PLANNING, SPORT AND THE RULE OF LAW: A COMMENTARY ON STADIUM-RELATED JUDICIAL REVIEW

Tadgh Quill-Manley, Student at King's Inns, 'Glenwood,' Cork, Ireland T23KP64

ABSTRACT

Stadium developments often ignite debates at the intersection of public policy, economic promise, and community concerns. This commentary examines recent judicial decisions from Ireland, the United Kingdom, and Northern Ireland to illustrate how courts navigate these tensions in planning law. Drawing on cases like *Butler v Dublin Corporation* and the Twickenham disputes, it explores the materiality of non-sporting uses - such as concerts - and the varying approaches to statutory classification versus historical baselines. The duty to provide clear reasons for decisions, as affirmed in *Flannery v An Bord Pleanála* and *Oakley v South Cambridgeshire District Council*, emerges as a safeguard against arbitrary administrative actions, ensuring fairness and enabling effective review.

Environmental compliance remains non-negotiable, with *Berkeley v Secretary of State* underscoring the substantive role of impact assessments. Private nuisance claims, per *Coventry v Lawrence*, persist despite planning approvals, demanding proactive mitigation. The piece also addresses standing for community groups (*Cumann Tomás Daibhís*) and the public-law accountability of sporting bodies (*O'Connell v The Turf Club*). Practical lessons for stakeholders emphasise rigorous documentation, environmental diligence, and interdisciplinary advice amid intertwined regimes. Ultimately, while sporting venues foster cohesion and growth, courts insist they adhere to ordinary legal standards—no exemptions for passion or profit.

Keywords: UK, Ireland, Sports, Planning, Facilities

1. Introduction

Stadium projects sit at an uneasy crossroads of public policy. They promise economic return, social cohesion and sporting opportunity, yet raise familiar planning law tensions: environmental impact, amenity and nuisance, the proper scope of administrative reasoning, and the public-law accountability of private or quasi-public sporting organisations. Recent jurisprudence from Ireland, the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland illustrates how courts balance those competing interests. Across recurring themes - permitted use, the duty to give reasons, environmental procedure, nuisance and public-law review-ability - the case law confirms that sporting purpose is not a legal free pass. Below I expand on those themes and draw out practical implications for developers, local authorities, sporting bodies and community stakeholders.

2. Historical and statutory context

Planning law treats land use and development as questions of regulating competing public and private interests. Stadiums are complicated because their use profile is hybrid: they host sporting fixtures, community events, and increasingly commercial entertainments such as pop concerts. Whether a new activity at a stadium is lawful often depends on whether it amounts to a "material change of use", a concept grounded in statute and statute-derived regulation and clarified by the courts. The answer often turns on the frequency and character of the proposed activity, the historic pattern of use of the land, and the local statutory framework governing use classes. This doctrinal matrix explains why superficially similar factual scenarios can produce different outcomes in different jurisdictions.[1]

3. Permitted use: occasional events, ancillary activities and the materiality test

A first recurring issue is whether non-sporting events - especially concerts - constitute a material change of use. In Ireland the Supreme Court in *Butler v Dublin Corporation* accepted that occasional pop concerts at Lansdowne Road did not amount to a material change of use because the historic pattern of events, and the transitory nature of concerts, were relevant to the planning baseline. This is a contextual, fact-sensitive approach which looks to historic use

[1] Butler v Dublin Corporation [1999] IESC 19, [2000] 1 IR 54 (SC).

and the sporadic, ancillary character of the activity.[2]

By contrast, English courts have sometimes been more categorical. The *Rugby Football Union* litigation (the Twickenham concerts disputes) found that large open-air concerts could sit outside the existing Use Class for active recreation (D2(e)) and therefore amounted to a change of use requiring explicit planning permission; the Court's reasoning emphasised the textual fit (or lack of it) between the proposed purpose and the Use Classes Order. That approach foregrounds statutory classification rather than flexible historical baselines.[3]

What this contrast means in practice is straightforward. Where national planning law embeds a rigid use-class scheme, promoters cannot assume "ancillary" status for high-impact events; where courts retain greater regard to historical, occasional use, authorities and operators have more elbow room - but only so long as the events remain genuinely sporadic and ancillary in character. The Twickenham disputes also show that changes in event frequency - for instance, moving from 3 concerts a year to 15 - are legally significant and will attract close scrutiny. Recent reporting confirms that Twickenham's attempt to expand concert numbers has become a contested, high-profile local planning and licensing issue.[4]

4. The duty to give reasons and the quality of administrative decision-making

Courts have repeatedly insisted that planning authorities justify controversial decisions with clear, intelligible reasoning. This procedural demand has two functions: (i) to ensure fairness to interested parties; and (ii) to enable meaningful judicial review. *Flannery v An Bord Pleanála* demonstrates this clearly. The High Court quashed a refusal of permission for a mixed residential and sporting development because the Board misapplied the "highly exceptional circumstances" test applicable to Z9-zoned recreational open space and failed to articulate coherent reasons for its conclusions. The judgment reads as a reminder that departures from local policy must be justified with rigorous reasoning, not ipse dixit.[5]

Similarly, in England the Court of Appeal in *Oakley v South Cambridgeshire District Council*

[2] See discussion in ibid regarding whether occasional concerts constituted a material change of use under the Local Government (Planning and Development) Act 1963.
[3] Rugby Football Union v Secretary of State for Local Government, Transport and the Regions [2001] EWHC Admin 517, [2002] JPL 185 (QB).
[4] Rogers, Dave. 'Blow for RFU's £650m Twickenham stadium upgrade plan after council says it can't increase number of major concerts.' Building UK (20 October 2025).
[5] Flannery & Ors v An Bord Pleanála [2022] IEHC 83 (Humphreys J).

confronted a committee that granted stadium permission contrary to a planning officer's recommendation without explaining its reasons. The court confirmed that where a public authority departs from professional advice in a way that materially affects rights or expectations, it must give reasons sufficient to enable review. That principle is now a well-established element of the modern common law duty to give reasons in planning cases.[6]

The practical consequence for planners and committees is clear: well-documented, logically coherent reasons are not optional in contentious stadium decisions. Failure to do so exposes decisions to successful judicial challenge and can generate costly delay.

5. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and statutory compliance

Large stadium projects commonly require an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) because of their scale and potential effects on traffic, noise, ecology and local amenity. The House of Lords in *Berkeley* (the Fulham/Craven Cottage litigation) emphasised that where an EIA regime applies, the decision-maker must base its decision on a properly prepared environmental statement. Attempts to substitute informal or partial material for a full EIA will not suffice; compliance is substantive, not merely procedural. The *Berkeley* principle remains a cornerstone: environmental procedure is a material precondition to lawful permission where the statute mandates it.[7]

That obligation also affects the sequencing of decisions. In practice, transport and environmental mitigation studies - including specific EIA chapters on noise and cumulative impacts - should be completed and published before final determination of highly contentious proposals, or the decision risks being quashed on procedural grounds.

6. Nuisance, planning permission, and private law limits

Another important strand concerns private nuisance. The Supreme Court in *Coventry v Lawrence* rebalanced aspects of nuisance law but affirmed that planning permission is not an absolute defence to a nuisance claim: lawful planning can be relevant to the character of a locality but does not automatically immunise a noisy activity from private law liability. For stadium operators, this means that even if planning and licensing are in order, neighbouring

[6] Oakley v South Cambridgeshire District Council [2017] EWCA Civ 71, [2017] PTSR 769.
[7] R (Berkeley) v Secretary of State for the Environment [2000] UKHL 36, [2001] 2 AC 603 (HL).

rights can persist in tort. Authorities and promoters therefore need to pay attention to design, sound insulation and operational mitigation measures to reduce the risk of private nuisance suits.[8]

VI. Access to judicial review and the standing of local interests

Stadium debates often involve local clubs, community groups and resident associations. The courts have recognised that these groups can have a substantial interest for the purpose of judicial review when a planning authority's resolution materially affects their rights or interests. In the Tallaght Stadium litigation the High Court granted leave for a GAA club to challenge a council resolution, recognising its legitimate interest. This jurisprudence helps ensure that local stakeholders can litigate where procedural or substantive defects affect community assets, rather than leaving oversight solely to municipal actors.[9]

At the same time, the courts will often weigh the public interest and the practical consequences of quashing a permission; the Northern Ireland decision in *Mooreland & Owenvarragh Residents 'Association v Department for Infrastructure* shows judicial restraint where authorities have substantially complied and where quashing would have disproportionate disruptive effect. Judicial review thus remains a discretionary remedy, and success depends on both legal error and the court's assessment of equitable relief.[10]

7. Sports governing bodies and amenability to public law review

A separate but related issue is whether non-statutory sporting bodies fall within the scope of public-law review. The Irish Supreme Court in *O 'Connell v The Turf Club* held that the Turf Club - though not a creature of statute - had functions which were public in character and thereby amenable to judicial review when acting in a regulatory or quasi-regulatory capacity. The principle is important: sporting organisations that exercise regulatory authority over participants or events must expect their decisions to be amenable to public-law standards of fairness and legality.[11]

[8] Coventry (t/a RDC Promotions) v Lawrence [2014] UKSC 13, [2014] AC 822.
[9] Cumann Tomás Daibhís & Ors v South Dublin County Council (High Court, unreported, 1997).
[10] Mooreland and Owenvarragh Residents 'Association v Department for Infrastructure [2022] NIQB 40.
[11] O'Connell & Anor v The Turf Club [2015] IESC 57, [2017] 1 IR 43.

For governance, this outcome highlights the need for sporting bodies to adopt clear procedural rules, transparent decision-making and effective internal review - the absence of which will invite external judicial oversight.

8. Procedural complexity: licensing, planning and the interlocking regimes

Large stadium projects commonly require more than a planning permission: they may need licensing (for entertainment, alcohol, safety), transportation approvals, habitat or water permits, and sometimes even special parliamentary or central government consideration for nationally significant projects. Recent press reporting on Twickenham shows how planning and licensing conflicts can impede a stadium's desire to expand concerts, even where the stadium argues economic necessity for redevelopment revenues. Those practical interactions mean that legal advice on stadium projects should be multi-disciplinary, addressing planning law, licensing law, environmental regulation and contractual risk allocation simultaneously.[12]

9. Strategic lessons for stakeholders

From the judicial line surveyed above, several practical points emerge:

1. *Do not treat use classification as a technicality:* Whether an event fits a statutory use class is often dispositive. If there is doubt, seek express permission rather than rely on an ancillary-use argument. See the Twickenham jurisprudence and recent local debates.[13]

2. *Document reasoning early and thoroughly:* Authorities should prepare reasoned, transparent decisions; developers should anticipate likely challenges and ensure committees can explain departures from officer recommendations. *Flannery* and *Oakley* are cautionary examples.[14]

3. *Treat environmental compliance as substantive:* If EIA regulations apply, produce a full environmental statement and integrate mitigation into design and operation; *Berkeley* shows the cost of shortcuts.[15]

[12] Lillywhite, Charlotte. 'Twickenham's bid for more concerts rejected.' BBC News (18 October 2025).
[13] See eg Rugby Football Union (n 3); Lillywhite (n 12).
[14] Flannery (n 5); Oakley (n 6).
[15] Berkeley (n 7).

4. *Plan for private law risks:* Even with permission, nuisance risk from noise and traffic remains; mitigation measures will be persuasive in both planning and civil litigation. *Coventry v Lawrence* emphasises this persistent tort risk.[16]

5. *Governance matters for sports bodies:* If an organisation exercises public functions, adopt procedures consistent with public-law standards - otherwise *O'Connell* indicates court oversight is likely.[17]

10. Conclusion

Judicial decisions from Ireland and the UK show that stadiums occupy ordinary legal terrain: planning law, environmental procedure, private nuisance and public-law principles apply with full force. Sporting purpose may weigh heavily in public opinion and economic argument, but it is not a legal trump card. The courts demand clarity in legal classification, rigorous reasons where policy is departed from, full compliance with environmental process when required, and respect for private rights where operations produce significant impacts. For promoters, local authorities and sporting bodies, the viable pathway to durable stadium development is legal prudence: anticipate classification issues, comply with environmental obligations, document reasoning, mitigate nuisance risks and adopt robust governance.

[16] Coventry v Lawrence (n 8).
[17] O'Connell v The Turf Club (n 11).

Bibliography

Cases – Ireland

- Butler v Dublin Corporation [1999] IESC 19, [1999] 1 IR 505 (SC).
- Cumann Tomás Daibhís & Ors v South Dublin County Council (HC, unreported) (Tallaght Stadium judicial review leave application).
- Flannery & Ors v An Bord Pleanála [2022] IEHC 83.
- O'Connell & Anor v The Turf Club [2015] IESC 57, [2017] 2 IR 43.
- Ballyboden Tidy Towns Group v An Bord Pleanála & Ors [2024] IESC 4.

Cases – United Kingdom (England & Wales)

- R (Berkeley) v Secretary of State for the Environment and Others [2000] UKHL 36, [2001] 2 AC 603 (HL).
- R (Adlard & Ors) v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions [2002] EWCA Civ 735, [2002] 1 WLR 2515 (CA).
- Rugby Football Union v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions [2001] EWHC Admin 927 (QB).
- Coventry (t/a RDC Promotions) & Anor v Lawrence & Ors [2014] UKSC 13, [2014] AC 822 (SC).
- Oakley v South Cambridgeshire District Council [2017] EWCA Civ 71, [2017] PTSR 769 (CA).

Cases – Northern Ireland

- Mooreland & Owenvarragh Residents 'Association v Department for Infrastructure [2022] NIQB 40.

Secondary Sources

- Lillywhite, Charlotte. ‘Twickenham's bid for more concerts rejected. ’BBC News (18 October 2025).

- Rogers, Dave. ‘Blow for RFU's £650m Twickenham stadium upgrade plan after council says it can’t increase number of major concerts. ’Building UK (20 October 2025).