



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2025

by **M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3373777

Igar Hotel, 116-124 Salusbury Road, London NW6 6PB

- 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 Ibrahim Al Khalil of Minds Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
- The application reference is 24/3200.
- The development proposed is the creation of basement level and rear extensions at ground to second floors to create 79 rooms, formation of internal courtyards, reconfiguration of existing layouts, provision for car parking, cycle and refuse storage, landscaping and boundary treatment to hotel.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary and Procedural Matters

2. The proposed development was described on the planning application form as "Extension of existing Igar Hotel, including extensions to basement, ground, first and second floors. Reconfiguration of existing layout and ancillary works". A revised description was used on the decision notice issued by the Council, and subsequently by the appellant on the appeal form. I have used the amended wording in the banner heading above, as it provides a more accurate description of the scheme.
3. During the appeal, the appellant drew my attention to an appeal decision issued on 10 November 2025 relating to the property at Nos 110-112 Salusbury Road in which they were also the appellant¹. Although I do not know the full details of the other appeal scheme, it is evident from the decision letter that there are some common main issues. Both main parties have been able to comment on the relevance of that appeal to this one, though the Council chose not to do so. I have taken that other decision into account as a material consideration, though of course my overall conclusion here is based on the planning merits of the particular proposal before me.
4. The decision notice issued by the Council gave five reasons for which it had refused planning permission. The fifth of these related to the development's potential impact on trees, and the lack of an arboricultural impact assessment as required by Policy BGI2 of the 2022 Brent Local Plan ("the BLP"). An AIA was submitted during the appeal, and the Council indicated that, subject to a condition relating to tree protection being imposed in the event of my allowing the appeal, it considered that its concerns in respect of trees had been overcome. None of the other evidence before me, including what I saw during my visit, leads me to

¹ PINS Ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3369833

disagree with that assessment, and I have not therefore addressed the matter further here.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are therefore:

- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Queens Park Conservation Area (“the QPCA”);
- The effect of the proposed development on living conditions for occupiers of neighbouring properties at 114 and 126 Salusbury Road, with particular regard to loss of privacy, outlook or daylight;
- Whether the development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to the size of bedrooms and communal facilities, and the provision of daylight in communal spaces;
- Whether the development would make adequate provision for safe loading and servicing, with particular regard to its effect on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The appeal relates to a group of properties in *sui generis* use as a hostel providing accommodation for homeless people. It comprises five interconnected three-storey buildings (each with a small basement used for storage) within a terrace block on the western side of Salusbury Road, with a garden area at the rear. The proposed development includes the enlargement of the basement areas and extensions of the building into the rear garden, as well as a reconfiguration of the front entrances to the building and landscaping of the front forecourt area.
7. The appeal property is within the QPCA, and I have a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, the National Planning Policy Framework (“the Framework”) states that they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (paragraph 202). It goes on to advise that any harm or loss requires clear and convincing justification (paragraph 213) and that any harm that is less than substantial must be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal (paragraph 215).
8. The QPCA comprises a predominantly residential neighbourhood surrounding the park from which it takes its name. The 2013 Queens Park Design Guide (“the Design Guide”) describes the park itself as “an excellent example of a Victorian urban green space and [...] the perfect complement to the high-quality built environment that surrounds it”. Dwellings are predominantly laid out in rows of two- and three-storey Victorian and Edwardian terraces, though there are also some semi-detached villas. Architectural details and composition are varied but of high quality, and there is a general consistency of building scale, form, and massing.
9. Salusbury Road, including the appeal site, was brought into the QPCA in 2024 and is not therefore assessed in the current version of the Design Guide. Some parts of Salusbury Road are more commercial in character than the rest of the conservation area, and buildings along the street are generally on a slightly larger scale those on

the surrounding residential streets. However, the layout of long terraced blocks, and the repeating patterns of form, massing and detailing within those blocks, reflects the consistency of the wider QPCA, and contributes positively to the quality and significance of the conservation area.

10. The Council's concerns on this matter relate to the proposed alterations at the back of the property, so it is on those which I concentrate here. The terrace of which the appeal property is part has three-storey rear outriggers (shared between adjoining pairs) which have chamfered corners and windows set in the angled walls. Ground floors have single-storey extensions projecting further beyond the back wall of the main outrigger, varying in depth, with pitched roofs. At some properties, including within the appeal property at Nos 118 and 120, and Nos 122 and 124, further ground level extensions have infilled some or all of the space between outriggers. These have not always been sympathetic additions to the block.
11. The enlarged basement level would infill the recessed spaces between outriggers across the full width of the appeal site. Given the overall scale of this part of the scheme and its position below, or only a little way above, ground level, the Council considered it would be acceptable. I agree with that assessment.
12. At ground floor level, the three existing outriggers would be enlarged, and the new extensions separated by inset "courtyards". The combination of extensions at basement and ground floor would give the rear elevation a stepped appearance – in both the horizontal and vertical planes – at those levels. The increased height of the building at ground floor level would clearly be seen from neighbouring gardens and rooms. While the Council was particularly concerned that the flat roofs would be at odds with the pattern of development along the terrace, it would remove the existing haphazard extensions, some of which also already have flat roofs, and replace it with something rather more orderly.
13. The removal of the pitched roof on the ground floor extension at the rear of the No 124 part of the site would lead to a loss of symmetry, as it currently reflects the roof form at No 126. However, given the variety in the scale, depth and form of ground floor extensions at the rear of the block generally, I am satisfied that this would not cause significant harm. The ground floor extensions would be visible from the surrounding buildings and gardens but they would not, given the existing site context, be harmfully incongruous or incoherent. I therefore also consider that the proposed development would be acceptable at ground floor level.
14. At first and second floor levels, the space between the outriggers at Nos 118 and 124 would be infilled. The existing pattern with its angled corners makes a major positive contribution by adding pleasing detail and visual interest to the rear of the block; this would be lost, replaced by a large flat elevation. This would be widely seen from neighbouring properties, and would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the terrace.
15. Because of the harm caused at first and second floor levels, I conclude that the character and appearance of the QPCA would not be preserved or enhanced. The development would therefore conflict with Policy BHC1 of the BLP and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021 which together, and among other things, seek to ensure that development affecting heritage assets respects and reinforces building design, plot and planform, contributes to local distinctiveness, and preserves or enhances the historic environment.

16. In the Framework's terms, the harm to the heritage asset would be less than substantial and, given the scale of the harmful alterations and their location at the rear of the appeal site, towards the lower end of that category. The provision of additional temporary accommodation for homeless people would be a public benefit carrying appreciable weight. However, the harm to the character and appearance of the QPCA should be afforded great weight. The public benefits do not outweigh the harm in this case, and the development is contrary to the Framework in this regard.
17. My findings in respect of harm to the QPCA differ from those of my colleague in the appeal decision relating to Nos 110-112. Having regard to paragraphs 19 to 21 in particular of that decision, it is evident that there are differences of scale and visual impact between the two schemes, and I am therefore satisfied that my reaching a different conclusion on this matter is justified.

Living conditions – neighbours

18. The Council's concerns about possible impacts on neighbours' living conditions also related to the rear of the property, so I again concentrate on those aspects of the scheme here. I have described the physical layout of the extensions in addressing the previous main issue. The Council was satisfied that neither the basement nor the first and second floor elements would have unacceptable adverse impacts in this respect. Nothing I have seen leads me to disagree with this assessment.
19. At the northern end of the site, the ground floor extension next to No 126 would have an eaves height around 3.6m above ground level on the boundary. It would be taller, and slightly longer than, the existing extension at that end of the property. It would be likely to lead to some loss of outlook from, and daylight reaching, the nearest window in the end of No 126.
20. The three "courtyards" which would be created at ground floor level would be set above the existing garden levels by between around 0.5m at the northern end of the site and 0.9m at the southern end. There would therefore be increased potential for overlooking of neighbouring gardens from the courtyards and the staircases leading down from them to the communal rear garden. Two of the courtyards – between Nos 118 and 120, and between Nos 122 and 124 – would be set between outriggers which would limit viewing angles. They would also be separated from neighbouring properties by the depth of the appeal site's rear garden so, although there would be likely to be some increase in overlooking, I am satisfied that this would not cause significant harm to neighbouring residents. However, the courtyard at the rear of No 116 would allow direct overlooking of the rear garden, and rooms within, No 114, which I consider would be likely to lead to a significant loss of privacy at that property.
21. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to living conditions for occupiers of neighbouring properties at 114 and 126 Salusbury Road. As such, it would conflict with Policy DMP1 of the BLP which, among other things, seeks to ensure that development provides high levels of amenity.

Living conditions – future residents

22. At present, the appeal property has 49 bedrooms² across the ground, first and second floors, some with ensuite facilities but many without. Shared kitchens are provided on each floor, and a small number of bedrooms are shown on the submitted drawings as having kitchens of their own. There are communal lounge and dining spaces on the ground floor, and a reasonably sized shared rear garden. The proposed development would see the building extended and reconfigured internally; the number of bedrooms would be increased to 79 (ten single bedrooms, the rest for two people), so it would be expected to have up to 148 residents. Communal facilities – a laundry, a kitchen, a dining room and a sitting room – would be provided in the basement.
23. Policy BH7 addresses developments of living accommodation with shared facilities, setting out a range of criteria with which proposals should comply. Of particular relevance to this appeal is criterion b), which requires that such accommodation should be “of an acceptable quality meeting appropriate standards for the needs of its occupants, including external amenity space [and] appropriate communal facilities”. In terms of the quality of accommodation, the supporting text to that policy says that self-contained rooms will be assessed against the requirements of Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, and that houses in multiple occupation (“HMOs”) should meet the standards of the Council’s HMO licensing scheme, including in respect of minimum room sizes.
24. The HMO requirements are set out in the Council’s 2022 *Houses in Multiple Occupation* Supplementary Planning Document (“the HMO SPD”). Referring to hostels, the supporting text does not refer to specific space standards, saying simply that layouts should “satisfactorily meet the needs of their intended occupants, with suitable communal spaces and rooms to meet any other associated needs”. Given the lack of specific standards for hostels, and the reliance on the provision of communal kitchen, living and dining spaces in the proposed development, I am satisfied that the HMO standards form a reasonable basis for assessing the scheme, although it would not itself be an HMO. I also acknowledge (and do not disagree with) the Council’s recognition that, in view of the intended temporary nature of the accommodation, some reduction in the standard for the amount of communal space may be acceptable, provided that space is adequate in all other respects.
25. In terms of bedroom sizes, the HMO SPD applies the space standards set out in Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, which requires a minimum of 7.5m² for a single bedroom, and 11.5m² for a two-person bedroom. The HMO SPD is clear that this minimum should not include space occupied by ensuite facilities, nor any constrained “corridor” type spaces less than 1.2m wide. The accommodation schedule on the submitted drawings suggests that only one bedroom would fall short of that requirement – room G25, a two-person room with an area of 9.8m². However, it is clear from looking at the submitted drawings that many bedrooms (including B-2 to B-11 in the basement, G14 and G15 on the ground floor, 1-02, 1-03, 1-06 and 1-07 on the first floor, and 2-02, 2-03, 2-06 and 2-07 on the second floor, though this is not intended to be an exhaustive list) would have narrow corridor areas, so it is likely that their actual useful space would be considerably

² The submitted Planning and Heritage Statement said 47 bedrooms, a figure repeated in the Council’s officer report, though the submitted drawings show 49 rooms identified as bedrooms and that figure was used in the appellant’s appeal statement.

less than stated on the accommodation schedule. By the Council's assessment, which the appellant has not challenged, as many as 43 of the 79 rooms would fail to meet the required space standards for bedrooms.

26. The kitchen in the basement would be around 32m². By the Council's calculation, applying the standard set out in the HMO SPD would require the provision of 13 separate kitchens (or, at least on my reading of the guidelines, 13 separate sets of kitchen facilities) with a total minimum floorspace of 143m². Even allowing for some flexibility in view of the temporary nature of the accommodation – and I note here that in the scheme at Nos 110-112 the Council considered that a 30 percent reduction would be acceptable – the kitchen space would be very small to serve the number of residents.
27. The submitted drawings also show a “servery/buffet” area within the dining room space, which might suggest that the intention is that meals would be prepared by staff and served to residents. However, this is not clear from the evidence put forward by the appellant, despite the question having been raised by the Council in its officer report. The appellant's statement says that “residents would prepare their own food if they wish”, but the kitchen space would be too small for all but a handful of residents to do so at any one time, and presumably would not be available to them at all if it was being used by catering staff at the time.
28. The single communal sitting room would have an area of around 30m², and so could only accommodate a small fraction of the total resident population at any given time, though applying its flexible approach in respect of temporary accommodation the Council considered that this would be acceptable. The dining space, at around 130m², would be of an adequate size. However, neither the sitting room nor the dining room would have windows or rooflights; they would therefore lack both natural light and any form of outlook. They would be likely to be somewhat gloomy places for residents to spend their time. While I note the appellant's comment that “people staying at the hostel are not present within the building all day on every day”, it is not difficult to imagine a situation – for example, a cold or rainy day – where residents might not wish to go outside but equally would not wish to spend most of the day confined to their bedroom. The communal rooms would not be likely to provide adequate alternatives for them.
29. I acknowledge that the appeal scheme would provide temporary residential accommodation for more people than at present, and the provision of ensuite facilities to all bedrooms would also be an improvement on the current situation. The building at the moment also has something of a labyrinthine layout, and the communal rooms I saw appeared somewhat tired and shabby. In these respects, I acknowledge the potential benefits of a scheme which would improve the standard of accommodation. However, in this particular proposal many bedrooms would be smaller than required, and the communal rooms would be either too small (in the case of the kitchen) or inadequately daylight (in the case of the dining room and sitting room) to adequately and acceptably meet the needs of residents.
30. The appellant has argued that providing larger bedrooms, or communal spaces with natural daylight, would come at the cost of reducing the overall number of people who could be accommodated within the property. That may be so, but there is a balance to be struck and, for the reasons I have just set out, in my judgement the appeal scheme would not strike that balance.

31. The Council did not find conflict with any of the other four criteria of Policy BH7, relating to access to public transport and services, to management arrangements (though I note their view that a condition to secure a management plan would be necessary in the event of my allowing the appeal), to the specific need for temporary accommodation for homeless people, or to there being a harmful over-concentration of similar accommodation in the locality. None of the evidence before me leads me to a different view. However, I conclude that the development would not provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers. As such, it would conflict with Policy BH7 of the BLP taken as a whole.

Servicing arrangements

32. Policy BT2 of the BLP seeks to manage the impact of vehicle parking, and applies maximum parking standards set out in Appendix 4 of the BLP. The appeal site has a PTAL of 4 indicating good public transport accessibility; the BLP says that hotels in such locations should have car parking spaces for operational needs and disabled motorists only, though it also seeks the provision of a coach parking space for every 75 bedrooms. It says that other residential institutions (including hostels for homeless people) should have a maximum of one car parking space per ten beds. Policy BT3 seeks the provision of appropriate servicing arrangements as set out in Appendix 5 of the BLP. For hotels – there is no standard specifically for hostels – as well as the meeting the coach parking standard, it requires a loading bay for at least one 8m rigid vehicle.
33. The appeal proposal would include only two car parking spaces, for disabled Blue Badge holders; this would be below the maximum standard (whether for hotels or hostels), and so would be acceptable. In view of the use of the property as a hostel for homeless people, such that it would not generally be used by organised groups arriving or leaving by coach or heading out for a day on coach trips as might be expected at a “traditional” hotel, I do not consider that a dedicated coach bay would be an absolute necessity.
34. However, that still leaves day-to-day servicing to deal with. The appellant has stated that servicing can currently be undertaken from the street and that they are “not aware of problems with servicing”. There is little in the way of further detail before me, though the Council notes that the property is already served by box vans making laundry deliveries. There are double yellow line parking restrictions on the stretch of Salusbury Road in front of the property as well as single yellow bar kerb markings indicating loading restrictions, so it would seem that vans making deliveries at present would be likely to use the existing forecourt for loading and unloading.
35. The proposed development would lead to the number of bedrooms being increased by more than 50 percent, so there would be a commensurate increase in the amount of laundry to be collected and delivered. Furthermore, on the basis that the kitchen and servery provision described in the preceding section is based on the intention that at least some meals would be provided to residents, there would also be a need for regular deliveries of catering supplies. The appeal scheme would not include off-street space where vans could be loaded or unloaded. While I recognise that it was only a snapshot, at the time I visited (late on a weekday afternoon), vehicles heading north along Salusbury Road moved slowly in stop-start fashion as early evening rush hour traffic began to build up. The site’s location is such that a

reliance on on-street parking for loading and unloading vehicles would be likely to add to congestion and reduce safety for highway users.

36. The appellant states that 8m vehicles could not possibly enter and exit the site at right angles to the carriageway; given that the submitted drawings show that the forecourt has a maximum depth of just under 7.4m (and that does not allow for the numerous bay windows projecting forward of the building's main elevation) that seems a reasonable assessment. The Council proposed that a one-way "carriage drive" type arrangement could be used, and went on to suggest that in the event of my finding the proposal otherwise acceptable a condition requiring the submission and approval of a revised frontage layout could be imposed. As the appellant pointed out, a "carriage drive" would leave less room for areas of soft landscaping; in view of the potential impact of the development on the QPCA, I am not entirely persuaded that this could be left to a condition. However, in view of my overall conclusion in the appeal I have not sought further comment from the parties on this particular point.
37. I conclude that the proposed development would not make adequate provision for safe loading and servicing. As such, it would conflict with Policy BT3 of the BLP, the principal relevant requirements of which I have set out above. As the proposed level of car parking would be acceptable, and I have not found it necessary that a dedicated coach space should be provided for this particular use, I find no conflict with Policy BT2. However, this does not alter my overall conclusion on this matter.

Conclusion

38. The proposed development would cause a degree of harm to the character and appearance of the QPCA, and to neighbours' living conditions. It would not provide acceptable living conditions for all future residents, nor would it make adequate provision for servicing. It would therefore conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. The development's benefits would not outweigh the harm I have found.
39. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications for planning permission should be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The other material considerations identified in this case, including the benefits of the scheme, and the policies set out in the Framework, do not justify a decision other than in accordance with the adopted development plan.
40. For the reasons given above, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector