

**Kings Hill**                      **TM/12/00788/FL**  
**Kings Hill**

**Two storey rear extension and single storey side extension at 4 Cellini Walk Kings Hill West Malling Kent ME19 4BA for Mr S Pinnell**

No further matters to report.

**Recommendation: unchanged.**

---

**Borough Green**                **TM/11/02591/FL**  
**Borough Green And**  
**Long Mill**

**Change of use: restaurant eat-in (Class A3) to restaurant eat-in with deliveries and takeaway (Class A3/A5) at Basement 49 High Street Borough Green Sevenoaks Kent TN15 8BT for Mr Aymal Mohammad**

It had been anticipated that a further accurate site plan would have been submitted but this has not yet occurred. I have also been in discussion with DHH with regard to matters related to nuisance and KCC in relation to parking/waiting arrangements and, in light of the absence of the plan I feel that these matters can all be fully finalised to ensure that proper and appropriate conditional controls can be applied that meet the necessary tests.

**Revised Recommendation:-**

**DEFER to finalise the resolution of the points mentioned above but subject to:**

- **The speaker(s) on 04 July being heard to ensure that their full comments are assessed in any reporting-back and**
- **That any speaker on 04 July be able to exercise the right to speak again at the time of the report-back**

---

**Leybourne**                      **TM/12/00498/AT**  
**West Malling and Leybourne**

**Erection of 1x double sided Corex board promotional sign at Castle Lake Castle Way Leybourne West Malling Kent ME19 5TR for Whitbread Group Plc**

Members were advised in the main report that “clarification is being sought as to the [Leybourne] PC’s views on the proposal and Members will be advised in a Supplementary Report”.

Members are advised that the application as originally submitted proposed the removal of the existing low-level sign at the site and the provision of two additional signs, including one of a broadly similar size in a similar location as proposed presently. The PC’s comments in respect of the *two* advertisements as originally proposed were:

“Object – on the grounds of overdevelopment and that the signs would be visually obtrusive”.

**Recommendation: unchanged.**