



Appeal Decision

by **Grahame J Kean BA (Hons) Solicitor (HRA), MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/C/24/3355668

Land Adjacent Former Aircraft Tower Manston Road North, Manston, CT12 5AY

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by SKIDZ UK against an enforcement notice issued by Thanet District Council.
 - The notice was issued on 9 October 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: without planning permission, the change of use of the airport land to car racing track and associated development.
 - The requirements of the notice are:
 - Cease the unauthorised use of airport land as a car racing track
 - Remove all fencing erected in connection with the unauthorised use.
 - Remove the straw bales sited on airport land which are associated with the unauthorised use.
 - Remove any other associated development relating to the unauthorised use as a car race track.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is: 1 month from the date this notice takes effect.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(b) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
-

Formal Decision

1. It is directed that the enforcement notice is corrected by the deletion of the words "car racing track" where they appear in the allegation and the requirements sections, and their substitution with the words "motorsport track".
2. Subject to the corrections, the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Procedural matters

3. The Appellant's statement contains several submissions based on the planning merits of the unauthorised development. This is perhaps understandable as the company sought to appeal against the enforcement notice on ground (a). However, since the notice was issued after 25 April 2024 and, within the previous two years there was a related application for permission which was refused with no appeal, consideration of ground (a) in this case was barred. The upshot is that I cannot take account of the planning merits of the development.

The enforcement notice

4. The appellant states that the notice inaccurately describes Skidz UK as a "car racing track" rather than an advanced driving school focused on education and safety, with no racing, time trials, or competition. The Council acknowledges that a driving school forms part of the use that occurs on the site, however the events and car shows that also occur, would not fall within the appellant's description.
5. The appellant's comments on this matter are made under ground (b) but I have a duty firstly, to put the notice in order if needed, using powers of correction under s176(a) of the 1990 Act. "Racing" as a term is not always linked to competitive

activity, but in any case, the Council is unopposed in suggesting that the description is amended to “motorsport track” and associated development. Based on what I have read, this better fits the description of the use being carried on. As no injustice would be caused to either party, I will amend the notice accordingly.

Ground (b)

6. An appeal on this ground is that the matters alleged to constitute the breach of planning control, have not taken place as a matter of fact. The appellant’s concerns over the description of the use are met in the correction already made. It is the use of the land as a track for motorsports that is the key component of the use, whether or not that has an educative element. On the corrected allegation therefore, the appeal cannot succeed.

Ground (g)

7. The appellant’s statement refers to ground (h) but clearly ground (g) is intended, ie that the period for compliance with the notice is too short. The appellant states that abrupt cessation could lead to resurgence of antisocial car-related behaviours, affecting public safety. An extended period would allow for outstanding commitments to be met and an eight-month compliance period is requested.
8. The appellant would have commitments to staff and customers, however given concerns raised by the Council and interested persons, particularly as to noise generated from activities on site, it is important that the notice is complied with as soon as practicable. The one-month period for compliance is considered reasonable within which to comply with the notice, which will prevent further harm resulting from this development.
9. The appeal on this ground fails.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice as corrected.

Grahame J Kean

INSPECTOR