Document Control Sheet

Project Name: Havering Retail & Commercial Leisure Needs Assessment
Project Ref: 30904
Report Title: Final Report
Date: April 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Adam Bunn</td>
<td>Principal Planner</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Francesca Rowson</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Jonathan Ngige</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by:</td>
<td>Peter Keenan</td>
<td>Senior Associate</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by:</td>
<td>Chris Quinsee</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For and on behalf of Peter Brett Associates LLP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prepared</th>
<th>Reviewed</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>JN</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>CQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>JN</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>CQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peter Brett Associates LLP disclaims any responsibility to the Client and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of this report. This report has been prepared with reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with the Client and generally in accordance with the appropriate RTPI, RICS or equivalent Agreement and taking account of the manpower, resources, investigations and testing devoted to it by agreement with the Client. This report is confidential to the Client and Peter Brett Associates LLP accepts no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report or any part thereof is made known. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

© Peter Brett Associates LLP 2014
# Contents

1 Introduction ................................................................................................................................. 1
  1.2 Terms of Reference ............................................................................................................... 1
  1.3 Structure of the Study .......................................................................................................... 1
  1.4 National Planning Policy .................................................................................................... 2
  1.5 Regional Planning Context ............................................................................................... 4
  1.6 Local Planning Context ..................................................................................................... 5
  1.7 Romford Area Action Plan ............................................................................................... 7

2 Context for Town Centres ........................................................................................................... 8
  2.1 Introduction ......................................................................................................................... 8
  2.2 Published Research ........................................................................................................... 8
  2.3 Market Context .................................................................................................................. 10
  2.4 Economic Context ............................................................................................................ 13
  2.5 Implications for LB Havering ........................................................................................... 15

3 Existing Performance of Network of Centres ......................................................................... 16
  3.1 Introduction ....................................................................................................................... 16
  3.2 Romford (Metropolitan Centre) ....................................................................................... 16
  3.3 Collier Row (District Centre) ............................................................................................ 20
  3.4 Elm Park (District Centre) ............................................................................................... 21
  3.5 Harold Hill (District Centre) ............................................................................................ 22
  3.6 Hornchurch (District Centre) ........................................................................................... 22
  3.7 Rainham (District Centre) ............................................................................................... 24
  3.8 Upminster (District Centre) ............................................................................................. 24
  3.9 Out-of-Centre Representation .......................................................................................... 25
  3.10 Surrounding Centres ..................................................................................................... 26

4 Existing Shopping Patterns ........................................................................................................ 29
  4.1 Introduction ....................................................................................................................... 29
  4.2 Definition of Study Area ................................................................................................... 29
  4.3 Current and Future Spending in the Study Area ............................................................... 31
  4.4 Patterns of Comparison Goods Spending ........................................................................ 32
  4.5 Patterns of Convenience Goods Spending ........................................................................ 36

5 Need for Retail Floorspace ......................................................................................................... 39
  5.1 Introduction ....................................................................................................................... 39
  5.2 Claims on Expenditure ..................................................................................................... 40
  5.3 Over-Trading of Floorspace .............................................................................................. 41
  5.4 Comparison Goods Needs Assessment ............................................................................ 42
  5.5 Convenience Goods Needs Assessment .......................................................................... 43
  5.6 Qualitative Need Assessment .......................................................................................... 44
  5.7 Summary of Retail Need .................................................................................................. 46

6 Need for Commercial Leisure Floorspace ............................................................................... 48
  6.1 Introduction ....................................................................................................................... 48
  6.2 Expenditure Growth in the Leisure Services Sector ......................................................... 48
  6.3 Restaurants and Cafes ..................................................................................................... 49
  6.4 Cinema and Theatre provision ......................................................................................... 53
  6.5 Gym & Leisure Centres ................................................................................................. 54
  6.6 Family Entertainment ...................................................................................................... 56
6.7 Games of Chance ........................................................................................................ 56
6.8 Hotel Provision .............................................................................................................. 57
6.9 Summary of Commercial Leisure Needs ...................................................................... 57

7 Recommendations ........................................................................................................ 59
7.2 Quantitative Need for New Floorspace ...................................................................... 59
7.3 Meeting Quantitative Needs in LB Havering ............................................................... 59
7.4 Network of Centres & Initial Vision/Strategy Advice .................................................. 61
7.5 Defining Boundaries .................................................................................................... 63
7.6 Monitoring .................................................................................................................. 63

Figures
Figure 1.1 - Hierarchy of Centres in LB Havering ............................................................... 6
Figure 2.1 - Leading Supermarkets’ Market Share, 1994-2014 .......................................... 11
Figure 2.2 - Example ‘C store’ formats operated by Tesco, Sainsbury’s and Morrisons ... 12
Figure 2.1 - Forecast of non-store retailing (‘Special Forms of Trading’) market share to 2030 14
Figure 2.4 - Top 20 e-commerce websites in the UK, 2013 ................................................ 14
Figure 3.1 - Extract from ‘PPG’ .......................................................................................... 16
Figure 3.2 - Visitors to Romford Metropolitan Centre by Zone .......................................... 19
Figure 3.3 - Frequency of trips to Romford Metropolitan Centre ....................................... 19
Figure 4.1 - Study Area ..................................................................................................... 30
Figure 4.2 - Comparison Goods Market Share of Romford Metropolitan Centre ............. 35
Figure 6.1 - Cinema Provision within and surrounding LB Havering ................................ 54

Tables
Table 1.1 - Summary of Study Area Zones ....................................................................... 17
Table 2.1 - Diversity of Uses in Romford Metropolitan Centre (Number of Units) ......... 17
Table 2.2 - Diversity of Uses in Romford Metropolitan Centre (Gross Floorspace) ......... 17
Table 3.1 - Diversity of Uses in Collier Row (Number of Units) ......................................... 21
Table 3.2 - Diversity of Uses in Collier Row (Floorspace) ................................................ 21
Table 3.3 - Diversity of Uses in Harold Hill (Number of Units) ......................................... 22
Table 3.4 - Diversity of Uses in Harold Hill (Floorspace) ................................................ 22
Table 3.5 - Diversity of Uses in Hornchurch (Number of Units) ....................................... 23
Table 3.6 - Diversity of Uses in Hornchurch (Gross Floorspace) ...................................... 23
Table 3.7 - Diversity of Uses in Hornchurch (Floorspace) ................................................ 23
Table 3.8 - Diversity of Uses in Upminster (Number of Units) .......................................... 24
Table 3.9 - Diversity of Uses in Upminster (Gross Floorspace) ....................................... 25
Table 3.10 - Main Out-of-Centre Retail Floorspace LB Havering .................................... 26
Table 4.1 - List of Study Area Zones .................................................................................. 30
Table 4.2 - Comparison goods expenditure growth in study area .................................. 31
Table 4.3 - Convenience goods expenditure growth in study area .................................. 31
Table 4.4 - Summary of Comparison Goods Spending Patterns by Zone ....................... 33
Table 4.5 - Romford Core and Secondary Catchment Area .............................................. 35
Table 4.6 - Most Popular Convenience Goods Destinations ............................................ 38
Table 5.1 - Summary of Expenditure Retention ................................................................. 39
Table 5.2 - Commitments to New Retail Floorspace ......................................................... 40
Table 5.3 - Sales Density Growth Rates .......................................................................... 40
Table 5.4 - Summary of Comparison Goods Need to 2031 ............................................. 43
Table 5.5 - Summary of Convenience Goods Need to 2031 ............................................ 44
Table 6.1 - Growth in Commercial Leisure Sectors to 2031 ........................................... 49
Table 6.2 - Summary of Retention of Food and Drink Spending in Study area ............... 51
Table 6.3 - Indicative A3, A4 and A5 Floorspace Need to 2031 ........................................ 52
Table 6.4 - Gym & leisure centre provision in LB Havering ............................................. 55
Appendices (bound separately as Volume 2)

Appendix A – Centre Health Checks
Appendix B – Study Area Map
Appendix C – Retail Capacity Tables
Appendix D – Quantitative Need Methodology
Appendix E – Technical Inputs
Appendix F – Leisure Capacity Tables

Household Survey Results (bound separately as Volume 3)
1 Introduction

1.1.1 The London Borough of Havering (LB Havering) commissioned Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA) in 2014 to undertake an assessment of the retail and commercial leisure needs to 2031. The study comes at an important time in retailing and town centres, with town centres facing increasing challenges and customers becoming increasingly discerning about their shopping habits. There is a widespread consensus that many town centres will need to adapt to ‘futureproof’ their long-term vitality and viability.

1.2 Terms of Reference

1.2.1 The agreed terms of reference with the Council, in summary, are as follows:

- Undertake an assessment of the existing supply of retail and leisure floorspace for the existing identified centres within the Borough and review their performance
- Identify spending patterns across the Borough for both retail (food and non-food) and leisure activities
- Assess the need (both quantitative and qualitative) for new retail and leisure floorspace to 2031, and the potential growth in population and expenditure
- Provide a set of core recommendations in respect of the potential strategies to accommodate need, hierarchy of centres and an approach to defining key boundaries for centres in the Local Plan

1.2.2 The methodology used by PBA is robust and up to date. Furthermore, this study is undertaken in accordance with the NPPF and the PPG in determining our recommendations to the Council.

1.3 Structure of the Study

1.3.1 In response to the agreed terms of reference, our study is set out as follows:

- The remainder of this section briefly summarises the national and local policy context within which this study has been prepared;
- **Section 2** sets out our view on how town centres are changing, providing important context to the remainder of the study;
- **Section 3** sets out a summary assessment of existing retail and leisure provision in Romford metropolitan centre and each of the Borough’s district centres — Hornchurch, Upminster, Collier Row, Elm Park, Harold Hill and Rainham, including a ‘health check’ assessment of their current performance, as well as a summary of out-of-centre retail and leisure development in the Borough;
- **Section 4** sets out a summary of where residents in the Borough are currently undertaking their spending on retail and leisure goods, informed by the findings of a household survey of spending patterns undertaken in support of the study;
- **Section 5** sets out the quantitative need for additional retail floorspace, split between convenience (food) goods and comparison (non-food) goods, and also discusses the qualitative need for additional retail floorspace in each of the main centres in the Borough;
Section 6 sets out a qualitative and quantitative assessment of the need for additional commercial leisure uses (such as cafes and restaurants, cinemas and health and fitness facilities); and

Section 7 draws together the findings of the previous sections to set out a series of recommendations, both Borough-wide and specific to each centre.

This report is supported by Volume 2 of the study, which contains appendices to the study as follows:

- Appendix A contains full ‘health check’ assessments of the town and district centres in the Borough (building on the summaries set out in Section 3 of Volume 1);
- Appendix B provides a plan of the study area which we have used as the basis of our assessment;
- Appendix C sets out quantitative retail capacity data tables;
- Appendix D provides a summary of our methodology for calculating quantitative retail need;
- Appendix E provides a summary of the technical inputs into our retail and leisure capacity forecasts; and
- Appendix F sets out quantitative commercial leisure capacity data tables.

Finally, Volume 3 of the study sets out the detailed household survey tables which have been used to inform the recommendations and outputs of this study.

1.4 National Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published by the Government in March 2012 and replaces all previous Planning Policy Statements and Planning Policy Guidance Notes. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which for plan-making this means that:

- “local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;
- Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:
  - Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
  - Specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”
  (paragraph 14)

In order to be considered sound, Local Plans should be positively prepared (i.e. based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements), justified (i.e. the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives), effective (i.e. deliverable and based on joint working) and consistent with national policy (paragraph 182).
1.4.3 Paragraph 22 states that planning policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments and set out policies for the management and growth of centres. This includes a requirement that ‘needs for retail, leisure, office and other main town centre uses are met in full and are not compromised by limited site availability’. This introduces a challenge for local authorities to maximise central opportunities.

1.4.4 The NPPF also requires Local Plans to be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. In terms of a retail evidence base, paragraph 161 states that they should assess:

- the needs for land or floorspace for economic development, including both the quantitative and qualitative needs for all foreseeable types of economic activity over the plan period, including for retail and leisure development;
- the role and function of town centres and the relationship between them, including any trends in the performance of the centres;
- the capacity of existing centres to accommodate new town centre development;
- locations of deprivation which may benefit from planned remedial action.

**National Planning Policy Guidance**

1.4.5 The Government recently published the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) in order to provide further guidance on and support to the policies contained within the NPPF. The PPG is a web based resource, which will be actively managed by the DCLG in order to allow for any necessary updates to be issued as soon as possible. The guidance will continue to be subject to a regular review process.

1.4.6 The PPG is set out thematically. Matters associated with town centre uses are set out in the section ‘Ensuring the vitality of town centres’. This section states that a positive vision or strategy for town centres, articulated through the Local Plan, is key to ensuring successful town centres, which enable sustainable economic growth and provide a wider range of social and environmental benefits. It also states that any strategy should be based on evidence of the current state of town centres and opportunities to meet development needs and support their viability and vitality. Strategies should also identify changes in the hierarchy of town centres, including where a town centre is in decline. In these cases, strategies should seek to manage decline positively to encourage economic activity and achieve an appropriate mix of uses commensurate with a realistic future for that town centre.

1.4.7 The PPG also provides further guidance in terms of the interpretation of the NPPF’s sequential and impact tests (discussed above), including how they should be applied to both plan-making and decision-taking. A stage-by-stage guide to undertaking an impact test is also provided.

**Changes to Permitted Development Rights**

1.4.8 The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2013 came into force on 30 May 2013. This order amends the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995. The aim of the policy is to reform the planning system so as to support “sustainable development” by encouraging the reuse of vacant property and by allowing building owners to unlock the value of their assets through a change of use. This reform is intended to make the planning system less bureaucratic and more responsive to changing demand.

1.4.9 The revised permitted development Rights have significant implications for High Streets and town centres. The most significant aspect of the revised policy is that property owners no
longer need to apply for planning permission if the change of use is within the same class or, in some cases, the change of use is to dwellings. The Permitted Development Rights allows the change of use of retail units (A1) to professional and financial services (A2) without seeking planning consent or the conversion of office space (B1) to residential dwellings (C3). This kind of conversion requires prior approval from the Local Authority. New Permitted Development Rights that came into force in April 2014 permit the conversion of A1 and A2 space to C3 (Single residential Dwelling). Up to 150 square meters of A1/A2 space can be converted to residential use subject to prior approval. The amendment also introduced a new use class CA which permits the change of use of a retail unit to a bank or building society without applying for planning permission.

1.4.10 It is important to note that some areas are exempt from Permitted Development Rights. This includes Conservation Areas, World Heritage Sites and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

1.5 Regional Planning Context

London Plan and Revised Early Minor Alterations

1.5.1 LB Havering’s location within Greater London means that the London Plan also forms part of the development plan, and guides the strategic development of individual London Boroughs. The London Plan was adopted in July 2011 and the Revised Early Minor Alterations were adopted in 2013.

1.5.2 The London Plan identifies five types of town centres: international, metropolitan, major, district, local and neighbourhood. Havering’s town centres are classified as follows: Romford is a metropolitan centre, whilst Collier Row, Elm Park, Harold Hill, Hornchurch, Rainham and Upminster are all defined as district centres.

1.5.3 Policy 2.15 of the London Plan seeks to coordinate the development of a network of town centres across London. Town centres are designated as areas of commercial intensification and residential development. As such, development proposals in town centres should ‘sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres’, accommodate economic and/ or housing growth, support and enhance the competitiveness, quality and diversity of town centre retail, leisure, arts, cultural and other consumer services and public services.

1.5.4 In preparing their LDF, Boroughs should identify town centre boundaries, primary and secondary shopping frontages. Furthermore, local authorities should, in co-ordination with neighbouring authorities, identify other smaller centres that cater to the day to day needs of residents and establish themselves as the focus of local neighbourhoods. Local authorities should also proactively manage declining town centres by encouraging a wider range of services, diversification and improving environmental quality.

1.5.5 Policy 4.6 focuses on the provision and enhancement of sports, cultural and entertainment uses. The mayor seeks to support London’s arts, cultural, professional sporting and entertainment enterprises. In developing LDFs, local authorities should designate and develop cultural quarters and identify, manage and co-ordinate local and evening and night-time entertainment activities.

1.5.6 Policy 4.7 deals with retail and town centre development. The mayor supports a ‘strong partnership approach’ to assessing the retail, commercial, cultural and leisure capacity in town centres. In developing LDFs, local authorities should:

- Identify future levels of retail, leisure and other commercial floorspace need in light of integrated strategic and local assessments;
- Undertake regular town centre health checks to inform strategic and local policy and implementation;
Take a proactive partnership approach to identify capacity and bring forward development within or, where appropriate, on the edge of town centres; and

Firmly resist inappropriate out of centre development; manage existing out of centre retail and leisure development in line with the sequential approach; seeking to reduce car dependency; improve public transport, cycling and walking access; and promote more sustainable forms of development.

Policy 4.8 seeks to develop successful and diverse retail centres. These centres should meet the needs of Londoners and should be easily accessible. This includes supporting additional comparison goods shopping in international, metropolitan and major centres and convenience retailing in smaller centres. The policy also provides a framework for maintaining and enhancing local shopping and specialist shops. Boroughs should also identify areas underserved by convenience goods and support local markets.

Further Alterations to the London Plan

In March 2015, the Mayor published Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP). The purpose of these alterations was to respond to housing and employment issues stemming from the projected increase in London’s population since the publication of the 2011 London Plan. The scope of these alterations include: accommodating changes in national policy and making clear links to the National Planning Policy Framework, providing a robust short and medium term planning framework and making factual corrections. The alterations also take into considerations advice given to the Mayor by organisations such as the Outer London Commission.

The changes include the promotion of Stratford to an International centre and the designation of Elm Park as a District Centre subject to monitoring.

Local Planning Context

Local Development Framework Core Strategy

This section sets out the current local policy position, however the emerging Local Plan will replace the key documents in the Local Development Framework.

The Havering Core Strategy was adopted in July 2008 and forms part of the Borough’s Local Development Framework. The Core Strategy sets out the Borough’s development framework up to 2020. The objective of the Core Strategy is to balance economic growth and the provision of affordable housing in the Borough with the protection and improvement of the Borough’s historic and natural environmental quality.

Policy CP4 – Town Centres sets out Havering’s town centre hierarchy. It is important to note that the Core Strategy does not directly align with the London Plan’s classifications of centres as the London Plan does not distinguish between major and minor district centres. Romford is defined as a ‘metropolitan centre’ In both the Core Strategy and London Plan, Hornchurch and Upminster are designated as ‘major district’ centres, while Collier Row, Elm Park, Harold Hill and Rainham are ‘minor district’ centres. In addition, Havering has 11 major local centres and 68 minor local centres.

The Council aims to strengthen Romford’s position as “East London’s premier town Centre. Hornchurch’s role as the borough’s cultural capital will be supplemented by the promotion of small to medium sized retail, culture, leisure and residential uses. Upminster functions as Havering’s second retail destination after Romford. According to the policy, the strategy for Upminster will be one of consolidation with some small to medium retail and leisure developments permitted. The more significant development opportunities in the town are located in edge of centre sites.
1.6.5 Rainham is situated within the London Riverside Regeneration Area and part of the London Riverside Opportunity Area identified by the Mayor. The regeneration scheme aims to revitalise the area and enhancing its heritage through investments in transport links and mixed use developments. Although Rainham already includes a large Tesco and a number of small shops, the regeneration scheme might require the addition of small scale convenience retail within the regeneration area.

1.6.6 The Core Strategy states Elm Park will continue to function as a predominantly convenience goods focused retail centre. The strategy for Collier Row and Harold Hill is to continue to support the centres by consolidating their current retail offer.

1.6.7 The location of each of the centres in the Borough is shown at Figure 1. We have also added the principal out-of-centre retail locations, which are discussed further in Section 3.

Figure 1.1 - Hierarchy of Centres in LB Havering
1.7 Romford Area Action Plan

1.7.1 The Romford Area Action Plan was adopted in October 2008 and provides the planning framework for the future development and regeneration of Romford metropolitan centre up to 2020. The AAP forms part of the Borough’s LDF. The AAP encapsulates a number of policies touching on various aspects including retail, leisure, heritage, accessibility and functionality.
2 Context for Town Centres

2.1 Introduction

This study is being prepared in the midst of a renewed focus on the role and function of the high street, in the context of the recent, sustained economic downturn, continued attraction of out-of-town facilities as alternative shopping destinations, and the increasing popularity of online shopping. A number of independent studies have recently been published considering the future role and function of the high street, most significantly The Portas Review, The Grimsey Review and Beyond Retail’s ‘Redefining the Shape and Purpose of Town Centres’; we briefly summarise each of these below. We then continue to review the key trends which are likely to influence the demand for new retail floorspace over the study period.

2.2 Published Research

The Portas Review (2011)

2.2.1 In May 2011, retail expert Mary Portas was appointed by the Government to lead an independent review into the future of the high street, largely in response to the stagnation and decline of town centres nationally, seen as a consequence of reduced spending on the high street. The report, published in December 2011, suggest a number of measures to tackle the further decline of the high street.

Amongst 27 separate recommendations in the report, there is a call to strengthen planning policy in favour of ‘town centre first’ following the publication of the draft NPPF. The core recommendations included:

- **Run town centres like businesses:** by strengthening the management of high streets through ‘Town Teams’, developing the ‘Business Improvements Districts’ (BID) model and encouraging new markets;

- **Get the basics right:** by looking at how the business rate system could better support small businesses and independent retailers, encouraging affordable town centre car parking and looking at further opportunities to ‘deregulate’ the high street and relax local authority restrictions that hold local businesses back.

- **Level the playing field:** by making explicit within the NPPF a presumption in favour to town centre development, introduce Secretary of State ‘exceptional sign off’; and encouraging large retailers to show their support for high streets by mentoring local businesses;

- **Define landlords’ role and responsibilities:** by encouraging a ‘contract of care’ between landlords and their commercial tenants, looking at disincentives for landlords leaving properties vacant, and empowering local authorities where landlords are negligent and making proactive use of Compulsory Purchase Order powers; and

- **Give communities greater say:** by including the high street in neighbourhood planning, directing more developer funding to supporting community groups, and, encouraging innovative community uses of empty high street spaces.


2.2.3 The Government published its formal response to the Portas Review in March 2012, which accepted virtually all of Portas’ recommendations. It announced that 24 ‘Portas Pilot’ towns secured funding to set up Town Teams to create plans for the future of their high streets and
trail some of the recommendations made in the Portas Review. In addition, the Government will provide investment to help BIDs access loans for their set-up costs, as well as funding for a High Street Innovation Fund (to help bring entrepreneurs back to their communities) and also a ‘Future High Street X Fund’ (to reward towns which are delivering innovative plans to bring their town centres back to life).

2.2.4 The Government however did not support the call to introduce Secretary of State ‘exceptional sign off’ for all new out-of-town developments and require all large new developments to have an ‘affordable shops’ quota. The Government states that LPAs are best placed to understand local needs and ‘exceptional sign off is contrary to the Government’s ethos of devolution. As such, the Government will continue to use its call-in powers sparingly.

The Grimsey Review (2013)

2.2.5 Bill Grimsey, the former boss of DIY chain Wickes and food retailer Iceland published his report ‘The Grimsey Review: An alternative future for the High Street’ in September 2013.This report was developed as an ‘alternative response’ to the recommendations of the Portas Review. The report makes a total of 31 wide-ranging recommendations, including encouraging more people to live in town centres, appointing a High Streets Minister, and freezing car parking charges for a year.

Beyond Retail: Redefining the Shape & Purpose of Town Centres (2013)

2.2.6 Arising from the key recommendations in the Portas Review, the Government supported the establishment of an industry ‘task force’ to analyse retail property issues relating to town centres. The task force included representatives from the banking, property, retail and public sectors, and the findings of the task force’s report were presented in the ‘Beyond Retail’ report published in November 2013.

2.2.7 The report outlines a ‘future vision’ of high streets, based on five key observations:

- Market polarisation, resulting in three broad types of town centre offer (strong centres with a wide retail and leisure offer; convenience food and service-based centres with an element of fashion and comparison goods; and localised convenience and everyday needs-focussed centres);
- A local authority will have a ‘clear vision’ of the role and function of their town centres, and the position of their respective retail offers in the hierarchy of centres;
- Active intervention on the part of the local authority should be encouraged by a more flexible planning environment, including reduced regulation and a mix of public and private sector funding models;
- A ‘re-basing’ of occupational costs (in terms of rents and rates), to encourage an improved retail and leisure mix of profitable multiple and independent operators, supported by local employment and residential development in close proximity to town centres, and providing a flexible approach to car park pricing to assist in completion with out-of-town developments.
- Technology as a critical enabler of future town centre relevance and vitality.

2.2.8 Based on this ‘vision’, the report makes a number of recommendations, and we consider those particularly pertinent to be:

- Develop strong and dynamic leadership, led at the local authority level but also including business and community involvement, to bring about long-term change in town centre functions;
- Undertake bold, **strategic land assembly**, to assemble redevelopment opportunities of scale and worth;

- Provide **greater flexibility** in the planning system to enable redundant retail premises to be converted to 'more economically productive uses';

- Consider the mechanisms to **address funding gaps** to encourage local authorities to commit to long-term planning for town centres; and

- Town centres must take advantage of **technology** to assist in marketing, driving footfall, and assisting independents and SMEs; and

- The **business rate system** should be reviewed, and new retail valuation guidance should be published.

### 2.3 Market Context

#### 2.3.1 The market context for town centres, and retail in particular, is evolving. The role of the town centre is not as clearly defined as it has historically been, and indications are that the town centres which have weathered the recent economic downturn (discussed further below) are those which have a diverse range of uses. In this section we discuss the key changes in the retail market which are considered likely to have the biggest implications on centres in LB Havering over the study period. These include:

- **Polarisation** to higher-order centres

- **Growth of the convenience goods centre**

- **Growth in commercial leisure provision**

**Key trend: polarisation to higher-order centres**

#### 2.3.2 The ‘polarisation trend’ refers to the preference of retailers to concentrate trading activities in larger schemes, within larger centres. Retailers recognise that greater efficiency can be achieved by having a strategic network of large stores offering a full range of their products, rather than a network of smaller-format stores which are only able to offer a limited range of products. Other trends discussed in this section, in particular the economic downturn and the growth in online shopping, have further amplified the need for retailers to have fewer physical stores. The ‘polarisation trend’ is also driven by customers, who have become more discerning and are increasingly prepared to travel further afield. There is therefore a concentration of comparison goods expenditure in a smaller number of larger centres. CBRE estimated that by 2008 half the population shopped in just 70 or so major locations, down from 200 locations 30 years ago.

However, this trend does mean that smaller centres may be required to potentially refocus their role and function away from solely being shopping destinations to incorporate a much broader retail, leisure, culture and residential offer.

#### 2.3.4 The result of this trend, according to Deloitte\(^2\), is that retailers are beginning to reassess their store portfolios: ‘**The increasing costs of operating stores, changes in consumer behaviours, and the growing online opportunity, coupled with the rise of shopping centres with larger catchment areas and improvements in infrastructure facilitating travel suggest that retailers will need fewer stores in the future**’

---

1 CBRE UK Retail Briefing, September 2008
2.3.5 The implications for this on town centres is that many retailers will, in the medium to longer term, seek to downsize their portfolios, particularly in smaller centres. Deloitte consider that this will have three principal impacts on retail property:

- Firstly, **increased availability** of property as vacancy rates increase;
- Secondly, **decreasing prime retail rents** (with the exception of central London); and
- Thirdly, **increased flexibility in rental terms**, with retailers demanding better terms, including shorter leases, rent-free periods, earlier break clauses, and monthly rental arrangements.

**Key trend: growth of the convenience goods sector**

2.3.6 The convenience goods sector has, during the economic downturn, become a key driver of growth. The sector has traditionally been dominated by the ‘big four’ supermarket operators of Asda, Morrisons, Tesco and Sainsbury’s, but increasingly both higher-quality operators (Waitrose, Marks & Spencer) and discount retailers (Aldi, Lidl) are making inroads into the market share of the ‘big four’. The discount retailers have posted significant year-on-year growth in recent years and beginning to emerge as increasingly important forces in the convenience goods market. We expect these retailers to continue to take market share from the ‘big four’ supermarket operators in future years (see Figure 2.1).

![Figure 2.1 - Leading Supermarkets’ Market Share, 1994-2014](source: Kantar Worldpanel)

2.3.7 The sector has often been the beneficiary of floorspace becoming available in town and city centres as a result of comparison goods retailers entering administration. For example, Iceland acquired 57 former Woolworths stores in early 2009, and recently Morrisons acquired a number of stores formerly operated by Blockbuster as part of their ‘M Local’ network of smaller-format stores. Tesco Express, Sainsbury’s Local, and Waitrose have significantly expanded store numbers in recent years.

2.3.8 Large foodstores (i.e. typically those with a net retail area of at least 25,000 sq.ft / 2,300 sqm) have historically been the primary driver of growth in the convenience goods sector. However, there is evidence of an increasing move by convenience goods operators away from opening...
larger-format stores towards smaller supermarkets and establishing a network of 'top up'
convenience goods shopping facilities (often referred to as ‘c-stores’), often located in town
centres, or district/ neighbourhood shopping parades. Both Sainsbury’s and Tesco now have
more c-stores than large supermarkets3 and the ‘big four’ operators appear to be favouring
these formats over large supermarkets. In summer 2014, Tesco announced plans to develop
4,000 houses on land formerly earmarked by the company for supermarkets, mostly in the

Figure 2.2 - Example ‘C store’ formats operated by Tesco, Sainsbury’s and Morrisons

2.3.9 Verdict Research5 comment that: ‘The second dip of the double-dip recession in 2012 has
knocked consumer confidence and shoppers are sticking more tightly than ever to their
budgets. They are shopping little and often and sticking more tightly than ever to their
budgets… increasing fuel prices, deterring out-of-town trips, and the move towards online food
shopping each feed into this trend towards top-up shopping. Out-of-town space is increasingly
difficult for grocers to make profitable’.

2.3.10 Verdict consider that the proportion of convenience goods floorspace which will be accounted
for by ‘smaller stores’ will increase from 37.6% in 2007 to 41.6% by 2017. The majority of
floorspace will continue to be accounted for by ‘superstores’ (53% of floorspace by 2017), with
‘food specialists’ and off-licences continuing to have their market share reduced. Industry body
IGD predicts that the convenience goods market will grow by 29% between 2012 and 2017,
from £33.9bn to £43.6bn, and the main retail operators are responding quickly by opening new
stores.

**Key trend: growth in commercial leisure**

2.3.11 Most commentators predict that commercial leisure, such as cafes, bars, restaurants and
cinemas, will constitute a growing share of town centre floorspace. This is partly a
replacement activity for reduced demand for space for traditional retail, and partly driven by
demand the shift to leisure expenditure as discretionary household expenditure rises.

2.3.12 When considering leisure expenditure available to households, spending on food and drink
typically accounts for upwards of 50% of total leisure spending, compared to around 15% on
‘cultural services’ (e.g. going to the cinema, theatre, art galleries or live music) and under 10%
on hotels, ‘games of chance’ (such as bingo) and recreation/sporting services.

2.3.13 There is scope for town centres to capitalise on this, redefining their function as ‘destinations’
in their own right. This, in turn, can have wider positive implications on the performance of the
town centres in question: residents and visitors spend longer in the centre, undertake ‘linked
trips’ between retail, leisure and other uses, and increase their dwell-time in the centre. The
development of a strong commercial leisure offer can also help to increase footfall outside of

---

3 Daily Telegraph, 12 January 2014
4 Daily Telegraph, 18 July 2014
5 Verdict Research ‘Food & Grocery Retailing in the UK’ Market Report
retail hours, for example in early evenings, particularly if the leisure offer also includes facilities such as cinemas.

2.4 Economic Context

2.4.1 The recent downturn in the economy had a number of clear changes on the retail landscape in the UK, with a series of high-profile retailers entering administration, and a general trend towards discount retailers increasing their representation — both in the comparison goods sector (for example, Poundland, 99p Stores and Wilkinson) and the convenience goods sector (for example, the continued expansion, and strong trading performance of, ‘deep discount’ retailers such as Aldi and Lidl). The downturn also affected consumer spending, with a greater reluctance to spend amongst consumers on non-essential goods. As a result, forecast levels of growth in consumer spending remain generally subdued, particularly in the short term.

2.4.2 It has been widely documented that online shopping has increased at a rapid pace in recent years — particularly in the comparison goods sector. Online shopping is perceived to offer a number of significant advantages over ‘traditional’, high street-format shopping — including lower prices (as there are lower operating ‘overheads’ for online retailers compared with those in a town centre), a wider variety of choice, and the ability for customers to easily search out bargains — including second hand goods. While unfavourable economic conditions are forcing many retailers to scale back on physical retail space, their online operations allow them to reach a much wider customer base. However, the competition is not as straightforward as ‘online shopping versus the high street’; new technologies are promoting an integration between the two shopping channels, to the point where a town centre that embraces digital technologies can find itself in a strong position.

2.4.3 Returning to the bigger picture, Internet sales have been rising much more rapidly than general retail sales in recent years. The average value of weekly retail sales on the internet was forecast at £844m in December 2012. The ONS forecast that online sales accounted for 9.4% of all retail sales in October 2012, which increased to 10.5% in October 2013 (equivalent to a year-on-year increase of 1.1 percentage points). Experian consider that this pattern is likely to remain the case for the foreseeable future, commenting in their Retail Planner Briefing Note (October 2013) that:

‘We retain our assumption that non-store retailing will increase at a faster pace than total retail sales well into the long term. There were 52.7 million internet users in the UK (representing 84.1% of the population) in mid-year 2012... growth momentum will be sustained as new technology such as browsing and purchasing through mobile phones and the development of interactive TV shopping boost internet retailing’.

2.4.4 However, Experian consider that at the turn of the next decade, growth in online shopping is expected to begin to plateau, stating that they expect ‘the SFT\(^6\) market share [to] continue to increase over the forecast period although the pace of e-commerce growth will moderate markedly after about 2020’.

2.4.5 The outputs of this study specifically take into account this anticipated growth in online shopping — based on the most up-to-date Experian guidance we remove the proportion of total expenditure which is expected to be diverted towards online shopping, before presenting the final updated quantitative floorspace requirements for the Borough\(^8\). In Figure 2.3, we

---

\(^6\) ‘Special Forms of Trading’, which includes online shopping as well as sales from markets and mail order.

\(^7\) Experian currently project up to 2030.

\(^8\) The figures which we use are Experian’s ‘adjusted’ comparison (non-food) and convenience (food) goods forecasts, which make a deduction on Experian’s ‘baseline’ figures in order to take account of internet goods sales from store space (such as through ‘Click & Collect’, as discussed below). For comparison goods, Experian apply a discount of 25% to calculate the ‘adjusted’ figure, and for convenience goods this figure is 70%. The latter figure is particularly high because many online food shopping transactions placed with Sainsbury’s, Tesco, Asda and Waitrose are ‘picked’ from the shelves of the nearest large store of the retailer. Convenience goods retailers
present the projected growth in online comparison and convenience goods shopping over the course of the study period to 2026, based on the forecasts provided by Experian. For reference, both the ‘unadjusted’ and the ‘adjusted’ figures are shown\(^9\) although for the purposes of our study we solely rely on the latter set of figures.

Figure 2.1 - Forecast of non-store retailing (‘Special Forms of Trading’) market share to 2030

![Figure 2.1](image)

Source: Experian Retail Planner Briefing Note 11, October 2013, Appendix 3. SFT includes spending on online shopping, mail order / catalogue shopping, and markets. ‘Adjusted’ figures include a reduction for store-picked online transactions.

2.4.6 This forecast growth in online spending does not equate to a redundant future for ‘bricks and mortar’ stores. There is a role for physical outlets to act as ‘showrooms’ for online retailers\(^{10}\). A physical presence on the high street improves the visibility of businesses; 12 out of the top 20 e-commerce businesses in the UK have a physical presence on the high street (Figure 2.4).

Figure 2.4 - Top 20 e-commerce websites in the UK, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>high street &amp; online</th>
<th>online only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>Amazon.co.uk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>ASOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;S</td>
<td>Netflix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lewis</td>
<td>Amazon.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debenhams</td>
<td>Play.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesco</td>
<td>Tesco direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currys</td>
<td>loveFilm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td>easyJet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cineworld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IMRG Experian Hitwise Hot Shops List, 2013

are increasingly choosing to instead fulfil orders from warehouses known as ‘dark stores’ — although this trend remains in its infancy.

\(^9\) See footnote 8

\(^{10}\) This is where customers visit ‘bricks and mortar’ stores to look at / try on a product, before using technology such as smartphones to check whether the product is available elsewhere (in another store, or online) for a cheaper price.
2.4.7 The growth in the ‘Click & Collect’ method of online shopping is a further relatively new trend, but one which looks set to play an increasing role over future years. Like ‘showrooming’, it is also one where the physical outlet of the store can still be used to drive footfall. The ‘click & collect’ concept is such that a customer orders and pays for the desired product online, and then collects the product from the nearest large branch of the retailer in question. This approach is being rolled out by an increasing number of retailers. Recent research by the British Retail Consortium indicates that 60% of ‘click & collect’ transactions result in an additional purchase in the store.

2.4.8 Recent trends indicate that major retailers are becoming more willing to embrace the challenge posed by online and mobile technology, putting into place technology such as better mobile websites, offering free instore wi-fi, or in-store technology points where a customer can order a product online which may be sold out or not available within the store. This may be particularly applicable for smaller town centres where many retailers’ stores are quite small and may not be able to carry the full range of products available.

2.4.9 There is, therefore, a role for ‘bricks and mortar’ stores, but there is an acute challenge for middle-order centres which will need to be embraced. The role and function of high streets — particularly those outside the higher-order shopping centres — are likely to need to consider uses beyond that of traditional retail activity in order to remain vital and viable.

2.5 Implications for LB Havering

2.5.1 There is little doubt that recent years have seen challenges to ‘traditional’ store-based shopping on a scale never previously witnessed. These challenges will continue to grow over the Council’s Plan period, and in order for the centres in the Borough to perform strongly and meet local needs, they will need to adapt to, and embrace, these challenges. However, it is quite clear that there remains a role for store-based shopping — and for town centres. Experian forecast that store-based shopping is still expected to expand at an average of 1.9% per annum in capita terms to 2030, and online sales will begin to plateau.

2.5.2 In our view, the most successful town centres will be the ones that adapt to the changes in shopping habits, which move away from solely being shopping destinations to those which offer a broad range of retail, leisure, cultural and civic services to enable residents to have multiple reasons to visit a town centre, and to spend longer amounts of time in the centres. Successful town centres will need to embrace and work alongside multi-channelling retailing, through the availability of free wi-fi, promotional offers, ‘click & collect’ hubs, and so on. There will need to be a willingness for the higher-order centres in the Borough to embrace the wider changes in shopping and spending patterns, and capitalise on them rather than compete with them.

2.5.3 There will also be an important role for niche / curated retail destinations, which are able to compete with advances in online / mobile technology because they offer a different experience, one based around high standards of customer service, and a unique retail offer which cannot be matched online. Related to this, we therefore expect that place marketing and ‘selling’ the offer of a town centre will become of increasing importance.
3 Existing Performance of Network of Centres

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 In this section we set out our assessment of the seven highest-order centres in the Borough, as follows:

- The Metropolitan Centre of Romford; and
- The District Centres of Collier Row, Elm Park, Harold Hill, Hornchurch, Rainham and Upminster.

3.1.2 Based on available evidence and our own analysis, the performance of each centre has been assessed against indicators of town centre vitality and viability set out in the Planning Practice Guidance, which can be summarised as follows:

Figure 3.1 - Extract from ‘PPG’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vitality and viability of town centres: key indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity of uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proportion of vacant street level property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retailer representation and intentions to change representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pedestrian flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perception of safety and occurrence of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State of town centre environmental quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Planning Practice Guidance (section: ‘Ensuring the vitality of town centres’, para 005)

3.1.3 Further details of our approach, and a more detailed assessment, are set out at Appendix A of Volume 2 of our Study. In our assessment below, we provide a brief summary of the performance of each centre against each of the PPG indicators, using a ‘traffic light’ system which is designed to identify areas where a centre is performing particularly strongly – or alternatively is considered to be underperforming.

3.2 Romford (Metropolitan Centre)

3.2.1 As a designated Metropolitan Centre, Romford is the principal shopping destination for residents within the Borough and visitors from further afield. The centre has a strong comparison and convenience offer alongside commercial leisure uses which include gyms, cafes, cinemas, amusement arcades and restaurants. The town centre is anchored by three main shopping centres (The Liberty, the Mercury and the Brewery) in addition to a popular market and high street retail units. The diversity of uses for the centre, as supplied by Experian Goad, is set out in Tables 3.1 and 3.2.
### Table 3.1 - Diversity of Uses in Romford Metropolitan Centre (Number of Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% UK average</th>
<th>% Difference to UK average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Experian Goad

### Table 3.2 - Diversity of Uses in Romford Metropolitan Centre (Gross Floorspace)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gross Floorspace (sqm)¹¹</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% UK average</th>
<th>% Difference to UK average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>27,920</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>105,120</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>36,080</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Experian Goad

#### 3.2.2 Romford

Romford enjoys good representation from national multiple retailers, as would be expected for a centre of its role and function. These include anchor stores Primark, Marks and Spencer, Next and Debenhams alongside younger fashion retailers H&M, Topman/Topshop and Superdry. Generally speaking the offer is firmly mid-market; there is an absence of upper-middle or higher end retailers. Primark and Marks & Spencer are both important anchors on South Street, which otherwise has a generally poor quality retail offer for what is such a prominent location in the town centre. There is also a good convenience offer in the town centre, with large branches of Asda (Mercury Gardens) and Sainsbury’s (The Brewery), Iceland (Market Place) plus Aldi and Lidl supermarkets to the north and southern end of the centre respectively. In addition, both BHS and Marks & Spencer food offer.

#### 3.2.3 The retail offer is further complemented by restaurant operators

Nandos, Frankie & Benny’s and Pizza Express. Fast food chains McDonalds, Subway, KFC also have representation within the centre, and there are a number of public houses such as Yates’ and Wetherspoons located on South Street. The offer also includes a range of independent cafes. There is also a good range of supporting retail services, two cinemas and a theatre. The centre also has an important civic function.

#### 3.2.4 While there is strong representation of national multiple retailers within the town centre, there are also significant presence of independent retailers – however for the most part this is consigned to the secondary areas of the town centre. Some parts of the centre have an over-concentration of low-grade retail uses, with the extensive number of hot-food takeways on Victoria Road being the most noticeable example of this.

¹¹ Floorspace includes allowances for internal upper floors within shop units.
3.2.5  The vacancy rate at the time of our visit to the centre was 7%, some way below the UK average of 12.5%. It is positive to note that the vacancy rate has decreased slightly since the most recent Experian Goad centre survey was completed in 2013.

3.2.6  Pedestrian circulation within the primary retail frontage is generally good – a lot of retail activity takes place in pedestrianized streets or covered shopping centres. Market Place is also a vibrant and well used civic space especially on market days. The Liberty was particularly busy at the time of our visit, reflecting the generally good ‘prime pitch’ offer of the retailers in this location. As would be expected, secondary areas of the town centre do not benefit from such high levels of footfall, although no area was observed that was exceptionally quiet.

3.2.7  The centre has good access to the surrounding region and Central London. Romford’s railway station is located on South Street, a short distance from the primary shopping area, and is served by services on the London Liverpool Street – Shenfield line with additional off-peak services to Southend and Colchester. Starting in 2018, Crossrail services will serve the station linking Romford to Reading via Central London. Numerous bus routes serve Romford connecting the town to the surrounding network of district centres. The centre also has good car parking provision which include eight Council owned car parks and five privately managed car parks. The centre feels generally safe during the daytime, although the fact that the much of the town centre is accessed by underpasses from the surrounding area due to the ring road that encircles the centre is not ideal. There is a small concentration of bars/nightclubs along South Street which contributes to the centre’s night time economy.

3.2.8  The central retail core is generally of good quality, with the Liberty centre, the Brewery and the Mercury Mall in particular offering a high-quality shopping environment. Recent improvements in the public realm such as the pavement widening works along Victoria Road and South Street have also improved the appearance of the town centre. The Council secured funding for these improvements from TfL. Romford generally has good architectural diversity spanning historic buildings such as the Havering Museum and St Edward the Confessor Church to more contemporary buildings such as the Liberty Centre. The most notable shortcoming of the town centre is a lack of significant green space and sitting areas.

Customer Perceptions of Romford Metropolitan Centre

3.2.9  As part of the household survey of shopping patterns which was undertaken in support of this study (which we discuss further in Section 4), respondents were asked a number of questions in respect of their views whether they visited Romford metropolitan centre for shopping / leisure activities, what they liked about the town centre, and what could be improved. We set out a summary of these findings below; the full results are included within the household survey data at Volume 3 of the report.

3.2.10 When asked whether they visited Romford metropolitan centre regularly for shopping, leisure or work 59% of survey respondents stated they did. The proportion of residents who said they did visit the town centre regularly varied between the 11 survey zones (refer to Appendix B) which we have used for the purpose of our analysis (see Figure 3.2). This data shows that as a general trend Romford metropolitan centre draws high amounts of trade from those zones in the immediate vicinity (the town centre falls within zone 1), with numbers of visits decreasing as proximity to Lakeside increases. A low proportion of respondents from Zones 5 (30%) and 11 (25%) which are closest to Lakeside shopping centre said they visited Romford. Fewer residents from Zone 2 do visit the centre than the other surrounding Zones. This could possibly be attributed to the strong leisure offer in Hornchurch district centre.
3.2.11 Out of those who stated that they did visit the centre, the majority of respondents (32%) said they visited Romford on a weekly basis. The frequency of visits to Romford undertaken by the total number of respondents is outlined below. This table shows that most people visit the centre on a regular basis once a week, 2-3 times a week or once a month.

3.2.12 When asked what they liked about Romford metropolitan centre the main reasons respondents gave were; close to home (39%), good range of chain stores (31%), good range of independent stores (18%) and nothing/very little (12%). A particularly high number of respondents (55%) from Zone 9 (Dagenham) commented that Romford contains a good range of chain stores. Other reasons that respondents gave included the following:

- Close to work/en-route to work
Good or free car parking

Good bus service/accessible public transport

Markets

Restaurants/cafes

Attractive environment

Compact centre

Undercover/sheltered areas

When asked what things could be improved about Romford metropolitan centre, 52% of respondents gave no answer, suggesting a reasonable level of satisfaction amongst users of the centre. Out of the reminder of the responses, the most popular improvements suggested by respondents included:

- Cheaper parking (12%)
- More parking (8%)
- Improvement to the market (6%)
- Cleaner Streets/removal of litter (5%)
- Better choice of shops in general (4%)
- Improve appearance/environment of centre (3%)
- More independent shops (3%)
- Better street furniture/floral displays (2%)
- More control on other anti-social behaviour (2%)

3.3 Collier Row (District Centre)

The district centre is located in the north west of the Borough. The centre generally caters to the day to day needs of local residents, with representation geared towards the provision of convenience goods, hot food and some services. Retail activity is centred around Collier Row Road, Clockhouse Lane and Chase Cross Road. The offering in the town centre is generally towards the lower end of the market, especially when the provision of hot food take aways and charity shops is taken into consideration.

The majority of retailers and food outlets are independently owned. The convenience offer within Collier Row is headed by a Tesco Metro (in an attractive art deco former cinema), alongside Costcutter and Londis. Other national multiples present include Boots, Lloyds Pharmacy, Lloyds Bank, Post Office, Greggs, Coral, a JD Wetherspoon operated pub, Domino’s Pizza and Pizza Hut. There are 11 vacant units in the centre, equivalent to 15% of all units, above the UK average of 12.5%. The diversity of uses for the centre is set out at Table 3.3.

Parking is also shown as where the centre could improve
### Table 3.3 - Diversity of Uses in Collier Row (Number of Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% UK average</th>
<th>Difference to UK average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Experian Goad

### Table 3.4 - Diversity of Uses in Collier Row (Floorspace)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% UK average</th>
<th>Difference to UK average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Experian Goad

3.3.3 Pedestrian flows were observed to be generally good, aided by the linear nature of the centre. The centre is served by six routes, and can thus be considered generally accessible.

Environmental quality in the district centre is generally good and the Council has also invested in upgrading the public realm which has added to the centre’s attractiveness.

### 3.4 Elm Park (District Centre)

3.4.1 Elm Park District Centre is located in the south western part of the Borough and is accessible by public transport via the London Underground district line and four bus routes. The centre is split into two distinctive areas located on either side of Elm Park underground station at each end of The Broadway. To the north the main shopping frontages include The Broadway and the junction of Elm Park Avenue/St. Nicholas Avenue/The Broadway. The environmental quality of this area is generally good as there has been extensive public realm investment — however the presence of vacant buildings does undermine environmental quality. To the south the main retail frontages are Station Parade and Tadworth Parade. The environmental quality and perception of safety in this area is quite poor due to a high number of vacant units and concentration of take-aways which remain closed during the day time.

3.4.2 The centre meets day to day shopping needs for residents and as a whole provides a good range of convenience stores including Co-operative Food, Tesco Express and Sainsbury’s Local as well as an extensive range of local services. The comparison retail offer is at the lower end of the market and, since the local pub was recently converted to a supermarket the evening economy is now limited to a small number of restaurants and eleven take-aways. The centre had a vacancy rate of 14% at 1 October 2014 this is higher than the current National Average of 12.5%. Whilst the vacancy rate should be monitored, we consider that overall Elm Park is able to meet day-to-day shopping needs to a generally good extent, and, with some improvement to the visual appearance of the centre, will offer generally positive vitality and viability.
3.5 **Harold Hill (District Centre)**

3.5.1 Harold Hill is a small district centre, occupying the ground floor of a purpose-built 1950s council-owned residential estate to the north-east of the Borough. Most of the retail units are independently owned though a handful of familiar High Street names have established themselves in the centre. The main focus of the retail offer is the provision of convenience goods and some services such as banking and hairdressing. In addition the centre also offers a restaurant, café and hot food takeaways. National retailers/operators present in the centre include Iceland, Co-Operative Food and Sainsbury’s Local supermarkets, plus Superdrug, Boots, Boots Opticians, Halifax, Santander, Natwest, William Hill and Ladbrokes.

Table 3.5 - Diversity of Uses in Harold Hill (Number of Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% UK average</th>
<th>Difference to UK average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Experian Goad

Table 3.6 - Diversity of Uses in Harold Hill (Floorspace)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% UK average</th>
<th>Difference to UK average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Experian Goad

3.5.2 **The diversity of** uses for Harold Hill is presented at Table 3.4. At the time of our visit the vacancy rate was 20% and therefore considerably above the UK average, although this partly reflects the renovation works being undertaken to facilitate the creation of a new library within the centre. Once this is considered then the vacancy rate falls to 5.6%. Notwithstanding this, the vacancy rate should be carefully monitored by the Council.

3.5.3 The district centre is of good environmental quality. While the development of the new Harold Hill library is a welcome addition to the eastern arcade, the number of vacancies within the western arcade diminishes the overall quality of the district centre. The centre is served by four bus routes, which is considered to represent a good level of accessibility given the role and function of Harold Hill as a district centre.

3.6 **Hornchurch (District Centre)**

3.6.1 Hornchurch district centre is located in the centre of the Borough and is accessible by public transport via national rail services, London Underground’s District Line and seven bus routes
though it is important to note that there are only half hourly services (Mon-Sat up to 8pm) to Emerson Park from Romford and Upminster and the tube station is not in the town centre. The focal point of the centre is the junction where the three main shopping Streets- the High Street, Station Lane and North Street intersect. The environmental quality of the centre is good, a number of key sites have been redeveloped to a high standard and there has been recent significant investment in the public realm including traffic calming measures using funds from Transport for London under its Major Schemes ‘branding’. The current vacancy rate of 6% is less than half the UK average, and there are no particularly prominent vacant units within the primary shopping area (although we note that there has been a slight increase in the vacancy rate since the Experian Goad centre survey was completed in 2013).

Table 3.7 - Diversity of Uses in Hornchurch (Number of Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% of total (UK average)</th>
<th>Difference to UK average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Experian Goad

Table 3.8 - Diversity of Uses in Hornchurch (Gross Floorspace)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gross Floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% of total (UK average)</th>
<th>Difference to UK average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>5,340</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>10,060</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>12,930</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Experian Goad

3.6.2 The retail offer contains a good diversity of comparison, convenience and service retail uses as well as an impressive commercial leisure offer which makes the centre a borough-wide leisure destination for eating and drinking and lends it a stronger ‘evening economy’ than might typically be expected for a district centre. The convenience offer is rather limited and the fact that the prominently-sited former Little Waitrose store has stood vacant for over a year suggests a lack of demand from retailers. The offer is anchored by a Sainsbury’s supermarket supplemented by Iceland food store and a range of small convenience stores. The comparison offer is at the mid-range of the market, there are a number of national multiple retailers however there is also a high proportion of charity shops and discount stores which account for 22% of the comparison offer. The centre’s leisure offer is focused on eating and drinking out and as such there is a vibrant evening economy. There is a high number of independent restaurants and national multiple outlets including Nando’s, Zizzi, Ask, Prezzo, Starbucks, Costa and a JD Wetherspoon pub. A consequence of this is that much of the centre does not benefit from strong levels of footfall during retail trading hours.

3.6.3 It is important to note that Hornchurch is widely regarded as Havering’s culture centre. The cultural offer includes the Fairkytes Art Centre and the Queens Theatre.
3.7 Rainham (District Centre)

3.7.1 Rainham is a small district centre which is anchored by a large Tesco Extra supermarket. The size of the supermarket is such that it offers many of the services and facilities which one may associate with a ‘typical’ district centre, such as a pharmacy, opticians, photo processing, travel money etc, alongside an extensive food and non-food retail offer. The store is open 24 hours when trading regulations permit. Elsewhere in the centre (which benefits from a direct pedestrian link to/from the Tesco store), the offer of the centre includes two convenience shops, estate agents, betting shops, a bank, a footwear store, a second-hand furniture shop and takeaway restaurants with the majority of units operated by independent operators. There are a number of gaps in the retail and services offer, including café and restaurant provision and clothing retailers, and a number of vacant premises were observed on Upminster Road. A new library (pictured above) is a positive addition to the centre, which benefits from its setting within the Rainham conservation area.

3.7.2 At the time of the district centre visit pedestrian activity was generally low while Tesco appeared to be trading well at the time.

3.7.3 Rainham is served by four bus routes and a train station. The mainline service runs from Fenchurch Street to Southend. Pedestrian navigation has been enhanced by the provision of way finding directional signs. The town centre has two main car parks: the first at the train station and the second adjacent to the Tesco supermarket.

3.7.4 Rainham district centre is performing adequately: the Tesco store appears to be trading successfully and offers an extensive product range. The recently-completed Rainham Library is evidently a positive addition to the centre. There are no areas of significant concern in respect of the performance of the centre.

3.8 Upminster (District Centre)

3.8.1 Upminster District Centre is located in the south eastern part of the Borough and is accessible by public transport via National Rail services, the London Underground district line and four bus routes. The main retail frontage extends south along the B1421 (comprising Station Road and Corbets Tey Road) from Upminster rail and underground station at the northern end of the centre and two secondary retail frontages, St. Marys Lane and Springfield Gardens both run east off the B1421. The environmental quality is good in most of the centre which contains a mix of architectural styles reflecting both civic and commercial functions.

3.8.2 The vacancy rate in the centre is low, at 7%, although has increased since the most recent Experian Goad centre survey of the centre in 2013, which identified a vacancy rate of 5%.

Table 3.9 - Diversity of Uses in Upminster (Number of Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% UK average</th>
<th>% Difference to UK average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Experian Goad
Table 3.10 - Diversity of Uses in Upminster (Gross Floorspace)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gross Floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% UK average</th>
<th>Difference to UK average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8,980</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Experian Goad

3.8.3 The environmental quality is good in most of the centre which contains a mix of architectural styles reflecting both civic and commercial functions. The environmental quality of the junction where the B1421 intersects with St. Mary’s Lane is poor however: the heavy traffic at the junction reduces safety and acts as a barrier to the flow of pedestrians; there is also a small concentration of vacant units.

3.8.4 Overall the centre contains a good mix of commercial, civic and residential uses which contribute to the centre’s vitality. The retail offer is, as would be expected in a district centre, geared towards meeting day-to-day uses, with a range of comparison, convenience and service retail uses. The centre has a diverse convenience offer including both high-end (Waitrose, Marks and Spencer’s Simply Food) and budget food stores (Aldi, Iceland) as well as a range of independent convenience shops. The comparison offer accounts for 24% of all units and is in the mid-range of the market however there are only a handful of national multiple comparison retailers (including Clarks, Superdrug and Boots). The Roomes department store (which principally sells fashion and homeware) acts as an anchor store to the northern end of the centre, whilst the foodstores anchor the central and eastern ends. The Waitrose store does not appear to be encouraging strong levels of pedestrian flow from the rest of the centre however, which is partly likely to reflect the fact that much of the rest of the retail offer along St Mary’s Lane is of poorer quality, including a number of take-away units.

3.8.5 The leisure offer comprises the local leisure centre and a number of independent and national chain eating and drinking outlets which mostly are positioned in the middle of the market.

3.8.6 Whilst Upminster generally benefits from positive vitality and viability there is some scope for improvement in the quality of the retail offer and for the centre to be better integrated through upgrading of the public realm.

3.9 Out-of-Centre Representation

3.9.1 Not all of the retail provision in the Borough is concentrated in the network of town centres. In common with elsewhere in the country, the established town centres compete for expenditure with retail parks and freestanding retail warehouses, as well as a network of large format out-of-centre convenience goods floorspace. Typically this floorspace offers ‘bulky goods’ retailing, such as DIY goods and furniture – although there is increasing demand from ‘high street’ retailers to take space in such developments where planning restrictions allow (or can be relaxed). Table 3.11 summarises the main out-of-centre retail and leisure floorspace provision in the Borough.
Table 3.11 - Main Out-of-Centre Retail Floorspace LB Havering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store / Retail or Leisure Park Name</th>
<th>Main retailers / Operators</th>
<th>Floor Area (Gross)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallows Corner Retail Park</td>
<td>Argos, Halfords, Harvey’s, DFS, Furniture Village, Next</td>
<td>65,000sq.ft/6,039 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom Valley Retail Park</td>
<td>Carpetright, Dreams Bed Superstores, Pets At Home, Mothercare World.</td>
<td>92,557sq.ft/8,5999 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Avenue Retail Park</td>
<td>PC World, Curry’s, Poundstretcher</td>
<td>110,000sq.ft/10,219sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roneo Corner</td>
<td>B&amp;Q (also an adjacent Tesco Extra supermarket)</td>
<td>72,000sq.ft/6,689sqm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PBA desktop research (excluding standalone foodstores)

### 3.10 Surrounding Centres

#### 3.10.1 Surrounding Havering is a competing network of centres which can be expected to provide competition to centres within the Borough for expenditure. We expect the principal centres which compete with destinations in Havering to be Lakeside, Chelmsford, Brentwood, Stratford and Ilford, whilst smaller centres may also play a more limited role in meeting some residents’ day to day shopping needs. We consider the competing centres below. Some of these centres fall within the study area which we have used as the basis of our assessment, which we discuss further in the following section.

#### Lakeside

3.10.2 Lakeside is designated as a new regional centre in the Thurrock Core Strategy, which supports the transformation of the northern part of the Lakeside Basin into a new regional centre. Lakeside incorporates the Lakeside Shopping Centre (LSC) as well as Lakeside Retail Park and Junction Retail Park, and a number of large, freestanding stores including Ikea, Costco and Tesco Extra. There is a strong and established retail offer, which benefits from good levels of accessibility from the national road network.

3.10.3 The main role of Lakeside at present is as a comparison shopping destination; and LSC in particular is a fashion and department store-led established comparison goods shopping destination. The shopping centre is anchored by large branches of House of Fraser, Marks & Spencer and Debenhams, with an extensive range of supporting clothing & fashion retailers, ranging from budget to upmarket. The retail parks also have a good representation of national retailers, and whilst this is principally ‘bulky goods’ in nature there is a shift towards ‘town centre’-format retailers establishing a trading presence here; for example Lakeside Retail Park includes representation from Next, Sports Direct and Costa Coffee, whilst Junction Retail Park has TK Maxx and ‘outlet’ stores from Marks & Spencer and Gap.

3.10.4 LSC has benefited from recent improvements to its food and drink offer in this respect through the creation of an exterior family dining destination overlooking the central lake. There are a number of coffee shops located in LSC, and drive-through restaurants in the vicinity of the retail parks. Lakeside offers extensive family entertainment and dining options (all of which are run by national multiple operators). This is designed to complement the retail offering and reinforce LSC’s role as a comprehensive retail and entertainment venue. Restaurant operators within the shopping centre include Las Iguanas, Nandos, Strada, Café Rouge, Giraffe and
Wagamama. Elsewhere in the centre there are branches of Pizza Hut, Yo Sushi, Gourmet Burger Kitchen and Taco Bell.

3.10.5 However Lakeside scores poorly in terms of representation in other service sector categories, such as banks/building societies, hair & beauty salons, travel agents and dry cleaners. This reflects Lakeside’s current role as a comparison goods shopping-led destination, rather than a ‘traditional’ town centre.

**Chelmsford**

3.10.6 Chelmsford is a strong regional shopping destination, with good representation from national retailers, and a significant civic, cultural and leisure destination. We expect Chelmsford to reinforce its position as a regional-level shopping centre with the recent commencement of construction of a new retail and leisure development in the city centre. The development will be anchored by a John Lewis department store, alongside 25 further retail outlets, a cinema and new restaurants. The scheme is expected to commence trading in 2015.

3.10.7 Chelmsford has a number of national hotel chains present within the town centre and the edge of centre. This includes the budget chain Travelodge as well as 2 hotels operated by Best Western. Chelmsford also has an 8-screen Odeon cinema with the independent Chelmsford City Theatres screening additional art house films as well as being the city’s main live music and theatre venue. Additional family entertainment includes the 36 lane, Tenpin bowling alley. The facility includes a pool hall, a laser tag room and a café. Chelmsford has a strong representation of national multiple restaurant operators in the town centre. This includes representation from Pizza Express, Prezzo, Pizza Hut, Zizzi’s, Café Rouge, Giraffe and Nandos.

**Brentwood**

3.10.8 Brentwood is the main town in the borough of Brentwood and is defined as a town centre in the Brentwood Local Plan. The centre has a good convenience goods provision, which includes a Sainsbury’s, Co-op and Iceland as well as independent specialist retailers. The comparison goods offer is also adequate, with a reasonable provision of clothing and footwear retailers, including small branches of Marks & Spencer and Next. The retail provision in the centre is supported by a good provision of services uses, including a range of coffee shops and restaurants such as Starbucks and Zizzi. National restaurant operators in the town centre include Nandos, Pizza Express, Prezzo and Chimichanga.

**Dagenham**

3.10.9 Dagenham is classified as a district centre in both the London Plan (2011) and the Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy. The town centre appears to cater primarily for local needs especially day to day convenience shopping. The high street has a significant number of hot food take away units and convenience shops. The presence of national multiple retailers is generally low though there a few exceptions such as Lidl’s, Iceland and Tesco Express. The Heathway Shopping Centre contains additional retail outlets though they are general mid to down market. These outlets include Phones 4U, Boots, Peacocks, 99p Store and Wilko. There appear to be few leisure amenities available within the district centre.

**Basildon**

3.10.10 Basildon is defined as a regional town centre in the emerging Basildon Borough Local Plan. The centre has a good diversity of uses, with a mixture orientated towards comparison goods retailers. Clothing and fashion retailers are principally concentrated in the Eastgate Centre, with key department stores including Marks & Spencer and BHS in Town Square. There is also a large Asda supermarket and a popular market. While retail diversity is strong, the town centre offers very limited leisure and evening economy options – a fact that is noted in the
representations made to the council on its emerging Core Strategy consultation. The Towngate Theatre is the only cultural venue within the town centre and there is a noticeable absence of family dining options.

**Stratford**

3.10.11 Stratford is designated as a Major Centre in the Newham Core Strategy (2012) and in the 2011 London Plan (though the 2014 Further Alterations draft of the London plan promotes Stratford to a Metropolitan Centre with considerations in place to prompting it to an International Centre in future). The retail offer at Stratford is dominated by the Westfield Stratford City Development. The shopping centre is offers a wide, high quality mix of retail and leisure amenities in a modern, good quality environment. In all there are over 300 retail units – anchored by Marks and Spencer, Waitrose and John Lewis in addition to High Street brands such as Zara, Uniqlo, the Kooples, Topman/ Topshop and Hugo Boss. Stratford also features a high number of fast food and casual dining options and a cinema. There are also three low to mid-range hotels present within the development.

**Ilford**

3.10.12 Ilford is designated as a Metropolitan Centre in the London Plan (2011). Retailing in Ilford town centre is mainly focused around the High Road and the Exchange Shopping Centre. The retail offer in the shopping centre is generally mid to down market. Anchor tenants at the Exchange Shopping Centre include Debenhams, Marks and Spencer, Wilco and TK Maxx. Additional retailers include Peacocks, the 99p Sore and Deichmann’s. Elsewhere in the town centre there is retailer representation from Argos, Sainsbury’s, and Primark. The town centre also has a modest restaurant offer and a cinema. Ilford High Street appears to benefit from a pleasant built environment.
4 Existing Shopping Patterns

Read this section alongside:
- Volume 2, Appendix B (Study Area plan)
- Volume 2, Appendix C (Quantitative retail need tables - Tables CM1 to CM5 and CV1 to CV5)
- Volume 3 (Household survey results)

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 In this section we set out where residents in the Borough are currently undertaking their spending on convenience (food), comparison (non-food) and leisure goods, establishing how much is spent at centres in the Borough and how much ‘leaks’ to destinations further afield. We also set out the study area which has been used as the basis of our assessment, and assess the extent of growth in spending on retail and leisure goods which can be expected to come forward over the course of the study period.

4.1.2 The findings of this section are informed by a household telephone survey of shopping and leisure patterns, which was undertaken by NEMS Market Research during August / September 2014. The NEMS data is provided in full at Volume 3 to this study. The approach to these studies is described in full below.

4.2 Definition of Study Area

4.2.1 In order to establish where residents in different parts of the Borough are currently undertaking their retail and leisure spending, it is necessary to firstly define a study area; and secondly split this study area into zones in order for a sufficiently fine-grain of analysis of spending patterns to be provided. The highest order centre in Havering, Romford, is identified as a Metropolitan Centre in the London Plan, and our health check assessment of the town centre has confirmed that it has a strong retail and leisure trade draw. Accordingly it can be expected that Romford can be expected to draw trade from an area wider than the administrative boundaries of the Borough. We have therefore adopted a study area which extends beyond these boundaries, reflecting what we consider to be a ‘natural’ catchment for Romford, having regard to competing surrounding centres. The study area thus extends into parts of LB Barking & Dagenham; LB Redbridge, as well as the Essex boroughs of Epping Forest and Brentwood. LB Havering is included in its entirety.

4.2.2 Figure 4.1 shows the boundaries of the study area we have adopted for the purposes of our study; these are largely unchanged from the Council’s previous study, although we have extended the study area eastwards to cover the Brentwood / Shenfield urban area (this forms a new zone, zone 11). Figure 4.1 also shows how the study area has been sub-divided in order to get an accurate indication of spending patterns for residents in different parts of the Borough, and shows a total of five survey zones, as follows:

13 A larger version of the plan shown at Figure 4.1 is provided at Appendix B
Table 4.1 - List of Study Area Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Zone name</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Zone name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>Romford</td>
<td>Zone 7</td>
<td>Collier Row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>Hornchurch</td>
<td>Zone 8</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3</td>
<td>Rush Green</td>
<td>Zone 9</td>
<td>Dagenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 4</td>
<td>Elm Park</td>
<td>Zone 10</td>
<td>Rainham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 5</td>
<td>Upminster</td>
<td>Zone 11</td>
<td>Brentwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 6</td>
<td>Harold Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 We therefore use these study zones as the basis of our assessment in the remainder of this report. The zones which contain all or parts of the administrative area of LB Havering are zones 1 to 7 inclusive, and zone 10. Therefore, reflecting the nature of this study as an evidence base document for the Council – it is in these zones which we focus our attention.

Figure 4.1 - Study Area
4.3 Current and Future Spending in the Study Area

4.3.1 Appendix C (Volume 2) sets out the growth in population and expenditure on comparison and convenience goods in the study area, over the study period to 2031. Table CM1 (for comparison goods) and Table CV1 (for convenience goods) both show that:

- The study area population at 2014 is 442,231 persons
- This will increase to 462,169 persons by 2017; 488,678 persons by 2021; 520,315 persons by 2026, 563,975 persons by 2029, and 547,846 persons by 2031 (ONS Population Projections).
- This is equivalent to a growth in population of 105,615 persons.

4.3.2 Table CM2 shows the per capita expenditure on comparison goods across the study area. Annual personal spending on comparison goods differentiates quite considerably across the study area, ranging from £1,925 in zone 9 (Dagenham), to £3,695 in zone 11 (Brentwood) at 2014. The average per capita expenditure on comparison goods for LB Havering zones is £2,987.

4.3.3 Table CM3 multiplies the population forecasts in Table CM1 to the per capita expenditure forecasts in Table CM2. It shows that, having made allowance for ‘special forms of trading’ (such as online shopping, and using SFT discount rates set out in Experian Retail Planner Briefing Note 12), there is currently £1,182.80m of comparison goods expenditure available to residents in the catchment area. This will increase over the course of the study period as shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 - Comparison goods expenditure growth in study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total comparison goods expenditure, inc SFT deduction (£m)</td>
<td>1,191.69</td>
<td>1,375.51</td>
<td>1,603.71</td>
<td>2,005.09</td>
<td>2,285.28</td>
<td>2,493.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table CM3, Appendix C

4.3.4 Table CV3 of Appendix C multiplies the population forecasts in Table CV1 (which are identical to those presented in Table CM1) to the per capita spending on convenience goods shown in Table CV2. Per capita spending on convenience goods ranges from £1,569 in zone 9 (Dagenham) to £2,236 in zone 5 (Upminster) at 2014. The average per capita expenditure on convenience goods for LB Havering is £1,976. Having made allowance for SFT, Table CV3 shows that total convenience goods expenditure will increase as shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 - Convenience goods expenditure growth in study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total convenience goods expenditure, inc SFT deduction (£m)</td>
<td>808.18</td>
<td>840.80</td>
<td>899.19</td>
<td>979.38</td>
<td>1,025.53</td>
<td>1,055.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table CV3, Appendix C
4.4 Patterns of Comparison Goods Spending

4.4.1 The household survey identifies where residents in the study are currently undertaking their shopping. Table CM4 (Appendix C) sets out where residents are undertaking their comparison goods shopping in percentage form, and Table CM5 converts these percentages into monetary values, by applying the percentages in Table CM4 to the total expenditure figures in Table CM3.

4.4.2 Of importance is the proportion of expenditure which is retained within the study area, as it is this proportion which is used to inform our estimates of future retail capacity. The row ‘total for study area’ in Table CM5 shows that, of the total £1,191.69m which is available to residents in the study area, £780.22m is retained by centres and stores within the study area, with the remaining £411.47m 'leaking' to destinations outside the study area. In other words, the study area retains 65% of total comparison goods expenditure available. The results of the household survey confirm that most of the remaining expenditure 'leaks' to Lakeside, a short distance outside the boundaries of the study area; we return to discuss this further below.

4.4.3 Table CM5 identifies that within the study area:

- Romford metropolitan centre draws a total of £374m comparison goods turnover from the study area, equivalent to 31% of total comparison goods expenditure, and – as would be expected – is the most popular destination for comparison goods spending in the study area by some margin;

- There are a number of retail parks in Romford which compete with the town centre for expenditure. In total these retail parks (Gallows Corner, Eastern Avenue and other smaller developments) account for £125m of spending;

- Brentwood is the second most popular destination for comparison goods spending in the study area, drawing £86m of spending, although virtually all of this comes from residents in the Brentwood zone, with little evidence of expenditure flows from residents in LB Havering;

- Similarly, Dagenham draws £40m of spending, but this is largely from residents outside Havering;

- Hornchurch is the second most popular comparison goods shopping destination within LB Havering, drawing £32m of spending, and the centre draws trade from a number of zones across the study area.

- Upminster attracts a slightly lower turnover of £28m, although proportionally more of its turnover comes from its local catchment, compared to the wider trade draw of Hornchurch;

- The comparison goods turnover of Rainham of £15m is largely accounted for by the presence of a Tesco Extra supermarket;

- Elm Park and Harold Hill do not act as significant comparison goods shopping destinations, drawing turnovers of £3m and £5m respectively.

Expenditure Leakage

4.4.4 The remaining £411.47m of comparison goods expenditure is spent at destinations outside the study area, with most popular destination by some margin being Lakeside, which accounts for £261m of spending, equivalent to 22% of total available comparison goods expenditure — therefore making Lakeside the second-most popular comparison goods shopping destination for residents in the study area. Trade is drawn to Lakeside from each of the 11 survey zones,
but it is noteworthy that for residents in parts of LB Havering, Lakeside is a closer or equidistant comparison goods shopping destination than Romford metropolitan centre.

4.4.5 Elsewhere, £23m of comparison goods expenditure is spent in central London, £27m in Basildon (mostly from residents outside LB Havering), £19m is spent in Stratford, East London (including at Westfield Stratford City), £19m at Bluewater, and £18m in Ilford.

### Spending Patterns by Zone

4.4.6 Clearly, spending patterns are not uniform across the study area. Table 4.4 summarises where residents in each part of the study area are undertaking their comparison goods spending. This helps to determine the extent of catchment areas of individual centres within the study area.

#### Table 4.4 - Summary of Comparison Goods Spending Patterns by Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Principal comparison goods shopping destinations</th>
<th>Summary of patterns of spending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zone 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Romford | Romford metropolitan centre (£67m); Lakeside (£11m); Gallows Corner Retail Park (£6m) | ▪ Of the £112m comparison goods expenditure available to residents in the zone, £81m is spent in Romford — split between £67m in the town centre, and the remainder in retail parks and other destinations. The town centre therefore attracts a good level of support from residents who live in the local area, and also appears to be withstanding pressure from competing retail park developments.  
  ▪ Most of the remaining expenditure is accounted for by Lakeside (£11m) and the Tesco Extra store at Bryant Avenue, Romford (£5m).  
  ▪ There are limited expenditure flows to Hornchurch and Upminster (£2m each). |
| **Zone 2**  |
| Hornchurch | Romford metropolitan centre (£51m); Lakeside (£43m); Hornchurch (£13m) | ▪ Of the £163m comparison goods expenditure available to residents in the zone, £79m is spent in Romford, including £51m in the town centre. It is the most popular comparison goods shopping destination for residents in this zone.  
  ▪ Romford faces stronger competition from Lakeside, which draws £43m of spending from residents in this zone.  
  ▪ Hornchurch itself only attracts £13m of comparison goods spending, reflecting its limited function as a comparison goods shopping destination.  
  ▪ £5m of spending goes to central London, the most from any individual zone. |
| **Zone 3**  |
| Rush Green | Romford metropolitan centre (£24m); Lakeside (£4m); Eastern Avenue Retail Park (£3m) | ▪ Of the £42m comparison goods expenditure available to residents in the zone, £31m is spent at stores in Romford, including £24m in the town centre. There is no other centre competing for expenditure to any significant degree, although there are some modest flows to Lakeside (£4m). Romford therefore enjoys a dominant position over residents’ spending patterns in this zone. |
| **Zone 4**  |
| Elm Park | Lakeside (£25m); Romford metropolitan centre (£24m); Hornchurch (£8m) | ▪ There is £82m of comparison goods expenditure available to residents of this zone, which is largely split evenly between Romford metropolitan centre (£24m) and Lakeside (£25m).  
  ▪ A further £8m is spent at retail parks in Romford.  
  ▪ Hornchurch also attracts £8m of spending from residents in zone 4, the highest turnover it draws from any zone other than its ‘local’ zone (zone 2). |
| **Zone 5**  |
| Upminster | Lakeside (£47m); Upminster (£14m); Romford | ▪ There is £95m of comparison goods expenditure available to residents in this zone. Romford does not draw significant amounts of trade in comparison to Lakeside, which draws £47m |
By contrast Romford draws £15m, including £10m to the town centre.

Upminster town centre draws £14m of spending, which is considered to represent a reasonable performance given the comparison goods offer of the centre is largely restricted to day-to-day uses.

A further £4m of spending goes to Hornchurch, and £4m to Bluewater Shopping Centre.

Of the £95m comparison goods expenditure available, Romford accounts for £57m and is the most popular comparison goods shopping destination. The town centre draws £37m of spending, and Gallows Corner Retail Park also draws £15m of spending.

Lakeside also draws £15m of spending from this zone.

Harold Hill is the only centre in this zone. Our health check analysis has confirmed this is not a major comparison goods shopping destination but it nevertheless draws £3m of spending from residents in the zone.

No other destinations draw significant amounts of comparison goods spending.

There is £92m of comparison goods expenditure available to residents in this zone, and Romford accounts for the majority (£71m) of this spending, with £47m spent in the town centre.

Gallows Corner and Eastern Avenue Retail Parks draw £9m and £11m of spending respectively.

There is £127m of comparison goods expenditure available to residents in this zone. Romford is again the most popular destination for comparison goods shopping, attracting £68m of turnover, with the vast majority of this (£57m) accounted for by the town centre.

The remaining spending is split between a number of other destinations including Lakeside (£10m), Ilford (£10m), Goodmayes’ retail parks (£8m), Dagenham (£6m) and central London (£5m).

The £120m comparison goods expenditure available to this zone is relatively equally between three destinations: Romford metropolitan centre (£35m), Dagenham town centre (£30m) and Lakeside (£28m). There are also limited flows of expenditure to retail parks in Romford, and also in Beckton.

Of the £53m of comparison goods expenditure which is available to residents in this zone, the majority of spending is accounted for by Lakeside (£30m), which is geographically in closer proximity to many residents than shopping facilities in Romford.

Reflecting this, Romford attracts only £9m of spending from this zone, of which £8m is spent in the town centre.

£9m of expenditure also flows to Rainham, chiefly to the non-food offer in the Tesco Extra store.

Zone 11 covers an extensive geographical area, with £210m of comparison goods spending available to residents in the zone. Brentwood town centre accounts for the greatest proportion of spending (£81m), but there are also significant expenditure flows to Lakeside (£39m), Basildon (£27m) and Chelmsford (£10m).

Centres in LB Havering attract some expenditure from this zone, with Romford drawing £24m of spending in total, including £14m to Romford metropolitan centre and £8m to Gallows Corner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 6</th>
<th>Harold Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romford metropolitan centre (£37m); Gallows Corner Retail Park (£15m); Lakeside (£15m)</td>
<td>Of the £95m comparison goods expenditure available, Romford accounts for £57m and is the most popular comparison goods shopping destination. The town centre draws £37m of spending, and Gallows Corner Retail Park also draws £15m of spending. Lakeside also draws £15m of spending from this zone. Harold Hill is the only centre in this zone. Our health check analysis has confirmed this is not a major comparison goods shopping destination but it nevertheless draws £3m of spending from residents in the zone. No other destinations draw significant amounts of comparison goods spending.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 7</th>
<th>Collier Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romford metropolitan centre (£47m); Eastern Avenue Retail Park (£11m); Gallows Corner Retail Park (£9m)</td>
<td>There is £92m of comparison goods expenditure available to residents in this zone, and Romford accounts for the majority (£71m) of this spending, with £47m spent in the town centre. Gallows Corner and Eastern Avenue Retail Parks draw £9m and £11m of spending respectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 8</th>
<th>Chadwell Heath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romford metropolitan centre (£57m); Lakeside (£10m); Ilford (£10m)</td>
<td>There is £127m of comparison goods expenditure available to residents in this zone. Romford is again the most popular destination for comparison goods shopping, attracting £68m of turnover, with the vast majority of this (£57m) accounted for by the town centre. The remaining spending is split between a number of other destinations including Lakeside (£10m), Ilford (£10m), Goodmayes’ retail parks (£8m), Dagenham (£6m) and central London (£5m).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 9</th>
<th>Dagenham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romford metropolitan centre (£35m); Dagenham town centre (£30m); Lakeside (£28m)</td>
<td>The £120m comparison goods expenditure available to this zone is relatively equally between three destinations: Romford metropolitan centre (£35m), Dagenham town centre (£30m) and Lakeside (£28m). There are also limited flows of expenditure to retail parks in Romford, and also in Beckton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 10</th>
<th>Rainham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside (£30m); Rainham (£9m); Romford metropolitan centre (£8m)</td>
<td>Of the £53m of comparison goods expenditure which is available to residents in this zone, the majority of spending is accounted for by Lakeside (£30m), which is geographically in closer proximity to many residents than shopping facilities in Romford. Reflecting this, Romford attracts only £9m of spending from this zone, of which £8m is spent in the town centre. £9m of expenditure also flows to Rainham, chiefly to the non-food offer in the Tesco Extra store.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 11</th>
<th>Brentwood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood (£81m); Lakeside (£39m); Basildon (£27m)</td>
<td>Zone 11 covers an extensive geographical area, with £210m of comparison goods spending available to residents in the zone. Brentwood town centre accounts for the greatest proportion of spending (£81m), but there are also significant expenditure flows to Lakeside (£39m), Basildon (£27m) and Chelmsford (£10m). Centres in LB Havering attract some expenditure from this zone, with Romford drawing £24m of spending in total, including £14m to Romford metropolitan centre and £8m to Gallows Corner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From our analysis, it can be seen that Romford draws trade from across the study area. Using the household survey results we can define a ‘core catchment’ and ‘secondary catchment’ of Romford metropolitan centre, as shown in Table 4.5. From the ‘core catchment’ zones, Romford does not face any significant competition for expenditure and thus enjoys a dominant trading position. From the ‘secondary catchment’ zones, Romford metropolitan centre remains an important comparison goods shopping destination for many residents, but faces a greater degree of competition for expenditure from other locations in the surrounding network of centres.

Table 4.5 - Romford Core and Secondary Catchment Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romford metropolitan centre core catchment area (market share 40%+)</th>
<th>Romford metropolitan centre secondary catchment area (market share 10-39%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>Market share %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1 (Romford)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3 (Rush Green)</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 7 (Collier Row)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 8 (Chadwell Hth)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 9 (Dagenham)</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 10 (Rainham)</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table CM4, Appendix C

4.4.8 The findings of Table 4.4 are shown visually in Figure 4.2.

Figure 4.2 - Comparison Goods Market Share of Romford Metropolitan Centre

Source: Table CM4, Appendix C
For the most part, the retail parks in Romford do not act as significant competition to the town centre. However their contribution to their spending patterns is not insubstantial – when aggregated, Romford’s retail parks account for a 24% market share from zone 7, a 20% market share from zone 6, a 19% market share from zone 3, a 17% market share from zone 2, and a 12% market share from zone 1, enough for them to act as ‘secondary’ shopping locations in each of these zones.

The remaining centres in the Borough do not generate significant market shares as they are not higher-order comparison goods shopping destinations. Nevertheless Hornchurch acts as a secondary shopping destination for residents in zone 4 (market share 10%), and Upminster for residents in zone 5 (market share 15%). Rainham also attracts a 16% market share from its ‘local’ zone (zone 10), largely on account of the strong non-food offer within the large Tesco Extra store. Beyond their immediate zones, the trade draw attracted to each of the district centres is generally limited.

Patterns of Convenience Goods Spending

The household telephone survey also assessed patterns of convenience goods shopping across the study area. Convenience goods shopping is generally a more localised activity, although residents are sometimes prepared to travel further afield if they have preference for a particular supermarket brand. It is apparent that there is a good network of foodstores across the Borough, including provision in Romford metropolitan centre and the district centres. Table CV5 of Appendix C shows that of the £808.18m convenience goods expenditure which is available to residents of the study area, the vast majority - £749.85m, or 93% - is retained within the study area. Clearly this represents a high level of expenditure retention and suggests that for the most part, residents’ shopping needs are being provided for at the local level.

A more useful analysis is to look at ‘local’ retention rates – i.e. how much of the expenditure available to residents in each of the five survey zones is actually spent in those survey zones, or whether residents are travelling longer distances to undertake their convenience goods shopping. The ‘localised’ retention rate can be seen in Table CV4, by looking at the row ‘sub-total’ for each survey zone. Table CV4 shows that:

- **Zone 1 (Romford)** has a localised retention of 64%, and most of this is accounted for by the Asda and Sainsbury’s stores in Romford metropolitan centre. The majority of the rest of the market share is directed to the large Tesco Extra stores at Hornchurch (Roneo Corner) and Romford (Bryant Avenue) which are a short distance outside the zone boundary. We do not therefore consider the retention rate for central Romford represents cause for concern.

- **Zone 2 (Hornchurch)** has a localised retention of 69%, with the Tesco and Sainsbury’s stores both attracting good levels of support from local residents. Other residents shop in nearby stores in Romford (Sainsbury’s and Asda in the town centre, or the Tesco Extra store at Bryant Avenue), or Aldi in Upminster.

- **Zone 3 (Rush Green)** has a localised retention rate of 7%, as there are no major centres or foodstores in this zone. Most residents travel the short distance to Romford or Hornchurch to meet their convenience goods shopping needs, although notwithstanding this there may be a deficiency of smaller-format convenience goods provision within this area.

- **Zone 4 (Elm Park)** has a higher localised retention rate of 21% on account of the presence of the Tesco supermarket at Airfield Way, which, whilst relatively limited in size, does enable some residents’ shopping needs to be met. The majority of residents prefer to travel to larger stores further afield however, chiefly to the Tesco Extra store in Rainham and the nearby Sainsbury’s in Hornchurch. Zone 4 contains Elm Park district...
centre, but as this is only served by small c-store format supermarkets, does not result in a particularly high localised retention rate.

- **Zone 5 (Upminster)** has a localised retention rate of 58%, with the majority of this accounted for by the Aldi and Waitrose supermarkets in Upminster district centre. Both of these supermarkets are relatively small in size. Outside the zone, the most popular destination for convenience goods shopping is Sainsbury’s in Hornchurch.

- **Zone 6 (Harold Hill)** has a localised retention rate of 67%, largely accounted for by the presence of the Tesco Extra store at Bryant Avenue, which draws almost half of all convenience goods spending for this zone. Foodstores in Romford attract a market share of 18% from this zone.

- **Zone 7 (Collier Row)** has a localised retention rate of 26%, which is mostly accounted for by the Tesco Metro store within the district centre, and it is clear this store has a dominant influence over shopping patterns in the zone. Foodstores in zone 1 (Romford) attract a market share of just under 50% from this zone, with the Aldi supermarket at Marlborough Road attracting a 22% market share. The Tesco Extra store at Bryant Avenue (zone 6) also attracts a market share of 17%.

- **Zone 8 (Chadwell Heath)** has a localised retention rate of 48%, aided by the presence of two large supermarkets within the zone (Tesco Extra in Goodmayes, and Sainsbury’s in Chadwell Heath). 15% of residents undertake their food shopping in Romford, and 20% travel to stores in Dagenham.

- **Zone 9 (Dagenham)** has a localised retention of 63%, of which approximately half is accounted for by the Asda store in Dagenham. Residents in this zone do not look towards stores in Havering to any significant extent, with the exception of some modest flows of expenditure to stores in Rainham and Hornchurch.

- **Zone 10 (Rainham)** retains 53% of convenience goods expenditure, chiefly on account of the Tesco Extra store in Rainham district centre. 17% of expenditure flows to Dagenham, 10% to Romford and 9% to Hornchurch.

- **Zone 11 (Brentwood)** is largely self-contained in terms of convenience shopping patterns but some residents travel to the Tesco Extra store at Bryant Avenue as this operator is not represented with a large-format store in Brentwood.

4.5.4 The fluctuations in the localised retention rates are not, in themselves, cause for concern, given the dense urban nature of much of the study area which means that many zones only cover a small geographic area and that, in practice, travelling to a foodstore in a neighbouring survey zone is not a lengthy trip. However, there are also instances where they may point to a local deficiency, and therefore we have regard to these localised retention rates in developing our strategic recommendations.

4.5.5 Drawing the above analysis together, **Table 4.6** summarises the most popular convenience goods shopping destinations by zone. The stores with attract a ‘dominant’ market share (over 30% from any one zone) and a ‘secondary’ market share (10 to 30%) are highlighted. It can be seen that in zones 1 to 5, residents benefit from the choice of a number of large supermarkets, and therefore all of the most popular destinations attract secondary levels of market share. In zones 6, 9, 10, and 11, one supermarket exerts a dominant influence over shopping patterns, indicating that in these areas consumer choice is more limited.
### Table 4.6 - Most Popular Convenience Goods Destinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Most popular convenience shopping location</th>
<th>Second-most popular convenience shopping location</th>
<th>Third-most popular convenience shopping location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>Tesco Extra, Bryant Avenue (17%)</td>
<td>Sainsbury's, The Brewery (16%)</td>
<td>Asda, Mercury Gardens (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>Tesco Extra, Roneo Corner (29%)</td>
<td>Sainsbury's, Hornchurch (27%)</td>
<td>Asda, Mercury Gardens (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3</td>
<td>Tesco Extra, Roneo Corner (26%)</td>
<td>Sainsbury's, The Brewery (16%)</td>
<td>Asda, Mercury Gardens, (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 4</td>
<td>Tesco, Airfield Way, Elm Park (21%)</td>
<td>Tesco Extra, Rainham (21%)</td>
<td>Sainsbury's, Hornchurch (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 5</td>
<td>Aldi, Upminster (25%)</td>
<td>Waitrose, Upminster (15%)</td>
<td>Tesco Extra, Bryant Avenue (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 6</td>
<td>Tesco Extra, Bryant Avenue (45%)</td>
<td>Iceland, Harold Hill (8%)</td>
<td>Asda, Mercury Gardens (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 7</td>
<td>Tesco Metro, Collier Row (21%)</td>
<td>Tesco Extra, Bryant Avenue (17%)</td>
<td>Asda, Mercury Gardens (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 8</td>
<td>Sainsbury's, Chadwell Heath (23%)</td>
<td>Tesco Extra, Goodmayes (16%)</td>
<td>Morrisons, Becontree Heath (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 9</td>
<td>Asda, Dagenham (35%)</td>
<td>Morrisons, Becontree Heath (8%)</td>
<td>Tesco Extra, Rainham (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 10</td>
<td>Tesco Extra, Rainham (44%)</td>
<td>Asda, Dagenham (8%)</td>
<td>Tesco Express, Rainham (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 11</td>
<td>Sainsbury's, Brentwood (48%)</td>
<td>Other foodstores, Brentwood (20%)</td>
<td>Tesco Extra, Bryant Avenue (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table CV4, Appendix C

**4.5.6** Having identified where residents in the study area are currently undertaking their shopping, the next step of the study is to assess the quantitative need for additional retail floorspace, and we consider this in the following section.
5 Need for Retail Floorspace

Read this section alongside:
- Volume 2, Appendix C (Quantitative retail need tables)
- Volume 2, Appendix D (Quantitative retail need methodology)
- Volume 2, Appendix E (Summary of technical inputs)

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 In the previous section we set out the current patterns of retail spending in the study area, based on the findings of the household telephone survey of shopping patterns. Having considered this, in this section we set out the ‘need’ for additional retail floorspace over the course of the study period to 2031, having regard to both quantitative capacity forecasts (sections 5.3 to 5.5) and qualitative observations (section 5.6). At the outset we emphasise that capacity forecasts should be subject to regular review throughout the Council’s Plan period, in order to ensure an up-to-date evidence base which is based on accurate economic and market trends. We also advise that longer-term quantitative forecasts set out in this assessment (post-2021) should be treated as indicative.

5.1.2 We therefore firstly consider the quantitative need for retail floorspace in the Borough over the study period. Our assessment is based on a standard methodology (see Appendix D of Volume 2 for a summary of our approach), and is based on up-to-date empirical forecasts.

5.1.3 The quantitative need forecasts are derived from the total amount of comparison and convenience goods expenditure which is retained within the Borough. In the previous section we have identified the total amount of expenditure which is retained within the study area — but for the purposes of our quantitative forecasts this needs to be adjusted further to remove those parts of the study area which are outside the administrative boundaries of the Borough. Therefore, for the purposes of our quantitative need assessment, we adopt the total expenditure retained within zones 1 to 7 (inclusive) and zone 10 as these most closely align with the administrative boundaries of the Borough. Table 5.1 summarises the expenditure retention from these zones, relative to that of the wider study area.

Table 5.1 - Summary of Expenditure Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expenditure retained within study area (£m)</th>
<th>Expenditure retained within study area (%)</th>
<th>Expenditure retained within LB Havering (Zones 1-7 &amp; Zone 10)</th>
<th>Expenditure retained within LB Havering (Zones 1-7 &amp; Zone 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison goods</td>
<td>780.22</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>624.01</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience goods</td>
<td>749.85</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>501.35</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table CM5, Table CM6, Table CV5, Table CV7, Appendix C

5.1.4 Therefore the purposes of our assessment we adopt the retention rates shown in the final column of Table 5.1 – i.e. 52% for comparison goods and 62% for convenience goods. We assume that these retention rates will remain unchanged over the study period for the purposes of our ‘baseline’ assessment, but for the comparison goods capacity forecasts we also assume that there is scope for Romford to further improve its market share over the course of the study period, in line with its designation as a Metropolitan Centre. We return to discuss this below.
5.2 Claims on Expenditure

5.2.1 We have set out in the previous section that ‘special forms of trading’ such as online shopping is removed from our baseline expenditure forecasts, in line with current forecasts of growth in this sector set out in Experian’s Retail Planner Briefing Note 11. The total expenditure figures summarised in Table 5.1 make allowance for this.

5.2.2 In addition to SFT there are two further claims on expenditure growth which need to be taken into account in our capacity projections: commitments to new retail floorspace (which are schemes under construction at the time of the household survey, or extant planning permissions which would result in additional retail floorspace); and sales density growth (which is the growth in turnover for existing retailers within the study area).

Commitments to New Retail Floorspace

5.2.3 From monitoring data provided to us by the Council, we have identified two schemes which benefit from planning permission for new retail floorspace — the redevelopment of the former Romford Ice Rink at Rom Valley Way, Romford, to form a Morrisons supermarket, and the mixed-use redevelopment of the former Decathlon store at Angel Way, Romford, which includes residential, food & drink and hotel uses, as well as both comparison and convenience goods floorspace. In Table 5.2 we set out the floorspace and estimated turnover of these commitments, which informs our capacity forecasts.

Table 5.2 - Commitments to New Retail Floorspace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comparison goods floorspace</th>
<th>Convenience goods floorspace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net sales area (sqm)</td>
<td>Turnover, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrisons, Rom Valley Way, Romford</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Decathlon, Angel Way, Romford</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,514</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table CM7, Table CV7, Appendix C

Sales Density Growth

5.2.4 Sales density growth (also known as floorspace productivity growth) is the amount of expenditure which is ‘ring fenced’ for existing floorspace to improve its turnover each year. Allowances for sales density growth are linked to expenditure growth; Table 5.3 summarises the expenditure growth rates we have used for the purposes of our assessment. It should be noted that, owing to the low forecast levels of expenditure growth for the convenience goods sector, we do not forecast any sales density growth in this sector until 2016 onwards.

Table 5.3 - Sales Density Growth Rates

|                                | Comparison goods sales density growth (% per annum) | Convenience goods sales density growth (% per annum) |
|                                |                                                    |                                                 |
| To 2016                        | 1.7%                                                | 0%                                               |
| 2016 onwards                   | 1.7%                                                | 0.3%                                             |

Source: Table CM6, Table CV7, Appendix C
5.2.5 This is a blanket sales density growth for all floorspace across the Borough. Inevitably, different types of floorspace have different ability to absorb expenditure growth – relatively modern floorspace (for example much of that in Romford metropolitan centre, and to a lesser extent the larger district centres) is better equipped than older property stock (for example some of the stock in secondary areas of Romford metropolitan centre). Given this is a Borough-wide study, a blanket approach is considered robust.

5.3 Over-Trading of Floorspace

5.3.1 ‘Over-trading’ refers to both the performance of centres and stores within a catchment when related to ‘benchmark’ (i.e. expected) turnovers, as well as more qualitative indicators such as overcrowding and congestion in stores. It is therefore both a quantitative and qualitative indicator of need.

5.3.2 Quantitatively, for comparison goods floorspace, we do not consider it appropriate to make allowance for the over-trading of town centre floorspace. For convenience goods floorspace, we have undertaken a detailed trading assessment of each of the principal foodstores across the Borough (principally foodstores with a net sales area upwards of 500 sqm, or those with a significant turnover from their local zones), and compared their trading performance with an expected ‘benchmark’ turnover (that is, the turnover the store would be expected to achieve if trading at company average turnover per sqm rates). Although this exercise is reliant on the use of operator average data in terms of the split between convenience and comparison goods floorspace within the stores (except in some stores where we have adjusted this based on our own estimate of sales mix from having visited the stores), and is based on national average sales densities, it nevertheless provides a robust, and industry-accepted, method of assessing current trading performance.

5.3.3 Our assessment of foodstore trading performance is set out at Table CV6 of Appendix C. This shows that, on aggregate, foodstores across the Borough are presently trading strongly, with a handful of foodstores trading significantly in excess of company average levels. Table CV6 shows that:

- Foodstores in the Romford Central area are trading, on aggregate, at about £8m above average. Whilst it would appear that the Asda store at Mercury Gardens is trading strongly, this is counterbalanced by the Sainsbury’s store at The Brewery which appears to be under-trading by a similar amount; the two largely cancel each other out. The Aldi store at Marlborough Road is also trading strongly, at about £13m above company averages.

- All foodstores in zone 2 (Hornchurch) are trading at above benchmark levels, with the Tesco Extra store at Roneo Corner trading at £17m above average, and Sainsbury’s in Hornchurch trading at £9m above average. In total foodstores in this zone are trading at £32m above average.

- The Aldi store in Upminster (zone 3) appears to be trading very strongly, at three times the company average. The Waitrose and Marks & Spencer Simply Food stores within Upminster District Centre both appear to be trading at just below company average levels.

- The Tesco Extra store at Bryant Avenue is another store which is trading very strongly, at above £26m above its benchmark level. The Tesco Metro store in Collier Row is also trading well, at about £11m above average.

- The Tesco Extra store in Rainham appears to have a trading performance more aligned to company average levels, but nevertheless trades at £4m above benchmark.
5.3.4 **Table CV6** shows that on aggregate foodstores across the Borough are over-trading at approximately £97.6m above company average levels – we therefore factor this trading performance into our capacity assessment.

5.4 **Comparison Goods Needs Assessment**

5.4.1 Drawing the above inputs together, **Table CM6 of Appendix C** shows the quantitative need for additional comparison goods floorspace in the Borough over the study period to 2031, based on current shopping patterns, and making allowance for sales density growth as discussed above. The table is structured as follows:

- **Row A** shows the total population of the study area at the interval years of 2014, 2017, 2021, 2026, 2029 and 2031.
- **Row B** shows the total comparison goods expenditure available to the study area at the same interval years.
- **Row C** shows the proportion of comparison goods expenditure which is retained within centres within LB Havering, which, as shown in Table 5.1, amounts to 52% of total comparison goods expenditure. This is shown in monetary terms in **Row D**, at the base year of 2014 and equivalent figures for each of the interval years under a ‘no development’ scenario (i.e. assuming that current shopping patterns remain unchanged over the duration of the study period);
- **Row E** shows the amount of expenditure which ‘leaks’ to destinations outside the District, and is the product of Row B minus Row D;
- **Row F** and **Row G** show in percentage terms (Row F) and monetary terms (Row G), the amount of inflow into the Borough. We have made no allowance for inflow of expenditure into our capacity forecasts and therefore these rows remain blank.
- **Row H** shows the total comparison goods turnover of destinations in the Borough (i.e., the retained expenditure, plus the inflow). This is held constant over the study period to 2031, and the growth in retained expenditure (the ‘initial surplus’) is shown in **Row I**. Row I therefore shows that by 2017 there will be £96.26m of surplus comparison goods expenditure in the SA, and by 2031 we forecast this figure to increase to £681.53m.
- **Rows J and K** summarise the ‘claims’ on comparison goods expenditure, as summarised in **Section 5.2** and **Section 5.3**. Row J shows that sales density growth accounts for £32.37m by 2017 and £207.08m by 2031. Row K shows that the comparison goods commitments discussed above amount to a ‘claim’ of £9.89m at 2017 and we increase the turnover of these in line with sales density growth rates. **Row L** is a summary of Rows J and K.
- **Rows M to R** finally summarise the surplus expenditure capacity available in the SA for new comparison goods floorspace, and convert this expenditure to physical floorspace requirements:
  - **Row M** shows the ‘initial surplus’ of comparison goods expenditure which is available to the District over the period to 2031 (as per Row I)
  - **Row N** then subtracts the total ‘claims’ on capacity (as per Row L)
  - **Row O** shows the residual expenditure, in monetary terms, which is available to support new comparison goods floorspace. There is a positive residual for each of the interval periods – so there is surplus capacity to support new floorspace for each interval period.
o **Row P** shows the sales density, i.e. the turnover per sqm, which is used to translate the residual expenditure to a floorspace requirement. For the purposes of our assessment we have used a turnover of £7,000 per sqm at 2014, which increases in line with our sales density growth estimates, to £9,323 per sqm by 2031. As the majority of the comparison goods floorspace in the Borough is accounted for by Romford metropolitan centre, which is a higher-order metropolitan centre and therefore likely to be the focus for future comparison goods development, it is appropriate to allow for a reasonably high sales density when calculating the scope for new floorspace.

o **Row Q** shows the net comparison goods floorspace for the Borough, by applying Row O to Row P. Finally, using a gross:net ratio of 70%, **Row R** translates the net requirements to a gross figure.

5.4.2 In **Table CM7 of Appendix C**, we test the comparison goods floorspace requirements which would arise if centres in the Borough were able to achieve an uplift in the amount of expenditure which is retained over the course of the study period, from the current retention rate of 52% to 57% by the end of the study period in 2031. Whilst a 5 percentage points uplift may not, on paper, seem a significant amount, Table CM7 shows that it delivers a significantly larger floorspace requirement than under the ‘constant market share’ scenario. Any uplift in floorspace will be related to the ability of Romford to deliver quality new comparison goods retail floorspace, reflective of its role as a Metropolitan centre. Given the aspirations of Lakeside for its own centre, we consider that any aggregate uplift over and beyond the 5 percentage points will be difficult to achieve.

5.4.3 For ease of reference, **Table 5.4** summarises the quantitative need for additional comparison goods as identified in **Table CM6** and **Table CM7 of Appendix C**. The requirements summarised in **Table 5.4** are cumulative, and are based on the assumption that current patterns of shopping will remain unchanged for the duration of the study period.

**Table 5.4 - Summary of Comparison Goods Need to 2031**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>floorspace req't</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sqm net) – static</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>16,100</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>42,300</td>
<td>49,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>floorspace req't</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sqm net) – increasing retention</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>38,200</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table CM6, Appendix C. Figures are cumulative. Figures in italics are indicative.

5.4.4 Therefore, the Council should make provision for between 16,100 and 21,500 sqm net additional comparison goods floorspace in the period to 2021, and indicatively between 49,500 and 62,000 sqm net by 2031. These figures should be kept under regular review throughout the study period.

5.5 **Convenience Goods Needs Assessment**

5.5.1 **Table CV7 of Appendix C** sets out the quantitative requirements for additional convenience goods floorspace for the Borough over the study period to 2031. The structure of the table follows that of **Table CM6**, so we do not repeat our description of the steps here. There is an additional row in the table (Row O) which builds in the trading performance of existing foodstores into the capacity projections, in order to take into account the over-trading of the foodstores across the Borough which we have identified above.
5.5.2 Table 5.5 summarises the quantitative convenience goods floorspace requirements, and identifies that, based on the current shopping patterns and trading performance of foodstores, there is a quantitative need for 7,500 sqm net additional convenience goods floorspace by 2021, increasing to an indicative requirement of 13,200 sqm net by 2031. This represents a quantitative need over the course of the study period, some of which should be developed in line with our qualitative recommendations (see below). On account of the strong Borough-wide retention rate, we do not test an 'increasing retention' requirement for convenience goods floorspace.

5.5.3 It should be noted that the requirement decreases between 2014 and 2017 as by 2017 the two extant planning commitments for new convenience goods floorspace have been taken into account in by 2017 (albeit it is appreciated that they might not be fully completed or occupied by 2017).

Table 5.5 - Summary of Convenience Goods Need to 2031

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience goods floorspace req’t (sqm net)</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>13,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table CV7, Appendix C. Figures are cumulative. Figures in italics are indicative.

5.6 Qualitative Need Assessment

5.6.1 Both the NPPF and the PPG are silent on the weight to be attached to qualitative retail floorspace needs, and how such needs should be assessed. We therefore revert back to the guidance in the preceding CLG Practice Guidance, which advises that qualitative factors to take into account include identifying gaps in local provision; consumer choice and competition; over-trading; ‘location-specific issues’, and quality of existing provision. Below we therefore present a discussion of these criteria, which largely overlap with one another, informed by our health check assessments of the town centres (Section 3) and our review of the current patterns of shopping (Section 4).

Qualitative Comparison Goods Needs

5.6.2 Gaps in provision are ultimately subjective; what one particular shopper may consider a gap in provision may not be of particular concern to another. Ultimately, centres need to be able to meet as many day-to-day shopping needs of local residents as possible, to help minimise expenditure leakage and promote sustainable patterns of shopping.

5.6.3 Our health check assessment and the results of the household survey indicate that Romford metropolitan centre generally does a good job of meeting residents’ comparison goods shopping needs. It draws a strong market share from 10 of the 11 survey zones, and is the dominant comparison goods shopping destination for four of those zones. Its influence over shopping patterns lessens in the southern half of the study area as residents in these areas benefit from good proximity to Lakeside. As our study has identified, Lakeside has ambitious plans for further enhancement of its retail offer over the course of the Council’s plan period, including the transformation of the shopping centre and adjacent developments into a fully-fledged ‘town centre’. Each of the 11 survey zones loses market share to Lakeside, ranging from 8% (zones 7 and 8) to 58% (zone 10). Romford cannot be complacent therefore; ongoing upgrading of its retail offer – including the modernisation of existing floorspace – will need to take place throughout the Plan period to ensure it retains its popularity as a comparison goods shopping destination.

5.6.4 The Liberty Centre sets a good benchmark for the type of shopping development which modern retailers seek to locate in. The units are generally large, the shopping environment is welcoming, and the centre is well-connected with the surrounding retail offer and public
transport networks. The older parts of the Liberty Centre (such as Stewards Walk) appear dated however. Despite not being relatively old, Mercury Mall does not offer the same quality retail environment, and this is reflected by a weaker tenant mix (although the presence of Asda is an important ‘anchor’ store). There are a good number of ‘anchor’ stores located throughout the town centre which help to disperse footfall across a wide area.

5.6.5 South Street, whilst historically the main thoroughfare, is in need of investment and upgrading of many of its units, in order to remain competitive and an integral part of the town centre. Some of the units in this location are low-grade retail and other uses (such as amusement arcades, pawnbrokers and so on) which do not reflect the primary shopping frontage allocation of this area. Many units are on the small side. The improvement in the quality of the retail offer along the pedestrianised section of South Street is therefore considered to represent both a priority and an opportunity for the Council over the course of the study period in order to cement Romford’s currently-strong trading position; whilst we have not assessed land ownership in this area, it is considered that amalgamation of units to increase their attractiveness to the retail market should be reviewed as an option.

5.6.6 The Brewery is a positive addition to the town centre through its provision of larger-format retail units, but does turn its back on the centre to a large extent. Better integration of this development would be beneficial – particularly because the extensive car parking which serves this site is likely to represent the principal opportunity for the town centre in the future (we return to discuss this later in the report).

5.6.7 The fashion offer of Romford metropolitan centre is good, with a healthy representation of mid-market retailers such as Gap, H&M, Next and so on. There is little to distinguish the retail offer from that of competing centres, and the attraction of a greater variety of mid-to-upper market retailers to the centre (examples might include Zara, Pull & Bear, Urban Outfitters and Lakeland) will help to ‘shore up’ the retention rate in the medium to long term and fend off the risk of further market share being lost to Lakeside. Generally speaking, retailer demand is linked to quality of provision; with the development of modern, larger-floorplan retail floorspace (which could involve the modernisation / amalgamation of existing retail premises), we would expect that there is scope for further retailers to be attracted to the town centre, particularly if opportunities are provided within/adjacent to the existing primary shopping area.

5.6.8 We have established that the district centres in Havering do not act as significant comparison goods shopping destinations in their own right. However, they play an important role in meeting local shopping needs and therefore their function as comparison goods shopping destinations should continue to be supported. Indeed, there is considerable difference in the offer of the larger district centres – Hornchurch and Upminster – with smaller centres such as Elm Park. Hornchurch seems to draw trade from a moderate catchment area. These centres do not compete with Romford (and Lakeside) per se, but rather offer a complementary role. There are gaps in the retail offer – none of the centres have particularly strong clothing & footwear provision for example — but unless the Council wishes for the centres to operate at a higher position in the District’s retail hierarchy, we would not expect this situation to significantly change over the course of the study period.

5.6.9 The main opportunity for the district centres lies with the opportunity to create a more specialist retail offer which offers an alternative to the national multiples-focused offer in Romford metropolitan centre. There is scope for Hornchurch to further develop this role, building on its existing strengths as a leisure-based destination.

5.6.10 A further constraint to the district centres significantly altering their role and function is a lack of suitable sites for significant expansion of their retail offer. Whilst we are aware of potential opportunity sites in Hornchurch, other centres are generally quite constrained in terms of their ability to accommodate a substantial amount of retail floorspace (i.e. of the scale which would change their role and function as a district centre). We therefore expect these centres to operate with incremental improvements to their retail offer coming forward, which should be
supported by the Council providing they are of an appropriate scale in relation to the role and function of the centre in question.

5.6.11 For all centres, reflecting national planning guidance, any new development should be directed towards town centres in the first instance.

Qualitative Convenience Goods Needs

5.6.12 The household survey confirms that the Borough is served by a good network of foodstores, with Romford metropolitan centre and surrounding urban area particularly well served for. The household survey also confirms that the existing network of foodstores are, for the most part, trading strongly, with the majority of stores trading above company average levels – significantly so, in some cases. The identified over-trading in itself is an indication that there is pent-up demand for additional provision.

Romford metropolitan centre has two large foodstores anchoring the western and eastern ends of the town centre – Sainsbury’s at The Brewery, M&S at the Liberty and and Asda at Mercury Mall. There are also Aldi and Lidl discount supermarkets and smaller c-stores. The offer in this part of the study area will be further enhanced through the development of a Morrisons supermarket on the site of the former Romford Ice Rink, which will provide further consumer choice and competition. Having regard to this outstanding permission, we do not consider there to be a qualitative need for additional convenience goods provision in the vicinity of Romford metropolitan centre.

Upminster is served by three supermarkets within the district centre boundary (Waitrose, Aldi and Marks & Spencer Simply Food), and whilst none of the stores are especially large, they are considered to be of a scale which will enable many residents’ top-up and larger shopping needs to be met. The Aldi store is trading very strongly, but the Waitrose and M&S stores – both of which are in slightly peripheral locations within the centre boundary – are performing less well. We do not consider there to be a pressing need for further provision in this area.

Similarly, Hornchurch district centre offers Sainsbury’s and Iceland supermarkets, and whilst the former is the only large supermarket in the town centre (and is over-trading) and thus occupies a monopolistic position over shopping patterns in the town centre, realistically we are not aware of any opportunity sites which could accommodate comparable-sized provision. The out-of-centre Tesco Extra store is also trading strongly, but given the identified constraints, we would expect future provision in Hornchurch town centre to be smaller-sized c-store developments.

There are qualitative opportunities in some of the smaller district centres. Elm Park is only served by small convenience stores, and would benefit from some larger-format provision (in terms of a medium-format supermarket, up to 1,000 sqm net), ideally located within or adjacent to the district centre, to reduce expenditure leakage to Hornchurch and Rainham. Similarly, Harold Hill has limited provision at present – although we are aware that there is an undetermined planning application for a Lidl foodstore in this area. In Rainham, there is a lack of consumer choice and the household survey results confirm that the Tesco Extra store occupies a monopolistic position over shopping patterns in this part of the Borough. We do not consider there to be an urgent requirement for additional provision in Collier Row.

5.7 Summary of Retail Need

5.7.1 Our capacity assessment has identified a need for the following amounts of floorspace:

- **Comparison goods**: between 16,100 and 21,500 sqm net additional comparison goods floorspace by 2021, increasing to between 49,500 sqm net and 62,000 sqm net by 2031.
- **Convenience goods**: up to 7,500 sqm net by 2021, increasing to 13,200 sqm net by 2031.

5.7.2 Our qualitative assessment identifies that, for comparison goods shopping provision, there is a need to improve the quality of the retail stock in Romford metropolitan centre in order to ‘future proof’ the town centre and protect its role and function as a Metropolitan Centre, and in the first instance the focus for this improvement needs to be South Street, where modernisation and amalgamation of units to create larger-format developments should be considered a priority. Improvements to the quality of the retail provision should in turn assist in diversifying the quality of the retail offer, and a key aspiration of the Council should be to seek the attraction of more middle/upper-middle-order comparison goods retailers to the centre in the short-to-medium term.

5.7.3 We do not consider there to be a pressing qualitative need for additional provision elsewhere in the Borough. However there is scope for the diversity of uses in all of the smaller centres to be improved, and therefore in instances where applications come forward which seek to provide additional comparison goods floorspace, they should be supported provided they are suitably located and are of an appropriate scale.

5.7.4 Turning to qualitative convenience goods needs (which have no specific timescale), when assessing current provision within centres and the patterns of shopping identified in the household survey, we consider that:

- There is no requirement for any additional large-format foodstore provision within or in the vicinity of Romford metropolitan centre, or Upminster district centre;
- There is a requirement for additional provision within or on the edge of Hornchurch district centre (if a suitable site can be identified) to improve consumer choice and reduce the over-trading of the existing foodstores in the area;
- There is a requirement for provision of a small to medium-sized foodstore in the Elm Park area (indicatively up to 1,000 sqm net), which should if possible be located within or adjacent to the district centre;
- There is a requirement for an additional small to medium sized foodstore in the Harold Hill area which should be locate within or adjacent to the district centre.
- There is a requirement for additional foodstore provision in the Rainham area to improve consumer choice and assist in meeting the future growth needs of this area;
- There is no qualitative requirement for additional provision in the Collier Row area.
6 Need for Commercial Leisure Floorspace

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 In this section we provide a summary of the scope for additional commercial leisure and other town centre uses which can be supported in the study area. Our findings are informed by an assessment of the growth of expenditure on leisure goods spending which is expected to come forward in the study area over the period to 2031, supported by the findings of the household survey of shopping and leisure patterns, as discussed previously in the report. We have also taken into consideration of findings from the previous Retail and Commercial Leisure Study (2012). The comments set out in this section should be read in conjunction with the leisure capacity quantitative tables set out at Appendix G to Volume 2.

6.2 Expenditure Growth in the Leisure Services Sector

6.2.1 Experian provide 2012-based per capita spending on the following key commercial leisure sectors:

- Accommodation services (e.g. hotels, room hire);
- Cultural services (e.g. cinema, theatre, museums, tv subscriptions);
- Games of chance (.e.g. lottery, bingo, bookmakers);
- Hairdressing salons and personal grooming / beauty establishments;
- Recreational and sporting services; and
- Restaurants and cafes

6.2.2 By applying the per capita figure to the projected population growth in the study area, the amount of total expenditure growth in each of these sectors can be identified. This is summarised in Table 6.1.
Table 6.1 - Growth in Commercial Leisure Sectors to 2031

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Spending, 2014 (£m)</th>
<th>Spending, 2021 (£m)</th>
<th>Spending, 2029 (£m)</th>
<th>Spending, 2031 (£m)</th>
<th>Growth in spending, 2014-31 (£m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation services</td>
<td>50.57</td>
<td>61.75</td>
<td>74.89</td>
<td>78.39</td>
<td>27.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural services</td>
<td>115.16</td>
<td>140.88</td>
<td>171.03</td>
<td>179.02</td>
<td>63.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games of chance</td>
<td>54.37</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>81.01</td>
<td>84.81</td>
<td>30.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdressing &amp; beauty</td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td>42.90</td>
<td>51.99</td>
<td>54.41</td>
<td>19.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational &amp; sporting services</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>67.14</td>
<td>81.43</td>
<td>85.23</td>
<td>30.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants &amp; cafes</td>
<td>423.75</td>
<td>518.07</td>
<td>628.77</td>
<td>658.14</td>
<td>234.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table LC3, Appendix G.

6.2.3 Table 6.1 shows that the majority of growth in the commercial leisure sector will come forward in the restaurants and cafes category, which will experience growth of over £234m over the course of the study period. Spending in cultural services and games of chance will increase by £64m and £30m respectively. There is therefore significant opportunity for centres in Havering to capitalise on this growth of expenditure, building on and enhancing what is, in the Borough’s largest centres, already a generally good level of representation from commercial leisure operators.

6.2.4 Whilst 60% of those surveyed do most of their household’s fashion shopping in Romford, linked trips are uncommon, with only 38% of those surveyed combining shopping with other activities.

6.2.5 As with the retail sector, it is possible to assess patterns of commercial leisure spending through the household survey of spending patterns which was undertaken in support of this study. An estimate of the quantitative need for new food & drink floorspace can also be forecast.

6.3 Restaurants and Cafes

6.3.1 The food and drink offer varies from centre to centre across the Borough. Generally, the smaller centres have a high provision of A5 (fast food and takeaways) and a smaller proportion of restaurants, cafes (A3) and drinking establishments (A4). Romford, as would be expected, has the highest number of café and restaurant uses as well as the highest diversity of these uses in terms of the range of options available.

Romford

6.3.2 As a metropolitan centre Romford has a good provision of A3 and A5 uses. In total there are 67 A3 and A5 units within the centre, with good representation from national restaurant and fast food chain operators. This includes fast food operators such as KFC, McDonalds, Burger King and Subway as well as a number of casual dining, family oriented options including Frankie & Bennie’s, Toby Carvery, Pizza Express, Zizzi and Nandos. National multiple operators within Romford are principally located within the primary retail frontage and the Liberty (mostly cafes) and the Brewery (where there is a broader mix in the vicinity of the cinema). It was generally felt that the first floor leisure uses at The Brewery are poorly integrated with the rest of the shopping centre and the wider town centre. There is noticeably
high number of hot food take-aways within parts of the town centre – especially in the peripheral shopping areas i.e. along North Street, London Road, southern end of South Street and Victoria Road. In all, we assessed Romford’s offer to be fairly basic as it mainly addressed the budget family and core youth markets. The centre could benefit from a higher quality of restaurants.

6.3.3 The branded coffee shop offer in Romford metropolitan centre includes two Starbucks outlets at the Brewery and The Liberty Shopping Centre and 3 Costa Coffee outlets located – one located within the Brewery and the remaining two located in the town centre.

6.3.4 Romford also has a good number of drinking (A4) establishments within the town centre, mostly concentrated around the South Street area, where there are also three nightclubs.

6.3.5 Reviewing the findings of the household survey, of those residents who stated they spend money on visiting restaurants, 34.1% of Zone 1 residents spend money on restaurants within Romford metropolitan centre. Romford’s appeal extends beyond the immediate area however, with the town centre also drawing market share from 28.5% of Zone 3 residents, 28.2% of Zone 9 residents and 27.6% of Zone 7 residents. Indeed, the centre attracts a significant amount of spend from all zones except Zone 11 (where residents prefer to use facilities in Brentwood) – this largely reflects the trends seen in retail spending patterns. Expenditure on cafes and pubs is similarly consistent: 35.4% of Zone 1 residents spend their money on cafes and drinking establishments within Romford. As with restaurants, Romford attracts a significant amount of spend from neighbouring zones, including Zone 3 (28.1%), Zone 8 (23.3%) and Zone 6 (20.0%).

Hornchurch

6.3.6 The food and drink offer in Hornchurch is strong for a centre of its size and when considering its defined role and function as a district centre. In total there are 30 restaurants and take away facilities within the district centre, of which nine are A5 uses. National operators represented in the district centre include casual dining mid-range operators such as Zizzi, Ask, Chimichanga, Nandos and Prezzo. The fast food offer includes KFC, McDonalds, Wimpy and Subway. Café operators Starbucks and Costa Coffee complete the offer. There are seven pubs and bars within the centre.

6.3.7 49.5% of Zone 2 residents and 40.3% of Zone 4 residents spend money on restaurants within Hornchurch. Hornchurch also attracts expenditure from surrounding zones including 29.5% of Zone 3 residents and 19.6% of Zone 10 residents. The expenditure on cafes and drinking establishments in Hornchurch is broadly similar to the expenditure on restaurants. 44.9% of Zone 4 residents, 40.8% of Zone 2 residents and 19.7% of Zone 10 residents visit cafes and bars within Hornchurch. Given its role and function as a district centre we consider these to represent good levels of market share attraction and confirmation that Hornchurch plays an important role as an evening destination.

Upminster

6.3.8 Upminster has a total of 29 A3 and A5 units within the district centre. The number of hot food takeaways within the district centre is high. While the centre has a fairly high number of restaurants and cafes, the offer is narrow and mostly consists of Chinese, Indian and Italian restaurants. National restaurant operators present within the town centre include Prezzo and Pizza Express while the fast food offering is represented by Subway, Wimpy and Papa John’s Pizza as well as an extensive number of independent operators. Finally café operators within Upminster include Costa Coffee and Café Nero. Upminster also has two pubs within the town centre. Restaurants in Upminster have a localised catchment area with 50.6% of Zone 5 residents spending the most amount of money within the district centre but limited trade is drawn from beyond this. 48.2% of Zone 5 residents spent money on cafes and bars within the centre but again results from other zones are negligible. Nevertheless the results indicate that Upminster is doing respectable job of meeting local commercial leisure needs.
Collier Row

6.3.9 Collier Row has 16 A3 and A5 units. The bulk of the food and drink offer is dominated by hot food takeaways. There are only two restaurants within the district centre. National operators present within the centre are Pizza Hut and Domino’s Pizza, both of which are takeaways. The rest of the fast food and restaurant offer is given over to independent operators. Collier Row has no cafes but it does have a pub. Only 5.6% of Zone 7 residents spend money on restaurants in Collier Row. The centre does not attract any spending from residents of the surrounding zones. For expenditure on cafes and drinking establishments, only 12.3% of Zone 7 residents use facilities in the district centre. Again, Collier Row does not attract any spending from residents in the surrounding zones.

Harold Hill

6.3.10 Harold Hill has five A3 and A5 units within the centre. There are no national restaurant or café operators within the centre. The offer includes two takeaway restaurants, two cafes and a restaurant. The centre has no drinking establishments. The centre only attracts 1.6% of spending from residents in Zone 10, and small amounts from neighbouring zones. Cafes and drinking establishments within the centre attract 3.1% of the resident’s expenditure in Zone 7 and 2.3% in Zone 6. Provision in the district centre can thus be considered to be limited.

Rainham

6.3.11 Rainham has a total of seven A3 and A5 units within the town centre, of these 4 are A5 units. The only national restaurant operator is Pizza Hut. The centre also has three pubs. In terms of expenditure on restaurants 12.7% of Zone 10 residents spend money within the centre. There is also limited spending from residents of Zone 4 (1.0%) and Zone 9 (1.4%). 12.4% of residents of Zone 10 spent money on pubs and cafes within Rainham followed by Zone 4 (1.2%) and Zone 3 (0.6%).

Elm Park

6.3.12 Elm Park has a total of 17 A3 and A5 units within the centre. The town centre is dominated by independent takeaways, the only national multiple operator is Dominos. According to the telephone household survey, there is very limited spending on A3 and A5 uses in Elm Park. However, 3.38% of Zone 10 residents spent money on bars and pubs in the centre.

Growth in Spending

6.3.13 Compared to retail, food and drink spending is much more mobile, due to the trend for people to travel longer distances to socialise, and since there are no constraints connected with transporting goods to the home. Table 6.2 sets out the extent of expenditure retention of destinations in LB Havering.

Table 6.2 - Summary of Retention of Food and Drink Spending in Study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spending, 2014 (£m)</th>
<th>Spending, 2014 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total spending in LB Havering</td>
<td>230.60</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total spending at centres outside LB Havering</td>
<td>193.15</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall total</td>
<td>423.75</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table LC6, Appendix G
6.3.14 On aggregate therefore, centres in LB Havering retain 54% of the total food and drink spending which is available to the study area. The main competition for expenditure for the Borough is Lakeside, Dagenham, and Brentwood, with the latter exerting considerably more influence over spending patterns in the study area for food and drink spending than it does for retail spending. Reflecting the ease of access which much of the Borough benefits from into central London, and the strength of the offer in this location, it is not surprising to see many residents of the Borough choose to direct their spending to facilities here. The figures need to be considered in the context of the fact that people tend to spend more on food and drink when they are visiting destinations (for example, on a day trip). Therefore, we would not expect the study area to retain 100% of available expenditure — but nevertheless we consider there to be some scope for improvement in the level of expenditure retention over the course of the study period.

6.3.15 In Appendix G, we set out summaries of spending patterns on the two different types of food and drink spending:

- Table LC4 shows the market shares for spending on restaurants (with and without survey responses for ‘don’t know / don’t undertake this type of activity’); and
- Tables LC5 shows the market shares for spending in pubs, bars, cafes and coffee shops.

**Indicative Need for Additional Provision**

6.3.16 As set out above, there is a total of £423.75m of expenditure available to residents in the study area for spending on food and drink in 2014. Table LC3 of Appendix G shows that this will increase to £518.07m in 2021 and £658.14m in 2031. We have estimated that 54% of this expenditure is retained by facilities within LB Havering, and we therefore use this retention rate as the basis for calculating an indicative floorspace requirement for A3, A4 and A5 floorspace. As with the retail capacity forecasts, we advise that forecasts beyond 2021 are considered indicative. The capacity forecasts shown in Table 6.3 apply to development in use classes A3, A4 and A5.

Table 6.3 - Indicative A3, A4 and A5 Floorspace Need to 2031

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; drink floorspace req’t (sqm gross)</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>15,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table LC6, Appendix G. Figures are cumulative/rounded. Figures in italics are indicative.

6.3.17 Table 6.3 shows that there is a requirement for 6,400 sqm gross additional food & drink floorspace by 2021, increasing to an indicative requirement of 15,100 sqm gross by 2031. Reflecting the existing hierarchy of centres, we would expect identified requirements in the first instance to be directed towards Romford metropolitan centre where, whilst there an existing reasonable level of representation in the town centre, it is largely concentrated in one area (The Brewery and to a lesser extent South Street) and further diversification of the range and quality of restaurant uses in particular would benefit the wider vitality and viability of the town centre. The current offer largely focuses on the family market. Therefore, there is potential to support additional floorspace within the town centre, especially where outdoor seating is possible, for example at Market Place – which according to the Needs Assessment is “not currently fulfilling its potential as a large public space”.

6.3.18 Diversification of the commercial food & drink offer could be achieved in Upminster town centre, where there is a slight over-reliance on take-away restaurants at present. However, we appreciate that Hornchurch is likely to be meeting some of Upminster’s needs due to the close proximity of the centres. Further provision in Hornchurch would help solidify what is
already a strong offer and this should be supported given Hornchurch’s well-established role as an evening destination, although we are not aware of any sites within the district centre which could accommodate a significant amount of floorspace. Any additional provision should not undermine the more important requirement to deliver additional floorspace and qualitative improvements to Romford metropolitan centre.

6.3.19 Elsewhere, we would expect development to be more limited – but supportable, provided it was within or well-related to existing centres, and of an appropriate scale. The development of commercial leisure facilities at the Borough’s network of out-of-town retail sites should be resisted.

6.4 Cinema and Theatre provision

6.4.1 The Borough has two cinema facilities which are both located within Romford metropolitan centre. The first is a 16 screen cinema operated by Vue Cinemas at The Brewery. The second is an eight screen facility operated by budget operator, Premier Cinemas at the Mercury Mall Shopping Centre.

6.4.2 According to the results of the household survey, both cinemas attract a good level of support from across all zones, although the significantly bigger Vue cinema attracts the highest proportion of visits on aggregate: 36.5% of Zone 2 residents, 30.3% of Zone 3 and 25.2% of Zone 1 residents visited Vue Cinema. The cinema also attracts good levels of support from residents in all other zones. The Premier Cinema, whilst smaller, attracts 24.0% of visits from Zone 1 residents, 23.2% of Zone 3, 18.0% of Zone 6 and 17.8% of Zone 4.

6.4.3 Key locations outside the Borough which residents look to include the Vue cinemas in Dagenham and Lakeside, as well as facilities in central London. Furthermore, there is a cinema planned at Brentwood which would impact on the cinema spending patterns.

6.4.4 Cinema operators make use of ‘screen density’ in order to make decisions on expansion or where to locate cinemas. In Havering the total number of screens from both cinema facilities is 24. Clearly, Havering’s cinema trade is not restricted to the Borough’s administrative boundaries. If we assess cinema provision within an 18-minute drive time (Figure 9), then the population within this catchment area is 454,292, representing a screen density of 5.3 screens per 100,000 people, compared to a UK average of 6.0 screens per 100,000.
This would suggest that – whilst not pressing – there is likely to be a need for additional cinema capacity over the course of the study period. When looking at the location of existing facilities within and surrounding the Borough, the qualitative gap in provision is in the vicinity of Hornchurch / Upminster, and the delivery of an appropriately-sized cinema facility one of these centres would help to further diversity uses and encourage patronage throughout the daytime and evening. We would envisage that should a cinema come forward in these locations, it would be of the specialist / independent operator nature (which would also address a qualitative deficiency of this type of facility in the Borough). Operators such as Curzon and Picturehouse are increasingly looking towards smaller centres to provide localised, small scale (two to three screen) developments, and there may be scope for such a development to be accommodated in this part of the Borough.

Over the longer-term, aligned with the growth agenda within and outside the Borough, consideration may also need to be given to provision to serve the Rainham area.

The Borough also has two theatres, Queens Theatre in Hornchurch and Brookside Theatre in Romford. Both theatres host a variety of shows including plays, pantomimes, musicals and music concerts. The Brookside Theatre attracts 2.5% of the market share from Zone 5 and 2.0% of Zone 7 residents. Queens Theatre however attracts a wider audience and as such is the Borough’s main theatre provision. 5.1% of Zone 4 residents, 3.7% of Zone 7 and 3.0% of Zone 5 residents visited the Queens theatre. The Queens Theatre also attracts modest support from the surrounding zones except Zone 11. Patronage to theatre facilities is, as a rule, considerably more limited than to cinemas, and we consider that current provision in the Borough is sufficient.

Gym & Leisure Centres

There are 15 gyms and leisure facilities located within the Borough. The location and type of activity on offer is outlined in Table 6.4.
Table 6.4 - Gym & leisure centre provision in LB Havering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gym/Leisure Centre</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Park Leisure Centre</td>
<td>Harold Hill</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Swimming pool, fitness suite, spa, indoor courts, outdoor spots area, crèche, group exercise studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chafford Sports Complex</td>
<td>Rainham</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2 swimming pools, sports hall, fitness suites, outdoor playing fields, group exercise studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornchurch Sports Centre</td>
<td>Hornchurch</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2 swimming pools, sports hall, fitness suite, group exercise studios, café, crèche, squash courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go30</td>
<td>Romford</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Fitness suite, beauty therapy, café, group exercise studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Active Romford</td>
<td>Romford</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Fitness suite, swimming pool, café, crèche, spa, group exercise studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness First Romford</td>
<td>Romford</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Fitness suite, group exercise, spa, group exercise studio, sauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDG Fitness Centre</td>
<td>Romford</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Fitness suite, group exercise, martial arts/boxing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Gym Romford</td>
<td>Romford</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Fitness suite, group exercise studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab Salute Gym Romford</td>
<td>Romford</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Fitness suite, group exercise studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbs Cross Health and Fitness Centre</td>
<td>Elm Park</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Swimming Pool, fitness suite, group exercise studios, sports hall, playing fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA Romford</td>
<td>Romford</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Fitness suite, group exercise studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infitness Gym</td>
<td>Upminster</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Fitness suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Allowed Gym</td>
<td>Hornchurch</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Fitness suite, group exercise studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymphobics</td>
<td>Hornchurch</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Fitness suite, group exercise studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lloyd Gidea Park</td>
<td>Romford</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Indoor and outdoor swimming pools, group exercise studios, sports hall, café</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PBA desktop research, October 2014

6.5.2 Spending on health and fitness appears to be localized — i.e. residents visited the leisure or gym facility closest to them. Romford is a notable exception. The centre attracted visitors to its gym and leisure facilities from all zones, with visitors perhaps using health and fitness facilities in association with other uses in the centre. 25.1% of Zone 3 residents and 24.7% of Zone 1 residents spent money in health and fitness facilities in Romford. Due to the number of gyms present within Romford, the centre also attracts some expenditure from all other zones.

6.5.3 The Business in Sport and Leisure (BISL) handbook 2009) states that 12% of the UK population has a gym membership. The resident population of the borough is 242,000 (ONS Sub-National Projections, 2012). Assuming that gym memberships are in line with the national average, then there are a total of 29,040. As detailed in Table 6.4 above there are 15 major health and fitness facilities in Havering. This gives an average of 1,936 members per facility.

6.5.4 The BISL handbook states that in March 2008 there were 5,775 private facilities with a membership of 7.2 million members. This gives an average of 1,251 members per facility. In this regard the average number of members per facility in Havering is significantly higher than
the national average. This in turn indicates that there is a need in the short to medium-term for additional facilities.

6.5.5 From our headline assessment the current facilities are generally of good to high quality. The council-owned Chafford Sports Complex and Hornchurch Sports Centre offer a wide range of facilities and activities. While the majority of health and fitness facilities are privately-operated we are aware that the council intends to improve the sports and fitness offer in the Borough through the development of a new leisure centre in Romford. Currently Romford has no swimming pool. The new facility will include an ice rink (to replace the Romford Ice Arena), a swimming pool, a fitness suite and group exercise studios.

6.5.6 From our assessment it is apparent that there is a lack of private health and fitness facilities in the southernmost part of the Borough, particularly around Rainham. We would expect residents elsewhere to look towards the network of facilities in Romford, Hornchurch and Upminster.

6.6 Family Entertainment

6.6.1 ‘Family entertainment’ (which includes facilities such as ten-pin bowling and ice-skating) provision in the Borough is mostly focused around the Romford area. There are two bowling facilities within the borough; the first is in Romford and the second on the outskirts of the Borough near Collier Row. The Namco Funscape facility is located within the Brewery, and offers ten pin bowling, a pool hall and dining facilities. The second bowling facility, Rollerbowl is located within the City Pavilion complex, a purpose-built leisure complex located between Chadwell Heath and Rainault, which includes a 34-lane bowling alley, a bar and restaurant.

6.6.2 Havering’s sole ice rink the Romford Ice Arena closed in April 2014 to make way for a new Morrisons supermarket which is currently under construction. The granting of planning permission for the new Morrisons was aligned to the delivery of a modern replacement facility within Romford metropolitan centre, which is more centrally-located and will assist in bringing footfall into the town centre. The replacement facility will also include a competition-length swimming pool, gym and other facilities, and therefore will be a significant improvement on the offer which it is replacing.

6.6.3 The results of the household survey identify Romford as the most popular family entertainment destination. Romford attracted visits from residents in all zones most notably 39.4% of Zone 1 residents, 37.0% of Zone 3 residents and 33.0% of Zone 4 residents.

6.7 Games of Chance

6.7.1 Compared to other commercial leisure facilities discussed in this report, games of chance (such as bingo and gambling) are a fairly niche activity. Indeed, based on the results of the household survey, the vast majority of Borough residents do not participate in these activities.

6.7.2 There are two main bingo halls in the borough. Both facilities are operated by Mecca Bingo and are located in Romford and Hornchurch. Romford’s facility attracts market share from a number of zones including Zone 3 (6.5%), Zone 2 (3.2%), Zone 1 (3.2%) and Zone 9 (4.9%). Hornchurch’s facility attracts market share from a number of zones including Zone 4 (5.6%), Zone 2 (5.3%) and Zone 5 (2.9%). According to the household survey results, it was evident that Dagenham was the principal competing out-of-borough centre for games of chance particularly for residents located to the south of Havering. Dagenham has a large bingo hall, again operated by Mecca Bingo. Dagenham mainly attracted residents from Zone 9 (6.4%) and Zone 10 (5.7%).
6.8 **Hotel Provision**

6.8.1 Hotel provision in the borough varies from small inns and guesthouses to national hotel chains though the offer predominantly consists of independently owned and operated accommodation. The offer generally falls towards the budget end of the spectrum. The hotel operators present in Havering are budget hotel chains Travelodge and Premier Inn.

6.8.2 Romford has five hotels within and around the town centre including a Travelodge and two Premier Inn’s. The Travelodge is located in Market Place, and has 242 rooms. In keeping with the “budget” business model, the hotel has comparatively few facilities. Premier Inn has two hotels in the Borough – Premier Inn Romford Central and Premier Inn Romford West. Premier Inn Romford West has 88 rooms and is located on Whalebone Lane North on the edge of the Borough, adjacent to the A12 at Chadwell Heath (and is thus some distance from any of the Borough’s defined centres), while Premier Inn Romford Central has 196 rooms and is located in the town centre within Mercury Gardens. While similarly priced, Premier Inn’s Romford hotels do have on site restaurants which distinguish them from Travelodge’s offer.

6.8.3 A major mixed use hotel, retail and residential development was granted planning permission though appeal in November 2009. The development will be located at Angel Way Retail Park and includes a 63 bedroom hotel. This development is yet to commence, and we are not aware whether an operator has been secured. While planning permission for the development has lapsed, the developer has recently applied for an extension of time limit. The application is yet to be decided by the Council.

6.8.4 Rainham hosts the Borough’s only other chain hotel. Premier Inn Rainham is located on New Road, some distance outside the urban area near the village of Wennington. The Premier Inn in Rainham is similar to the Romford hotels in that it offers an on-site restaurant in addition to free parking. The hotel has 230 rooms.

6.8.5 With the exception of the two hotels in Romford metropolitan centre, none of the other centres in the Borough benefit from hotel provision within or close to the rest of the retail and leisure offer. Whilst it is not within the remit of this study to undertake a full appraisal of the need for additional hotel facilities, the Council may wish to consider a fuller assessment of the market demand for additional hotel provision as these facilities, where well-located, play important roles in contributing to the wider vitality and viability of centres, through generating footfall and spin-off ‘linked trips’ to local retailers and café/restaurant facilities. In particular, we note the lack of mid/upmarket hotel chains in the Borough at present.

6.9 **Summary of Commercial Leisure Needs**

6.9.1 We have undertaken a quantitative and qualitative assessment of commercial leisure needs for LB Havering. This has identified the following:

- An indicative quantitative need of up to 6,400 sqm gross A3, A4 and A5 commercial leisure floorspace across the Borough over the period to 2021, increasing to 21,000 sqm by 2031

- Scope for further enhancement of the A3 and A4 offer in Romford metropolitan centre, to further diversify the range and quality of the town centre offer and enhance cross-town centre footfall in the evening, and to diversify the market orientation of South Street away from the dominance of drinking establishments and nightclubs.

- Scope for further enhancement of the food and drink offer in all of the district centres, with a particular emphasis on moving the offer in Upminster away from take-aways, and continuing to support Hornchurch’s important role and function as an ‘evening economy’ destination, through additional development of an appropriate scale.
- A need for additional cinema provision, having regard to the qualitative deficiency of specialist / boutique operators in the Borough at present, which should be directed towards Hornchurch or Upminster as preference.

- A short-to-medium term need for additional gym/leisure facilities, although this need will partly be met by the opening of the new Council-operated facility in Romford metropolitan centre. There is a need for privately-run facilities in the southern part of the Borough, which should be aligned to a district centre if possible.

- From our headline assessment, it appears that there is a need for additional hotel provision, particularly in Romford metropolitan centre, although this may in part be met should the Angel Way site be developed. There is a lack of mid/upmarket hotels in the Borough at present, with existing provision concentrated in the budget market, and, in some cases, poorly-related to existing centres. It is recommended that a full assessment of the need for additional hotel provision is undertaken by the Council.

- We do not consider there to be a need for additional games of chance or family entertainment facilities.
7 Recommendations

7.1 In this Section, we set out our core recommendations considering quantitative need, how this need could be met within the LB Havering, provide advice on a network of centres and some initial strategy advice (considering qualitative factors). Finally, we provide policy advice on the approach that we recommend is adopted when considering boundaries within a development plan and provide our advice on monitoring.

7.2 Quantitative Need for New Floorspace

7.2.1 Our quantitative assessment has revealed that there is a comparison goods need for between 16,100 and 21,500 sqm net additional comparison goods floorspace by 2021, increasing to between 49,500 sqm net and 62,000 sqm net by 2031. The lower figure is based on a constant market share, with the higher figure based on a theoretical increase in market share. It is our advice that the lower constant market share need should be planned for, given the level of competition that exists in the area.

7.2.2 The convenience goods assessment has demonstrated a need for up to 7,500 sqm net by 2021, increasing to 13,200 sqm net by 2031. This is based on a constant market share, but allows for significant overtrading of existing floorspace. This effectively means that much of this floorspace need is generated by diverted ‘pent up’ demand from existing facilities, rather than through expenditure and population growth.

7.2.3 Our assessment has also revealed an indicative quantitative need of up to 6,400 sqm gross A3, A4 and A5 commercial leisure floorspace across the Borough over the period to 2021, increasing to 21,000 sqm gross by 2031.

7.3 Meeting Quantitative Needs in LB Havering

7.3.1 We have stated clearly the longer term figures should be treated indicatively, although the NPPF requires needs for town centre uses to be met in full. Furthermore, amongst other things, our review of market trends indicates a polarisation trend occurring in the comparison sector with spending gravitating towards those larger centres that have more choice. As such, the Council will need to carefully consider how it meets the needs that exist - particularly in a situation where central sites are scarce, or challenging to develop. Therefore, we think it is helpful to set out the practical implications of our need assessment for the Council under the three sectors we have assessed.

Comparison Goods Sector

7.3.2 A floorspace output from a quantitative need assessment is generated directly from a monetary value (i.e. expenditure growth) and is conventionally based on a constant market share of spending in a given catchment. Planning policy is not very effective at responding to monetary values and that is the reason why the monetary value is translated into a floorspace figure (which is our quantitative need output). Considering the monetary concept further within the comparison sector, if the empirical forecasts are correct then the additional money available will need to be spent somewhere (remembering we have already taken into account growth in spending through the Internet and an allowance for existing shops to improve their turnover). As such, if it isn’t in existing shops and no new comparison floorspace comes forward, then will leave the catchment - which will have a consequential effect of reducing the market share of the area.

7.3.3 The primary need for additional floorspace is within the comparison goods sector, which is a function of Romford being a large centre and as such attracting a high market share of the expenditure growth that has been estimated. Irrespective of the quantitative outputs, in our
view, there are three realistic alternatives for a local authority to meet its comparison goods needs:

- **Meet its need through floorspace**: this is the development option and would result in the needs set out in our study being built in full during the plan period with sites being allocated using the sequential test, and taking into account impact where necessary. Given uncertainty over longer term forecasts, we consider that plans should consider the needs to Romford and the district centres first but then consider safeguarding areas in the designated centres for the longer term needs beyond 2021.

- **Meet its needs (in part or full) through improved turnover performance of existing floorspace**: our assessment assumes existing floorspace will increase its comparison goods turnover year on year by 1.7% which is a blanket approach across all floorspace. We acknowledge that there is scope, under certain conditions, for existing floorspace to improve its turnover beyond this allowance. The ability to achieve this higher rate is dependent on two things:
  
  o Firstly, the quality and configuration of existing floorspace is important, with modern floorspace with larger footplates better equipped to improve their level of sales per sqm.
  
  o Secondly, whether there are qualitative interventions that could take place to make more customers visit a centre, have an increased dwell time and therefore spend more money in existing shops.

To measure the effect of this approach is particularly difficult, because it will depend on a number of factors. However, given that most town centres have a mix of modern and dated floorspace, we consider achieving an increased turnover per sqm beyond our allowance will only be possible with significant intervention under our second point above.

- **Accept a reducing market share**: in certain locations, it might be considered difficult, if not impossible, to keep the market share of a centre the same over the longer term given the polarisation trend being observed in the non-food sector and potentially the lack of available or suitable central sites. If out of centre is not appropriate (for example due to impact) or there is lack of demand, then under these circumstances, it might be acceptable to plan for a reducing market share (which may well reduce any quantitative need that exists, or even result in some uses coming out of retail altogether). Effectively this is a form of ‘managed decline’, which could in the longer term improve the vitality and viability of a centre.

7.3.4 Our study has set out an assessment of comparison goods need based on a constant market share across the whole Borough. In the interests of proper planning and ensuring self-containment where possible, we think this is an appropriate starting point. Furthermore, it can be measured in a straightforward manner (i.e. build X sqm by Y). However, the Council, through its Local Plan preparation, consultation and engagement with key stakeholders may wish to consider the second and third points above. This will require the Plan to monitor its performance against the need outputs that we have identified.

7.3.5 In respect of accommodating the comparison goods needs that we have identified, the sequential test should be applied and we would expect the largest proportion to be accommodated with Romford metropolitan centre with more modest allocations being directed to the district centres. It is also possible that some of the need that has been identified can be met through re-occupation of vacant floorspace.
Convenience Goods Sector

7.3.6 The above issue applies less to the convenience sector because the need is primarily generated through overtrading of existing floorspace. The sector is going through unprecedented change, with a shift towards smaller supermarkets and convenience stores. This means that to meet this need, we expect a number of smaller development will be needed in a range of locations. Furthermore, a proportion of this need is likely to be accommodated through conversion of existing premises rather than new developments and would not require any policy intervention. In terms of developments, we consider the Local Plan preparation should consider how convenience goods developments can be accommodated within mixed use developments in central locations, applying the sequential test.

A3, A4 and A5 Leisure Sector

7.3.7 The quantitative leisure outputs for A3, A4 and A5 uses and needs to be considered alongside qualitative factors (see below). However, again like the convenience sector, it is expected that this floorspace will be accommodated part through conversion of existing premises – or re-occupation of vacant floorspace – and part through new development. Again, we consider that the Local Plan preparation should consider how improved an improved food and drink offer can form part of mixed use developments (typically ground floors of residential led developments), whilst applying the sequential test.

7.4 Network of Centres & Initial Vision/Strategy Advice

7.4.1 Based on our assessment, we consider that the network of centres within the Borough should remain as currently identified given that the centres largely fulfil the functions that they have been awarded within the development plan. Our assessment has identified a series of qualitative factors for each centre, which we consider could form the basis of a town centre vision or strategy and should be combined with a strategy to meet the Borough’s retail and leisure needs. However, as advised by the PPG, a positive vision or strategy should be articulated through the Local Plan. Therefore, our advice below is based on the evidence collected and will need to be tested and assessed in further detail as the Local Plan is prepared. We address each of the designated centres in turn.

Romford

7.4.2 Romford is the largest centre in the Borough and benefits from a strong comparison goods retail function. Our initial review of the composition of the town centre is that outward expansion of retail and other town centre uses should be resisted, with the ring road forming a logical town centre boundary. Most of the retailing activity takes place north of the railway with the area to the south performing a secondary role.

7.4.3 There is a quantitative and qualitative need for additional and improved food and drink floorspace across the town centre. Much of the existing food and drink offer is concentrated in The Brewery development and is ‘hidden’ from the rest of the town centre. The southern section of South Street - in vicinity of the train station – could be a potential location for additional food and drink floorspace, capitalising on recent investment made by the Council in this area.

7.4.4 In our view, improvement and upgrading of the retail premises along South Street should be a priority for the Council early in the plan period. Improved configuration of units could be expected to account for some of the identified quantitative/qualitative needs that we have identified due to an improved turnover per sqm through better floorplates and a better mix of retailers. It will be necessary to consider how asset management could achieve this aim. Similarly the street market at Market Place could be gently nurtured towards providing a mix of
goods that is unique among competing markets in the area. This would further diversify the retail offer.

7.4.5 A potential site for additional comparison goods floorspace provision could be the intensification of The Brewery development given the large surface level car park that exists. But this will need to be undertaken as part of a programme of works to better integrate this development with the rest of town centre, such as shared public realm or directional signposting. We would expect any development would require a strong anchor store.

7.4.6 Finally, we expect that the footfall within the town centre may change when Morrison’s opens and we recommend that the situation is monitored.

**Upminster**

7.4.7 Generally, Upmister is a vital and viable town centre and we recommend only limited intervention is necessary to maintain the centre’s role and function. There are no obvious development sites for future expansion so we expect that the focus should be on supporting existing retailers through ensuring the collective ‘identity’ of the centre is strengthened. In terms of physical improvements, integration could be improved between the Waitrose store and the rest of the centre.

**Hornchurch**

7.4.8 Hornchurch provides the leisure and cultural focus of the Borough and this function is clearly important with a number of restaurants present within the town. In our view, the quality of the retail offer does not match that of the leisure and as such, some better quality retail operators within the town would improve its vitality and viability, although this aspiration will be subject to demand and availability of premises.

7.4.9 Sainsbury’s has dominant trading position within the town and is overtrading. Therefore, if a second operator could be introduced into the centre this would be beneficial to consumer choice and would help claw back trade travelling to out of centre locations. This aspiration is subject to a suitable site in the town centre being available, given that edge and out of centre sites would not achieve the same outcome.

7.4.10 Based on our assessment, we are aware of underused sites on North Street – for example, Scottish Mutual House or the telephone exchange. As there is no cinema in Hornchurch, the potential for a mixed use scheme to include a small cinema (Curzon/Everyman) plus other supporting uses - would complement theatre further along the road. If this is an option, linkages with centre would need to be strengthened.

**Elm Park**

7.4.11 Elm Park will need to be monitored carefully by Council given its potential removal from London Plan ‘district centre’ level. We expect that the centre would benefit from a small supermarket, for example up to 1,000 sqm net, ideally towards the eastern side of the centre to help rebalance footfall and improve vitality and viability.

**Collier Row**

7.4.12 We have no specific recommendations in respect of Colliers Row, other than a suggestion that the Council continues to monitor its vitality and viability and seek to protect its convenience function from competition from out of centre developments that could draw significant amounts of footfall from centre.
Harold Hill

7.4.13 We are aware that the Council is investing significantly in this centre through the provision of new library within the centre itself. Two significant new residential developments to the north and east of the centre will deliver new footfall and support existing retailers. Vacancy rate appears high on face value but reduces significantly once the library works are factored in.

Rainham

7.4.14 Rainham is a functional centre that is dominated by Tesco. Improved linkages between Tesco and rest of the centre should be explored. We would expect the potential for further development in the area will be largely driven by the residential growth. However, there are qualitative needs to provide an improved consumer choice for retail and other services beyond the Tesco store.

7.5 Defining Boundaries

7.5.1 The NPPF requires local authorities to define the extent of town centres and primary shopping areas, based on a clear designation of primary and secondary frontages in designated centres. Based on the definitions in Annex 2 of the NPPF, the methodology for defining such boundaries and frontages ought to start centrally and work outwards. If we are considering the position now, the approach is as follows:

- Define first primary frontages as those frontages that include a high proportion of retail uses (including food, drinks, clothing and household goods). In our view, these ought to represent the frontages with most daytime footfall;

- Then define secondary frontages as those frontages that include town centre uses, but have a wider diversity of non-retail uses, such as restaurants, cinemas and businesses;

- Using the primary and second frontages, the primary shopping area should be defined as area where retail is concentrated by plotting the area around primary retail frontages and adjoining and closely-related secondary frontages. It does not necessary follow that secondary frontages fall within the primary shopping area, but often they do. This area typically represents the 'retail heart' of a town.

- Finally, the town centre boundary should be plotted that incorporates all of the primary shopping area and areas predominantly occupied by main town centre uses within or adjacent to the primary shopping area. So this means the area will incorporate any adjacent non-retail town centre uses, such as leisure uses, offices, arts, cultural and tourism uses.

7.5.2 It is possible for smaller centres that the primary shopping area will be identical to the town centre boundary.

7.5.3 It will always be necessary to consider whether there is a requirement to intervene in policy terms to change these areas from what is currently on the ground, for example to facilitate development by expanding a primary shopping area, or to encourage diversification of uses away from solely retail by reducing a primary frontage and converting it to secondary. In any event, the eventual boundaries will need to be tested and consulted upon as the Council's Local Plan is prepared.

7.6 Monitoring

7.6.1 This study provides the Council with its floorspace needs requirements to 2031. To establish whether the requirements for new floorspace (by type) are being met and more generally to monitor the performance, the Council should monitor:
- planning permissions for retail floorspace - by type, amount (sqm gross and net), location and retailer;
- completions of retail floorspace - by type, amount, location and retailer;
- mix of uses, including vacancies; and
- health checks of designated centres

The monitoring recommended above is relatively straightforward and should be conducted on a rolling basis for items (i) and (ii) and annually or every two years for items (iii) to (vi). Time series data can thus be produced and continually updated, starting with this study or possibly with earlier work undertaken by the Council. Contingent on the timetabling of the Council’s Local Plan, such updating will prove to be valuable when this evidence is tested at examination in public.

This report provides a robust indication of the current position. The recommendations set out in this report may need to be adjusted, in the future, due to changing market conditions, demographic changes and the impact of developments elsewhere. They may also need to be adjusted if standard assumptions, in particular those relating to expenditure growth and e-tailing, change. The role of monitoring is crucial in highlighting changes in the assumptions that underpin this study and we recommend regular monitoring to the Council.