

DELEGATED REPORT

Application No: P/26/0166

Site Address: 31 Rocky Road
Penydarren
Merthyr Tydfil
CF47 9JL

Development: Non material amendment to planning permission P/25/0326 to extend platform to the front of dwelling and extension and replace front window with double doors

Case Officer: Rebecca Owens

Application Expiry Date: 15th September 2026

Consultation reply date expired:

APPLICATION SITE

The application relates to a semi-detached dwelling located within a residential area of the settlement boundary. The site is bound by a highway to the front and other dwellings to the sides and rear.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Permission is sought for a proposed non material amendment to planning application P/25/0326 to extend the approved platform and associated railings to the front of the dwelling by an additional 3.83m so it projects along the front of the side extension. Its height would remain a uniform 0.55m. In addition, permission is sought to replace the window in the front elevation of the side extension with double doors to provide access on the extended platform and to the steps and ramp.

PLANNING HISTORY

The relevant planning history is detailed below:

P/25/0326 Single storey side extension, re-profiling of front garden, new vehicle access and parking
 Granted planning permission subject to conditions on 9 January 2026

CONSULTATION

No consultation exercise was undertaken.

PUBLICITY

No publicity exercise was undertaken.

POLICY CONTEXT

Local Policies

Policy SW11: Sustainable design and place making of the Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council Replacement Local Development Plan 2016-2031 was relevant to the determination of the previous planning application and will again be considered. Furthermore, the application will be determined having regard to the advice contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 6, A Design Guide for Householder Development.

Welsh Government Planning Guidance: Approving Non-material Amendments to an Existing Planning Permission (July 2014)

The guidance advises that a non-material amendment will depend on factors such as the context of the overall scheme, the amendments being sought to the original planning permission, the specific circumstances of the site and the surrounding area, which will vary from one application to another.

In deciding whether or not a proposed change is non-material, consideration should be given to the effect of the change, together with any previous changes made to the original planning permission. The guidance also identifies four tests, which local planning authorities may wish to consider when assessing and determining whether a proposed change would qualify as a non-material amendment. These are as follows:

- is the scale of the proposed change great enough to cause an impact different to that caused by the original approved development scheme; and,
- would the proposed change result in a detrimental impact either visually or in terms of local amenity?
- would the interests of any third party or body be disadvantaged in planning terms; or,
- would the proposed change conflict with national or development plan policies?

These four tests have been used in the determination of this application, as set out below.

REASONS FOR REACHING THE RECOMMENDATION

Section 96a of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides the mechanism to approve non-material amendments to an existing planning permission.

Main issues:

The main issue in determining this application is whether or not the extended platform and replacement door would constitute a non-material amendment to the development approved under application reference P/25/0326. In this respect, the main consideration would be the impact of the change on residential amenity and character and visual amenity.

The application site is located on a residential street comprising of mainly semi-detached dwellings. Many of these have been altered and extended with examples of porches and side extensions of varying scales and designs.

The application dwelling forms one half of one of these symmetrical semi detached properties with the adjoining dwelling benefitting from an existing side extension. Having regard to this context, the proposed side extension was previously found to be of an acceptable design and scale which would not appear discordant within the streetscene or harmful to the character of the property itself. This amendment would replace the front window of the extension with double doors. Whilst, a window would be preferable, it is recognised that the extension on the neighbouring dwelling current features front patio doors and as such, it is not considered that the proposed doors would significantly impact on the overall character of the extension or area in general. It is also acknowledged that the doors are required to provide disabled access to and from the dwelling via the platform and ramp. This application also seeks permission to extend the front platform previous approved so it spans across the front of the extension allowing access from the aforementioned door. Whilst the platform has an associated handrail and its extension would make it a more prominent feature, within the context of the streetscene it is not considered that it would appear incongruous or have a harmful visual impact. As such the amendments are deemed to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

With respect to residential amenity, the replacement of the window with doors would have no greater impact or result in any harmful overlooking or loss of privacy. It is acknowledged that the extended platform would be closer to the shared boundary with 30 Rocky Road, and would be elevated above it. However, it would still be set over 1m off the boundary and its purpose would be for access only (not being wide enough to create a useable external amenity space). In addition, whilst there are windows in the flank elevation of 30 Rocky Road, views from the platform to these windows would be not be significantly greater than from the existing front garden and as such it is not considered that there would be any loss of amenity to its occupiers. The proposal would therefore still accord with Policy SW11 of the LDP in respect to residential amenity.

For the above reasons the changes are considered to be a minor amendments that would remain in accord with Policy SW11 of the Replacement LDP.

Other Considerations:

The following have been taken into account in considering the application and in reaching the recommendation set out below.

1. There are no conditions on the original permission which would prevent this non-material amendment.
2. There have not been any other amendments to the originally approved development.
3. No objections were received following the original publicity exercise.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposed amendments are considered to be acceptable and would constitute a non-material amendment to the originally approved scheme. Accordingly, the following recommendation is made:

RECOMMENDATION: BE APPROVED

RECOMMENDATION ENDORSED



Director of Neighbourhood Services

DATE: 31.07.2026