



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2025

by A Hickey MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/25/3368767

29 Newlands Grove, Sheffield

- 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 Nicholas Talbot of Talbot Industries Ltd against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03245/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as develop the former site of 29 Newlands Grove to provide two (2) public EV (Electric Vehicle) charging bays, to be available for use by local residents and the general public as a commercial service, at a price charged per kWh of electricity consumed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development and site address cited in the planning application form differs to that contained within the decision notice and appeal form. In the interests of clarity, I rely on the description and site address provided in the application form for the purposes of the heading above.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to an existing pedestrian footway and flagged area adjacent to 31 Newlands Grove (No 31), close to the junction. At the time of my site visit, there was some vegetation growing on the flagged area, which sloped upward, adjoining the boundary wall/fence of No 31. The appeal scheme would involve regrading this sloped area as part of redirecting the footway, among other works.
4. In undertaking the site visit and considering the scheme, I have noted that despite the elevation drawings being identified at a scale of 1/100, they are not well-detailed. The scale plans submitted do not accurately reflect existing site levels or existing boundary treatments at No 31. The accuracy of the submitted plans was also raised by the Council as the slope up to No 31 would likely result in a retaining wall being required. Interested parties further raised concerns over re-levelling and retention of land.
5. The lack of detailed drawings in combination with a change in site levels means ambiguities have been created in the proposed drawings, which, amongst other details, fail to show if a retaining wall would be required near the boundary with No 31. Without such details, the location and dimensions of equipment, parking spaces, footway and landscaping treatments cannot be known. Irrespective of my

views as to the planning merits in this case, it is imperative that plans are accurate to avoid any uncertainty about what is proposed or its likely effect on pedestrian and highway safety. For these reasons, it is not possible for me to draw any conclusions against the National Planning Policy Framework or the policies in the development plan.

6. In coming to this view, I have considered the possibility of amended plans being provided or attaching conditions. However, I am mindful that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme. Moreover, in this instance, I find that to take any such plans into account has the potential to be prejudicial to the interests of both the Council and interested parties.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hickey

INSPECTOR