we learned that Green Sefton use a small 'Bobcat' to clear the east/west paths because they are too narrow for the one remaining tractor used on the promenade. Unfortunately we have since heard that the driver employed and trained to drive the Bobcat has been made redundant. We suggest that this is a very short-sighted economy.

'A new multi-use path that provides a fully accessible alternative to using the current promenade.'

This is a controversial proposal which has not to our knowledge been adequately consulted upon, if at all, but for which European funding is said to have already been secured. The meaning of 'multi-use' was explained to be for use by pedestrians, cycles, mobility scooters and so forth, but not by vehicles.

This path was promoted at the Drop-ins as an alternative to the route along the promenade and not as a replacement for it or any part of it, but we were candidly informed that Green Sefton now think they lack the resources to continue clearing sand effectively from the part of the promenade which stretches between the path from Blucher Street car park and the Baths, which they would prefer to leave to Nature to form into a sand dune.



We must emphasise that we strongly object to any idea that part of the promenade should be abandoned to Nature. At SRAG's Open Meeting (which was for anyone with an interest in the Park) on a show of hands this idea was almost totally rejected. Residents and visitors to the area want the promenade to be kept open, free from sand, and accessible to a diverse range of users.

[See footnote (2) below.]

No-one knows or is prepared to say precisely where the new path is to be sited. At the Drop-Ins it was assumed that it would probably run just to the west of the western walls of the Seafront Gardens, then on to cross the existing path which runs from Blucher Street car park to the promenade, rounding the compound opposite Beach Lawn Garden, and continuing in front of Harbord Terrace following the line of the existing path to the end of Westward View. Nothing was suggested for its short route from there to the Leisure Centre, whether using Endsleigh Road which is always full of parked cars, or by-passing Endsleigh with a new path, subject to sand blow, to its west.

If the assumption is correct there would be danger to the public who would be at some peril from cycles potentially moving swiftly across in front of them or towards them just after they negotiate the several entrances to the Marine Park. Wherever it were to be sited, at the speeds often achieved by cyclists with a clear run, it would be essential to post warning signs and to demarcate the separate halves of the path to protect cyclists and pedestrians from each other.

If on the other hand the path is to bisect the existing areas of grass between, say, South Road and the end of Harbord Road, it would detract from the sweeping area of green space which has always been one of the assets of the Marine Park. More importantly, it would infringe the conditions under which the land is held in trust for the public by the Council under the Open

[Footnote (2): The Friends of Crosby Beach do not share this aspiration.]

Spaces Act 1906, which prohibits building on more than five per cent of the open space of the land. (See our section on the legal status of the land of Crosby Coastal Park.)

This proposal bears the hallmarks of the previous process of Council imposed policy initiatives, which the proposed Masterplan and Supplementary Planning Document, and now the Vision, were each meant to replace with consultation to take advantage of local knowledge and to generate local support. It cannot be achieved without a planning application and would be likely to be opposed by SRAG.

‘Areas managed for nature conservation including a natural dune frontage’.

A world of different interpretations might exist for this proposal.

On one of the Guided Walks we learned that Green Sefton consider the Marine Park part of the Coastal Park to be a hybrid of Amenity Park and Nature Reserve. This was news to us, though not necessarily bad news, depending on how the nomenclature is interpreted.

The Marine Park was intended to be an Amenity Park. It was funded at great expense out of the general rates paid by the residents of Crosby. It cost £1 million when built, which is approximately the equivalent of £12 to £13 million now. It is the first genuine gateway to the coast north of Liverpool. It is a splendid community asset and should be well maintained and prioritised against decline. All it lacks are sufficient well positioned public toilets and a Visitor Centre.

The original ideas for tennis courts and bowling greens overlooked the relative rigours of the terrain, and the nine hole pitch and putt course which was established proved unviable over time. The westerly fringe of sand dunes has become established. What has eventuated is an oasis for quiet green recreation, much appreciated locally and by regular visitors from far and wide, many accompanied by their dogs. In the Marine Park very happy dogs regularly stretch their legs, often with all four paws in the air as in children’s drawings. Their owners share in the benefits of regular exercise.

The enclave north of the water treatment building was fenced off by United Utilities when the building was constructed. It has developed as a nature enclave for exceptionally rare flora and a preferred breeding space for skylarks. This year it was actively managed for conservation by the Lancashire Wildlife Trust. They removed *Rosa rugosa* and sea buckthorn in order to protect the native species of flora, insects and birds and posted explanatory signs.

Although we should not wish to see further restrictions on the public’s ability to roam at will through the Park, we suggest that the fences here should be restored to good repair and the sand that has been piled up on the path to the north of the water treatment building should be removed. It entices people and dogs into the enclave. This land will still remain within the definition of open space within the requirements of the Open Spaces Act 1906.

On the other hand, one prospect not mentioned by the Vision is the potential loss to walkers of a large part of the open space land of the Park to be fenced off for use as compensatory land and water habitat for birds if the Port were to be allowed to expand operations over the land of Seaforth Nature Reserve. We oppose any such loss to the public.

Until two years ago much of the grass in this Zone was cut regularly about six times a year, until the schedule reduced the mowing to twice a year. The idea was to reduce costs and emissions and provide ecological benefits. Mowing selectively can form barriers and direct people without their realising. If timed appropriately the orchids by the path near the lake can briefly flourish; but so too can dandelions throughout much of the Park, which has taken on an air of neglect.

Zone E (South Road to Cambridge Road).

This Zone comprises the remainder of the Marine Park.

‘Areas managed for nature conservation including a natural dune frontage’.

The small Nature Reserve with boardwalks in front of the Marine Lake was an imaginative and attractive use of the wet area there and is a quiet haven appreciated by those who visit it. The illustrative plaques have all been removed and the enclave would benefit from their renewal.

The dune frontage in this Zone has grown up since the creation of the Marine Park. Old photographs show there were only tiny sandhills near the Esplanade prior to the building of the seawall. But whether the dune frontage is natural is irrelevant since it has become established. It makes a pleasant backdrop to the western edge of the lake.

However, nothing has been explained about what is implied by ‘nature conservation’ of the dune frontage. If it means no more than allowing for natural dune dynamic activity with the dunes being left open to walkers, and grass continuing to anchor the sand, it is a welcome continuation of previous policy. If it requires any fencing off to protect plants or wildlife it impinges on the public’s current enjoyment of the open space land here which is held in trust for them by the Council.

The land immediately in front of the Esplanade has been left for long grass to grow. In front of that the Council purported to turn the grass into an overflow car park without seeking planning permission on the doubtful grounds that it had been used as such for a period in excess of 10 years. The wooden bollards are an attractive low level feature. The entrance signs to the overflow car park are not attractive, and the unenforceable signage purporting to require compliance with marked parking spaces which do not exist ought in our view to be removed.

‘A new multi-use path that provides a fully accessible alternative to using the current promenade’.

The generality of our remarks on this proposal for Zone D also apply again to it in Zone E. Where in Zone E is this alternative path to be situated? Why is it even necessary given that a scenic and interesting route already exists from Cambridge Road around the south of the lake past the Port and Nature Reserve and along the promenade next to the beach and ‘Another Place’? There is sand blow to the southern part of the promenade but much less severe than that beyond the path from Blucher Street car park.

Better links to public transport, cycling and walking networks, including well designed signage and information provision’.

The National Cycle Network should come down Cambridge Road and link with the Coastal Park. The promised new right of way for pedestrians will link the Coastal Park with Rimrose Valley Park.

‘Better on site interpretation’.

There is already an example of a self-effacing interpretative sign lost amongst vegetation and giving interesting historical detail. We support the development of a Visitor Centre in the CLAC.

‘Safe viewing points to see Antony Gormley’s ‘Another Place’ and alternative access to the beach’.

As previously for ‘safe viewing points’.

For Zone E ‘alternative access to the beach’ has not been explained and so we cannot comment.

The path that runs in front of the western edge of the larger lake, was built at considerable expense, but has been effaced by Nature. At a Drop-In, Path 2 was suggested to be ripe for

similar treatment. As stated above, it should be kept open, unless the water bodies were to be reconfigured to allow for Olympic training on the large lake, in which case it might be moved further north.

'Better lighting appropriate to the area'

We strongly support this proposal.' Appropriate to the area' necessitates lamps in keeping with the historic seafront location, with pools of light and not, for instance, any form of high intensity security lighting. Modest pools of light from globe lights could enhance the ambience of the interface between the CLAC and the Marine Lake. Low level lighting from the South Road entrance to the Park along the foot path to the car park and on to the CLAC is planned and would be a welcome improvement in the near future. The lamp posts ought to conform to the traditional style of lamp installed in Waterloo Conservation Area and (on a smaller scale) as recently installed at the entrance to the Park at the bottom of South Road; or to any other style appropriate to the Marine Park environment.

'Improved visitor and leisure facilities, accessible to all'.

This vague statement may include the suite of 3 new stand alone public toilets to be sited near the western wall of Marine Garden. This extra facility has been discussed for over three years and will be welcome as soon as possible. Having settled on a location, the Council have changed it at the eleventh hour. There is now concern from Waterloo Place Cafe, who observe the location throughout the year, that people queuing for the lavatories may lead to congestion at busy times with queues for the ice cream kiosk.

The Crosby Lakeside Adventure Centre is imminently to be reconfigured internally to improve the flexible use of its facilities. The improvements are expected to include relocating the kitchen to enable private functions to take place whilst enabling simultaneous public use of the bistro. The improvements ought also to ensure that the lavatory provision intended for the general public is available at all opening times.

It is frustrating that there has not been any community engagement in the proposed redevelopment, although we have been offered the eventual prospect of consultation subject to the preservation of confidentiality relating to commercial sensitivity. A visionary approach to attracting the public to use the CLAC will be missed if no Visitor Centre is to be established relating to the wider attractions of the natural and built environment of the Park and 'Another Place'.

An idea for 'Glamping' units near the lake was floated in 2017. SRAG asked what was involved and was informed that the proposal had to receive further feasibility study and consideration before any consultation would take place. SRAG earnestly hope and believe that such ideas have been abandoned as incompatible with a proper understanding of the planning law relating to the setting of the listed buildings. For the avoidance of doubt they emphasise that properly construed on visual, historical and other relevant criteria the setting extends beyond the western walls of the Seafront Gardens to the beach.

There is enough land between the southern edge of the Marine Lake and the perimeter of the Port to allow for the path to be widened to become a two lane carriageway with a cycle lane to run between the lake and the Nature Reserve and to open out into a car park near the Radar Tower. The Tower could be demolished or adapted to provide a cafe with a superb vantage point for observing the marine vista, the wild birds, 'Another Place' and the ships that pass close by.

Zone F (The Waterloo Seafront Gardens including Potters Barn Park).

'Formal Gardens suited to the changing climate and needs of visitors'.

Volunteer groups are a useful addition to work in the gardens but they can never replace basic maintenance which is needed to make sure the structure and plan of the gardens remains in keeping with its original plan.

The Coastal Community Team suggest that the Royal Horticultural Society and the local Universities might be asked to offer advice on suitable flora for the seaside environment in a changing climate and to form a partnership with the Friends. The plants and bushes that have survived down the years have formed an experimental basis establishing the horticultural possibilities.

‘Enhanced conservation value supporting the historic built environment’.

We wholeheartedly agree with this proposal.

We think that another attempt should be made by all interested groups and individuals, including the Council, in a joint application to ensure that the Waterloo Seafront Gardens are registered with Historic England under the National Heritage Act 1983. Registration would add another material consideration in the planning process, requiring the Planning Authority to consider the impact of any proposed development on the landscapes’ special character. Registration is intended to celebrate designed landscapes of note and encourage appropriate protection.

The Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England lists gardens with an emphasis on designed landscapes, rather than on planting or botanical importance. The Waterloo Seafront Gardens in front of the terraces were created partly to provide work for local people during the depression in the 1930s. They are a paradigm of 1930s garden design. Marine Garden contains a large rockery made from limestone. Moreover, although Beach Lawn Garden was doubled in size in the late 1930s, it had originally been created earlier by the owner of the White Star Line.

The Council have gradually replaced but not painted the railings in Marine, Crescent and Adelaide Gardens. Those in Beach Lawn Garden are sadly neglected. This year they were supported by angled metal props installed by a contractor, but these railings too need to be replaced to the original design.

Potters Barn Park is of special historical significance to Waterloo, L22. In 1841 William Potter, a wealthy merchant from Everton, built a barn, coach house and stables intending later to build a house and estate, but his firm collapsed and he was unable to complete his scheme. The original red sandstone buildings remain as the entrance to the Park and are Grade II listed. The design for the entrance is said to be an exact copy of some of the famous farmhouse buildings of the Chateau of Hougoumont at Waterloo in Belgium. The Duke of Wellington said the success of the battle of Waterloo turned upon the closing of the gates at Hougoumont. Formerly used as a park keeper’s lodge and public toilets, now apparently closed. They deserve better.

The future of Potters Barn Park depends on agreement between the Council and the Peel Ports Group who own and lease the land to the Council. An exciting prospect would be if the land were to be leased again for a significant term of years and if a further strip of land could be acquired as a matter of community goodwill from PPG to provide a direct link down to the current entrance to the Marine Park near the end of Cambridge Road.

Historic England gives grants to national and local organisations for the conservation of historic buildings, monuments and landscapes.

All graffiti should meet with a policy of zero tolerance.

‘Better links to public transport, cycling and walking networks, including well designed signage and information provision’.

The four Seafront Gardens in front of the historic terraces do not need better links to public transport or cycling or walking networks. Our previous remarks for the same proposal for Zone D apply equally here.

However we agree it would be beneficial to improve the links to the England Coast Path as it develops and approaches from Liverpool into Potters Barn, but we think the National Cycle Network should bypass Potters Barn and approach the Coastal Park down Cambridge Road.

‘Better on site interpretation’.

We think the interpretation would be best provided in a Visitor Centre in Zone E, complemented by notice boards within the sites of the Gardens.

‘Better lighting appropriate to the area’.

There is no lighting in the Seafront Gardens. Under the Council’s Byelaws 3 and 4 they are required to be closed one hour after sunset all year round, with people being prohibited from staying later than those times.

This seems to be a mistaken repetition of the proposal for Zone E. If not, what is intended?

‘Better links to the rest of the Park and other green space in the area’.

The Seafront Gardens are each self contained within their boundary walls. This is an historic feature of their design and its integrity should be preserved. The idea that they are inadequately linked to each other or to the rest of the Coastal Park is misconceived. To get from one to another or to the Coastal Park from any of the Gardens merely requires exiting from any of the gates in their eastern boundaries and walking down a path or continuation of Great Georges Road, South Road, Wellington Street, Blucher Street or Harbord Road. Why do we need more access points than these existing five? There is no need to fear that people who are being encouraged to take exercise in the open air are nonetheless too lazy to walk the small extra distances required.

The western boundary walls of the Gardens are an attractive feature of the Gardens in their own right, whether looking towards them from the east or the west. Their 1930s design, small bricks, and visual sweep complement the Conservation Area of which they are a part. They were intended to act as a bulwark against wind and blown sand and have done so successfully. If they were breached, wind would be funnelled through the gaps created, even if they were to be gated with solid gates closed at night. The walls make the Gardens a valuable resource in the early part of the day as shelter for migrating birds and for insects and other wildlife.

‘Other green space in the area’ appears otiose, but we assume that what is envisaged is a foot path link from Potters Barn Park to Rimrose Valley Park.

The influence of Planning Law.

The provisions of the Sefton Local Plan on conservation of heritage and on green space are well drafted. They provide strong and effective protections, not only for the built environment which lies next to Crosby Coastal Park, but also for the natural environment which it contains. However, as the law permits the local planning authority to derogate from its own plan if persuaded that it is in the public interest to do so, protecting these environments requires vigilance by the public and reliance on the good judgement of the Planning Committee of elected representatives.

In this context we should record that in our view current planning law clearly establishes, on both visual and other prescribed criteria, that the setting of the listed buildings and other heritage assets in Waterloo Conservation Area extends across the Marine Park to the sea. The setting is not merely restricted to the Seafront Gardens.

For the natural environment, Policy NH 2 ‘Nature’ is applied by the Local Plan Policy Map to all the land in Crosby Coastal Park, except for the Seafront Gardens, and out on to the beach up to mean low water. This derives from reading the key to the Map, and the map itself, which shows small green squares up to the westerly walls of the Seafront Gardens and up to the houses on

the Esplanade. All the land is therefore apparently, (but perhaps just potentially) a 'Nature Site of Local, National and International importance'.

However, reading this with Figure 11.1, which shows 'Nature Conservation Sites in Sefton', may qualify what the key implies so that it signifies that what is indicated is merely potentially being one or more of these sites. The reason is that para 11.28 of the Local Plan states that the Designated Sites are shown on the Policies Map and the full list of Sefton's Designated Sites is set out in Appendix 2 of the Local Plan, which is headed 'Nature Conservation and Enhancement—Supporting Information'.

Appendix 2 lists the following as Local Wildlife Sites within the Coastal Park: Hightown Dunes, Meadow and Saltmarsh; West Lancashire Golf Club; the Coastguard Station, Hall Road; and Crosby Marine Lake, which seems to be the Lake in its entirety and not just the small northerly fresh water lake that has been colonised by birds.

The key to Fig 11.1 also appears to show, although this plan is indistinct as to boundaries of land and seashore, that the Coast Park, except for the Seafront Gardens, is all a 'Site of Local Nature Conservation Importance'; whilst the beach, and Seaforth Nature Reserve (which is outside the Park in the Port Estate) are of all three levels of importance, viz. Local, National, and International.

Under para 11.23 of the Local plan any applicant for a planning application which affects a site of nature importance, and/or Priority Habitats and Species, is required to submit an ecological appraisal carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist. The details required are set out in the Nature Conservation Supplementary Planning Document.

Our Supplement to the Vision for 2030.

The Zoned approach is an intelligent method to deal with competing objectives whose priorities can vary from place to place. We have set out our views above for and against the proposals in the Vision and we have offered some complementary proposals of our own. We now expand on our Response above by stating the rest of our Vision for the Coastal Park as a whole. Essentially we want Sefton to look after the inheritance it has received from the past.

In the short term:

In the short term we urge the Council to obtain sufficient revenue funding and to identify sufficient resources of people and machinery to ensure that the Coast Park remains an attractive accessible green space and that the promenade is kept clear of sand and in good repair. We urge that barriers are either renewed or repaired and the 3 scruffy unsightly skips parked on the promenade are removed.



Unfortunately the Vision fails to acknowledge that the promenade was built to be the best viewing point for the entire stretch of coastline and beach running through the length of five of the six Zones of the Park, from the boundary with the Port near the Radar Tower to the Coastguard Station at Hall Road West. The promenade is a principal attractive feature of the Coastal Park providing an excellent hard cycle and walking path on level beachside terrain, next to the two mile extent of '*Another Place*'. The path it supports runs from boundary to boundary through all six Zones continuing on through open country to Hightown and beyond.

The plan for the Sefton section of the England Coast Path has already accepted the promenade as its route. It would be very embarrassing were walkers to find that they could not use the Path as it passed through Sefton, because it had been effaced or blocked by a sand dune. We realise the proposed alternative path, if built, could be used instead, but it would fail the essential requirement to pass as close as possible to the beach and as such is a poor second best option. We repeat the point made in relation to Zone D, that we strongly object to any idea that part of the promenade there should be abandoned to Nature. The promenade should be kept open, free from sand, and accessible to a diverse range of users.

There are places where the signage and demarcation between cycle and pedestrian sides of the pathway urgently needs to be renewed.

In the medium term:

In the medium term, central to our Vision is renewal of the sea defences and promenade in an attractive form all the way from the erosion to the perimeter with the Port of Liverpool. The current (2019) planned renewal of the sea defences is vital. It will protect the beach and 12,500 dwellings from the consequences of flooding but it will only run south from the erosion as far as the slipway or ramp opposite Admiral Quay apartments, opposite the point where Burbo Bank Road meets the Serpentine. South of that the Vision impliedly relies on the rising beach level and the accumulating dunes to protect the remainder of the residential areas until 2030. If these defences are to be future proofed against the risk of flooding, we suggest that account needs to be taken not only of the rising sea level but also of potential storm surges.

Even though the beach has a designation as a Site of Special Scientific Interest we feel it should be acceptable to move the seawall containing the Marine Park further west to be closer to the mean high tideline, which is known to have been receding out to sea since at least the mid 1840s. Moving it west would reduce the tendency to create new sand dunes.

The cost would be many millions of pounds. We appreciate the current difficulties with public infrastructure funding. We are aware that local authorities have lost on average over 50 per cent of their government funded spending power in real terms since 2010. And we are told that for sea defences central government requires a robust business case with a high benefit to cost ratio and that our Council can only realistically hope to obtain funding from them for work for which an engineering case can be made.

Nonetheless the Vision covers a decade into the future and the funding possibilities may change in ways that cannot be predicted now. Even with the present funding regime, seaside resorts around the country have revolutionised their seafronts in spectacular fashion. For instance recent visits to the Fylde coast, have shown us what can be achieved when several local authorities work in partnership with each other, the Environment Agency and United Utilities.

Cleveleys, and Lytham St Annes (including Fairhaven Park) have achieved splendid results that ought to be achievable over the next ten years here. Further along the estuary of the Mersey, Otterspool in Liverpool does not suffer the same ravages of nature, but it puts our tired promenade, parked skips, and broken railings to shame. And there are other fine examples further afield.

We know that the Liverpool City Region Combined Authority has resources of funding that could be accessed by Sefton. The Combined Authority, Merseytravel, and even Liverpool City Council market themselves with reference to the attractions of the Sefton Coast.

Other grants are available to the Coastal Community Team through the Coastal Communities Fund and from funds such as the Ørsted Community Fund (formerly DONG Energy).

Desirable small scale development:

Our other main suggestion is for some appropriate and desirable small scale development provided it respects the densely residential nature of the eastern border of much of the Coastal Park, that is the part in Waterloo, Brighton-le-Sands and Blundellsands.

The Vision proposes enhanced or improved visitor facilities accessible to all for Zones B, C, D and E. We have suggested that the Coastal Park could support two Cafe/Visitor Centres alternatively at or near the Coastguard Station, or at the southern end of the Coast Park at the CLAC, or later in time, at or near the Radar Tower. We have suggested widening the access road at the southern end of the Park next to the Marine Lake to link with a car park near the south west corner and within easy reach of the Radar Tower and the beach. We have welcomed the Community Cafe at the northern entrance to the Park at Hightown, and proposed an extension to the cafe at Crosby Leisure Centre. We look forward to being consulted about any proposals for reconfiguration of the CLAC.

Green Sefton could use the cafes or centres as starting points for the excellent guided walks they provide for parties for which a small charge per head is sometimes made.

The Coastguard Station and the Radar Tower development would offer sheltered beach-side accommodation where people could have a meal or a drink or just sit and enjoy an unrivalled view of the beach, the Iron Men, the distant coast of the Wirral and North Wales, the birds, the ships that pass, and sometimes in the early evening, the superb sunsets. We are not suggesting long opening hours or the sale of intoxicating liquor by retail. The cafe at Waterloo Place appears to have demonstrated a viable pattern for the Park.

We also support the provision of new toilets in the cafes and as stand alone units in Zones C and D.

Parking and visitor management:

SRAG conducted a parking survey in the summer of 2018 and as a result suggested that the seafront car parks should be free from charging again. The current policy prioritises the interests of visitors and Council revenue raising over the interests of local Sefton residents.

Understandably visitors prefer to park free of charge in nearby streets, causing inconvenience to locals. Wirral MBC accepted the force of the contrary argument from their residents and traders and decided not to implement seafront parking charges.

According to law the surplus revenue from Council car parking has to be ring-fenced in a parking account and defrayed only for traffic management purposes. The most recent figures obtained by SRAG under Freedom of Information rules showed a surplus from the Coastal Park car parks of about £160,000 which was put into Sefton's subvention to Merseytravel. This surplus is roughly equivalent to twice the estimated annual cost of clearing the sand from the promenade. If charging is to continue we suggest that the Council's Legal Services Team should consider whether the surplus could properly be defrayed for sand clearance, because cyclists and pedestrians each constitute 'traffic' to be managed.

The appearance of the car parks should be improved. There is an unsightly excess of 'Have you paid and displayed?' signs on raw metal poles. Crosby village car parks, for instance, manage with far fewer reminder signs. The status of Blucher Street car park has been left in limbo for many months, the pay machine having been vandalised and removed. The tall poles remain at its entrance without signage, the other signs remain.

The unsightly compound at the end of this car park next to Beach Lawn Garden lies behind a metal fence, with all the appearance of a derelict site. It still shelters assorted semi-industrial detritus and skips used for waste transference containing rubbish. There appears to be no record of planning permission for the compound and its use as a waste transference site. It is largely hidden from view from vantage points looking west, but it is a blot on the landscape looking east. One option would be to demolish it and extend the car park over the land it occupies. Another would be to restore it to grass.

If the applicable restrictive covenants were to be amended a unit of stand alone public toilets could be installed there, at or near the situation of the former lavatory. This would afford a much needed facility at this location for visitors accessing the Park, the beach and '*Another Place*'.

The current effect of the signage at the car park and of the compound is to detract from the setting of the listed buildings and the Conservation Area.

The Port of Liverpool:

The Port of Liverpool forms the southern boundary of Crosby Coastal Park, but Sefton Council's Vision for the Park is silent about the Port.

In 2011 a Draft Masterplan was published by Peel Ports Group as a twenty year strategy for growth. It is being refreshed but remains current. It signals their intention, if permitted, to extend their railway over the Seaforth Nature Reserve, notwithstanding its ecological designations, and to seek compensatory habitat for the wildlife elsewhere, possibly in the Coastal Park.

A year ago SRAG and FoWSG had separate meetings with the Development Director for the Peel Ports Group. At that time Peel saw the way forward as the consultation on Sefton's proposed SPD. Since then the Council have shelved the SPD pending resolution of "a number of strategic issues which might have significant implications for land use in the Park..." In the meantime the Council said they would still issue a Coastal Park Masterplan to facilitate a consultation and take account of wider views on the Coastal Park as a whole. That Masterplan appears to be the Vision. However the Vision says nothing about the aspirations of the Port and so it appears that the strategic issues remain unresolved.

SRAG have prepared a separate Paper on 'The Vision for Crosby Coastal Park and the Port of Liverpool', which they may submit as part of their individual Response.

The legal Status of the Land:

As another part of their individual Response to the Vision, SRAG have prepared a Paper on 'The Legal Status of the Land in Crosby Coastal Park', because the legal status of the land sets the parameters for the aspirations of any Vision for its future.

The legal provisions are sufficiently complicated and scattered over so many sources of information that in the past there has perhaps been difficulty in ascertaining the scope for permitted development. For future reference they have brought the rules together in what they hope is a readable and comprehensive statement.

That paper is nearly completed but given the time constraints of the consultation period, even though it has been extended, there are still areas of land for which the relevant information is missing or needs research. The Paper will be submitted and then updated as soon as is practicable.

In summary SRAG say there is a long and well established pattern of a series of Council promises restricting the lawful use of the land of the Marine Park, keeping it open and unbuilt upon, and protecting the views available from buildings along the seafront, made as a matter of public policy, firstly to obtain the lands, and secondly, once they were obtained, to balance and protect private interests with the public interest.

These promises are enshrined in the provisions of the Open Spaces Act 1906, the residual effect of the Crosby Corporation Act 1968, letters from the individual Councils as time passed, deeds under seal, restrictive covenants, and Undertakings lodged in Parliament; all cemented by past conduct by the Councils.

The Marine Park part of the Coastal Park (Zones D and E) is to be held and administered in trust for the enjoyment of the public as an open space, and for no other purpose, and maintained and kept in a good and decent state. The Greens, that is to say the Seafront Gardens and the accretions beyond them, were acquired under resolutions passed under the 1906 Act, subject to restrictive covenants. Although the Crosby Corporation Act 1968 was mostly repealed in 1980, the conditions under which the land of the Marine Park was created and acquired derived from the Act of 1968. Section 13(7) of that Act, which was inserted at the request of the seafront residents, provided that all the land forming part of the seaside improvements was to be held as and for the purpose of an open space under the Open Spaces Act 1906.

When account is taken of the Adventure Centre, the boat park, the roads and walkways, the five paved car parks, the buildings and compound against the wall of Beach Lawn Garden, and the water treatment works and its yard, they estimate that five per cent of the open space of the seaside improvements land has already been built upon, reaching the limit permitted under the Open Spaces Act 1906. (They have not included the small nature reserve or the children's play area because they are open enclosures, the former is a type of garden, and both are used for recreation.)

Therefore there is probably little or no scope for any further development in the Marine Park which impinges on the open space unless extra land is added.

As to the remainder of the land of the Coastal Park north of Crosby Leisure Centre, the relevant Zones here (B and C) are also next to a densely populated residential area, but unlike Waterloo and Brighton-le-Sands they are free from commercial development, which no doubt has added to their residential amenity. The parameters for development are constrained by the restrictive covenants revealed by SRAG's researches up to this time, which are continuing.

In the public domain as a matter of administrative law the owners of seafront properties and the wider public of Waterloo and Crosby can therefore invoke the law of legitimate expectation, a form of estoppel. They legitimately expect that the current Council will continue to honour the spirit and intention of the promises made to them by their predecessor Councils, as Sefton has done in the past.

Events in the Coastal Park

This is a controversial topic on which we have not yet tried to reach consensus. The only reference to it in the Vision appears in relation to an events space in Zone B, which as stated above met with a hostile reception at the Open Meeting.

Community engagement.

Wishing for the Vision will not make it happen. The Council needs community buy-in and for that it may need a Forum which includes local residents and Councillors, such as a Neighbourhood Forum under the Localism Act 2011. A Neighbourhood Forum would help to control and shape such development as is acceptable to Sefton residents. As no-one is actually resident in the Coastal Park the relevant constituency might be the voters in the particular Wards in Sefton which contain the Park.

A less formal arrangement would be to establish a specific 'Crosby Coastal Park Forum' drawn from volunteers, or elected, or both, made up of local residents, public and private sector representatives and community groups to meet at regular intervals to consider any proposed changes.

We estimate that there are approximately 450 seafront residences along the eastern boundary of the Park. SRAG has suggested that in future the terms of items (iii) and (iv) in the Undertaking given to buildings fronting the protected area of the Marine Park should be extended as a new undertaking to all the owners and occupiers of properties directly bordering the Park.

One aspect of plans for proposed development is that most of the people who make them are not resident in the area concerned and lack the intimate pride in and knowledge of place which is inherent in those who have chosen to make their homes there, some for generations. The residents are not merely protective of their own interests. They are well aware that they are privileged to live in a special place and that it is required that it be shared for the public good. They are a resource which should be trusted and their views tapped.

Conclusion.

By 2030:

1. The Park will have benefitted from substantial new capital investment from central government and levered in by local government through the Sefton Coast Landscape Partnership and the Coastal Community Team. The private sector will also have contributed.
2. Running from the boundary with the Port, to Hall Road West, the promenade will have been redesigned and renewed to become an extremely attractive public amenity, enhancing and protecting the environment for residents and visitors. It, and all paths leading to it, will be maintained as fully accessible at all times for multi-purpose use by pedestrians, cyclists, prams, wheelchairs, and other aids to mobility. It will continue to form a key attractive section of the England Coast Path, the Sefton Coast Path and the National and Sefton Cycle Networks.
3. The Seafront Gardens and Potters Barn Park will have received substantially increased investment, allowing their potential as envisaged by FoWSG and others to be fully realised.
4. A forum made up of all stakeholders with an interest in the Coastal Park will meet on a six monthly basis to consider any and every issue relating to the Coastal Park
5. There will be sufficient car parking to cope with the periodic peaks in visitors.
6. There will be sufficient easily accessible public toilets.

7. Two, or possibly three, Visitor Centres (depending on the level of demand to sustain them) will exist at appropriate junctures through the park.
8. Attractive beachside signage and information boards throughout the Coastal Park will have been installed in all appropriate locations.
9. The green space of the Park will continue to be fully protected by appropriate Nature designations in the Sefton Local Plan and any other Supplementary Plans, clearly distinguishing between public amenity spaces and areas of natural habitat. The land in the amenity spaces will be kept in a good and decent state and free from unsightly weeds.
10. Visitors to the beach will continue to be well protected by HM Coastguard and RNLI.
11. The beach will still be protected by appropriate Nature designation, well signposted with appropriate information and safety warnings, and be fresh, clean and exhilarating. It will be one of the most popular beaches to visit in the North West.
12. The beach will be clear of litter and detritus. New litter bins will be in place.
13. Sufficient revenue funding will be available each financial year to maintain these community assets to a high standard.
14. The Crosby Coastal Park will continue to be a major asset for quiet green recreation for the community of Sefton and its visitors. As such it will optimise its contribution to the amenities of one of the finest residential areas in the North West of England.

**The Seafront Residents' Action Group.
Friends of Waterloo Seafront Gardens.
Friends of Crosby Beach.
Representatives of Waterloo & Crosby Coastal Community Team.**

November 2019.