

Consultation Statement

Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans for Romford, Rainham, and Gidea Park Conservation Areas

August 2025

1. Consultation activities and details

The consultation on the draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans (CAAMPs) for Romford, Rainham, and Gidea Park ran for 6 weeks from 28th April - 9th June 2025. The purpose of the consultation was to gather feedback on the newly drafted CAAMPs; the updated draft appraisals, proposed boundary changes, and updated draft management plans.

A consultation page and questionnaire was hosted on Citizen Space. Responses were also gathered via in-person events and some consultees emailed responses directly to developmentplanning@haverling.gov.uk.

Three in-person events were held. One for each CAAMP:

- Rainham: 28th May, Rainham Hall, 2:30-4pm
- Romford: 29th May, Town Hall, 10-11:30am
- Gidea Park: 29th May, Town Hall, 1:30-3pm

The events were hosted by the Council's Development Planning Team with input from specialist heritage consultants at Purcell. At each the events, there was a presentation about the Conservation Area and the associated draft appraisal and management proposals. This was followed by an open question and answer session enabling attendees to question the council officers and heritage specialists. Physical copies of the documents were provided at each event, alongside large A3 print outs of key maps to help facilitate discussion.

The consultation and associated public events were advertised via social media, the 'Living in Havering' newsletter, and through a [press release](#).

Notification emails were sent out from the Council's development planning team to the planning policy consultation database at the start of the consultation (28th April 2025) and a reminder email was sent on the 30th May 2025. A notification email was also sent on 6th May 2025 to all Havering Councillors about the consultation.

The comments that were made over the consultation period, and how they have been incorporated into the final documents, are summarised in section 2 below.

2. Response to the consultation

The Council received 21 responses to the consultation. Plus, informal comments gathered at the events.

"All three draft appraisals are comprehensive, clear, and well researched, providing well presented guidance and justification for the proposed boundary changes and recommendations."

- Historic England

This included 4 statutory bodies:

- National Highways
- Environment Agency
- Historic England
- Natural England

All statutory bodies were supportive of the plan, or had no comment. No changes were requested by the statutory bodies, apart from adding a reference to a Historic England advice note 18, which was actioned and reflected in the final CAAMP.

2.1 Romford

Changes made to the Romford CAAMP include, but aren't limited to:

- Further wording added to the 'Special Interest' section (Section 2): "The arrival of the railway at the beginning of the Victorian period served as the stimulus for this growth and prosperity. The importance of the railway continued into the 20th century, especially the inter-war and post-war periods, which saw Romford increasingly becoming the social and commercial centre of the wider area."
- Added the railway station as an important view in map on page 28
- Added in railway arches in Section 4.7
- Additional Specific Recommendation added to section 6.8: 'Enhancement of the public realm is encouraged including appropriate surface treatments and with potential for integration with heritage interpretation.'

Many comments were made about the boundary changes proposed for Romford CA. Overall, responses were very positive about the expansion to the boundary proposed, with most comments suggesting further expansion of the boundary. Only one commenter suggested a reduced boundary.

The Council and our heritage experts (Purcell) considered these comments thoroughly. A carefully nuanced approach has been undertaken to propose changes to the boundary which balances the best practice approach of not just including facades in a conservation area boundary, whilst not including extensive areas of building which do not contribute to the Conservation Area. The boundary of a Conservation Area should not be used to protect any asset of heritage value but instead be focused on the special interest of a Conservation Area. It is not desirable to extend a conservation area boundary too far as this dilutes the special interest of the area protected. Historic England's response confirmed they are entirely supportive of the proposed boundary changes and consider that they align with their best practice guidance. Historic England had no comments to make on the proposed boundary.

Ultimately, the boundary remains unchanged from the proposed consultation boundary. The Council's response to specific suggestions to include or exclude in the Romford CA boundary are laid out below.

Comments suggesting further buildings/areas to be included in the boundary:

Include / Exclude	Building or Street	Council Response
Include	The Rogern Reede Almshouses	This building is modern and of no heritage interest.
Include	St. Edward the Confessor RC Church	The Church is statutorily listed Grade II and therefore has considerable projection in its own right. It is therefore not considered necessary or appropriate to extend the conservation area across the ring road to include.
Include	Kingston Road, Erroll Road and Gilbert Road	These roads are not near or adjacent to the CA and therefore do not add to the special interest of Romford.
Include	Como street	These roads are not near or adjacent to the CA and therefore do not add to the special interest of Romford.
Include	The Boundary should include both sides of South Street (including the Havanna Cinema)	Buildings on the west side of South Street are all post war and would dilute the designation if included. The cinema has been substantially altered through redevelopment and it is not considered appropriate to include. It was also recently removed from the local list for the same reason.
Include	Raphael Parks and Blacks Bridge	These are in the Gidea Park CA already.
Include	Junction of Victoria Road and South Street	The other buildings on this side of South Street are all post war and would dilute the designation if included. Also many are on the local heritage list, so already have protection.
Include	Old mill parade	There is insufficient justification to include this building / area in the conservation area boundary
Exclude	• South of Market Place between Nos. 30–96 • Entrance to the Liberty Shopping Centre on South Street • North of Market Place and High Street • Parts of the South Street extension	This commenter suggested that the CA boundary should be kept as it is, largely focusing on frontages rather than expanding the CA to include the whole buildings behind the frontages. Safeguarding only frontages of buildings is no longer a supported approach by Historic England. Guidance has changed since the Romford CA was designated, and previous reviews published. Historic England supports the proposed expansion of the Romford CA boundary to include whole buildings.

Other comments made were not relevant to the scope of the CAAMP, but have been noted by the Council:

- Many comments on suggested changes to the Market Place, including the financing behind the rejuvenation of the market, and the coordinated approach that will be needed between the Council, Romford BID, Local Businesses, and the Romford CAAMP (heritage aspect)
- Suggestion to introduce an Article 4 direction for Romford CA
- Comments about the maintenance of the Town centre (cleanliness, CCTV, antisocial behaviour)
- Suggestion of a Conservation Area advice service available to Town Centre property owners
- Suggestion for Romford CA to have an action plan with targets and funding attached

“Romford Civic Society is very supportive of the new Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan for Romford Conservation Area. We particularly welcome the proposed the expansion of the conservation area as per the 2008 recommendations, with a reasoned justification for what is proposed.”

- Romford Civic Society

2.2. Rainham

Very minor changes to the Rainham document took place, mainly updating the issues section. There were 5 responses in citizen space about the Rainham CAAMP, plus the comments considered at the in-person event.

Comments were generally supportive of the boundary proposed, and protection of the Rainham Conservation Area. There was one suggestion to extend the boundary further to include buildings such as Rainham village primary school, the Albion, old police station building, and the bridge on bridge road. After careful consideration with our consultants, it was decided to not extend the boundary further as the buildings suggested are far removed from the historic village core of Rainham. There is too much intervening suburban expansion to warrant extending the boundary and it was noted that these elements are unlikely to be of sufficient interest for inclusion due to their more recent date and lack of strong physical connection to the village core.

Other comments made were not relevant to the scope of the CAAMP, but have been noted by the Council, such as

- Maintenance issues: graffiti in the area, clock on the war memorial broken, planter maintenance, more bins needed
- Infrastructure needed to support new communities in the area

- Support for more greening
- Suggestions for buildings to be locally listed

There were also comments about topics such as buildings in the setting of the CA needing to be sympathetic, fittings reflecting the historic character of Rainham, need for sympathetic signage on retail units, etc. These are already covered in the Rainham CAAMP.

2.3 Gidea Park

There were 7 responses in citizen space about the Gidea Park CAAMP, plus the comments considered at the in-person event, and a formal response from the Gidea Park Civic Society.

Changes made to the Gidea Park CAAMP include, but aren't limited to:

- Clarified wording around EV charge points
- Updated wording on solar panels
- Recommendation 6 strengthened to include other greening and succession planting planning
- Changed the wording in section 6.2.3 to reflect that reinstatement of original windows is 'strongly encouraged'
- Added opposition to artificial grass in section 6.2.2
- Small grammatical / spelling edits
- Additions to the bibliography

Comments were very positive about the need to protect and conserve the historical area of Gidea Park. Comments were supportive of the boundary proposed; the Gidea Park Civic Society agreed with the proposed boundary. There were some suggestions for further expansion of the boundary but the Council is conscious to keep this boundary aligned with the original planned garden suburb and areas that have surviving model houses. This strictness of the boundary ensures the special character is kept and cannot be contested.

Other comments made were not relevant to the scope of the CAAMP, but have been noted by the Council, such as

- Suggestion to do a more general greening strategy
- Suggestion to re-visit/update the article 4 direction – some planning controls suggested sit outside the scope of a CAAMP
- Wanting to encourage more active travel in the area
- Comments on lack of funding affecting heritage, planning enforcement, etc.

“The opportunities for improvement are sound”

- Resident

“it is so important to preserve this area”

- Resident

“We fully support the positive approach adopted throughout this very comprehensive review and update”

- Gidea Park Civic Society

“I agree with need to protect and conserve this historical area of Gidea Park”

- Resident