



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2024

by **C Butcher BSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/W/24/3346485

Jamei Mosque, 2b and 2c Cranmer Road, Bournemouth BH9 1JU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Rahman (Trustees of Jamei Mosque) against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is 7-2023-2046-L.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed parking arrangement on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document, January 2021 (the PS SPD), sets out that the proposed increase in the total floorspace of the mosque would result in a need for an additional four parking spaces. The proposed development would see the loss of one space, and therefore the main parties are in agreement that the requirements of the PS SPD would not be met in this instance.
4. There are several public car parks within walking distance of the mosque. However, it is highly likely that a proportion of people attending the mosque would need to park close by, either because they are unable to walk far themselves, or because they are running late. Given the lack of dedicated parking spaces at the mosque, it seems inevitable that this would lead to significant demand for on-street parking, particularly on Fridays when Jummah services take place. Indeed, the Highways Officer has provided photographic evidence of illegal parking in the surrounding streets during that time of the week. This evidence illustrates the level of parking stress that can occur at key times.
5. I undertook my site visit on a Thursday, at a time when people were not attending the mosque. However, even then, I noted that there were very few on-street parking spaces available. While only a snapshot in time, it seemed obvious to me that it would not take many additional vehicles for quite severe parking stress to occur. The provision of greater floorspace would likely see an increase in visitors to the mosque at certain times of day thereby exacerbating existing parking issues. It seems inevitable to me that this would then lead to increased highway safety

concerns for road users and pedestrians. This is a matter that I must give significant weight to.

6. I do note that the proposed development would include provision for cycle parking. The appellant has also set out that a condition could be imposed to require a traffic management plan. However, these factors are highly unlikely to mitigate the increased risks to highway safety that I have identified as a result of a deficiency in parking spaces. While it appears that mosque trustees have been putting out traffic cones in an attempt to prevent illegal parking, this is not an appropriate course of action given that doing so is unlawful without the consent of the Highway Authority. Furthermore, the ability of enforcement officers to issue parking tickets does not justify the increased risk of harm.
7. As a result, I conclude that the proposed development would lead to an increased risk of highway safety issues. It would therefore conflict with Policies CS16 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy, October 2012, which in part, seek to ensure that new development is well designed, including by providing a sufficient number of parking spaces.

Other Matters

8. I note that the proposed development would support the activities of a community building. However, while I attribute moderate weight to this issue, it does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

9. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C Butcher

INSPECTOR