**Commercial and Chancery team** 



# Restrictive covenants and barriers to development

**John Sharples** 

March 2017

### Issues for the developer (1)



- > does the covenant bind me?
- > do I know who can enforce it?
- > restrictive covenant indemnity insurance
- > inform lender?
- > who can give an effective discharge?
- > would the work be in breach?

### Issues for the developer (2)



St John's

- > special considerations regarding covenants not to build without consent
- approach the objectors (effect on insurance?)
- > start the works?
- > apply to the UTLC?
- > consider objections/address./evidence

#### Issues for the objector(s)



St John's

- > has the benefit of the covenant passed to me?
- > can anyone else sue?
- > is it protected by registration?
- > (household/ATE) insurance?
- > what does the covenant require?
- practical impact of the works
- > need to start claim / likely remedy
- > evidence required to oppose UTLC application

### Enforcing the covenant – can you sue?



See flowchart p.3 of long notes

## Enforcing the covenant – can you be sued?



See flowchart p.4 of long notes

### **Applications to the UTLC**



- > Ground (a): covenant is obsolete \*
- Ground (aa): impedes reasonable use & no practical benefit of substantial value/contrary to public interest/compensation adequate \*
- > Ground (b): consent to modify
- Ground (c): no injury to party entitled to enforce (longstop)
- discretionary power

#### **Applications generally**



- > highly fact sensitive
- consider specific benefits of covenant see examples long notes p.5
- > need to marshal evidence
- costs: presumption successful objectors get costs; no presumption in favour of successful applicant (unless objectors have no entitlement to object)

### Ground (a): general



- > requires very clear case
- change in character of (a) property (b) neighbourhood (c) other circumstance
- > renders original purpose incapable of fulfilment
- take account (a) development plan (b) pattern for grant/refusal of planning permission (c) period/context when covenant made

#### Ground (a): issues



- > original purpose of the covenant?
- changes in burdened land / "neighbourhood"
- > extent of neighbourhood
- > in light of changes, can original purpose still be fulfilled?

### Ground (a): practical tips



St John's

**Burdened land**: original vs current use: conveyance plans? photos? local records (planning, rating, archives)?

**Neighbourhood**: current vs historic use: OS maps? aerial photos? local plans (changes in planning history/purpose)

Paradox: partial change

#### Ground (aa): general



St John's

Shephard v Turner [2006] EWCA Civ. 8 at [58]:

The general purpose [of ground (aa)] is to facilitate the development and use of land in the public interest, having regard to the development plan and the pattern of permissions in the area. The section seeks to provide a fair balance between the needs of development in the area, public and private, and the protection of private contractual rights. "

#### Ground (aa): issues



#### Re Bass' Application (1973) 26 P&CR 156:-

- 1. is the proposed user reasonable?
- 2. does the covenant impede it?
- 3. does impeding the user secure practical benefits \*
- 4. if so are they of substantial advantage/value \*
- 5. if no, would money be adequate compensation \*
- 6. is impeding the user contrary to public interest
- 7. if yes, would money be adequate compensation?

#### Ground (aa): practical benefits



- > identify specific benefit
- > reduction in value? (useful, not essential)
- > the "even worse" alternative
- > not loss of bargaining position
- normally long term effects only, not temporary nuisance: <u>Shephard v Turner</u>
- > "thin end of the wedge" arguments
- > effect on building scheme?

### Ground (aa): substantial advantage/value



- 'considerable, solid, big": <u>Shephard v</u>
  Turner
- > broad, common-sense approach
- > not confined to financial value, etc.
- > financial value: no rule, but as broad guide
- diminutions in value of 10%+: substantial
- diminutions of 5% or less: not substantial

### Ground (aa): contrary to public interest?



- exceptional
- mere fact it prevents development insufficient
- possible examples
- pressing, local, social need e.g. elderly housing
- loss of use of already-built stock

### Ground (aa): adequate compensation



- > no substantial practical benefit: compensation usually "adequate" (and modest)
- > contrary to public interest: possibly greater
- based on diminution in value, not loss of bargaining position: <u>Winter v Traditional &</u> <u>Contemporary Contracts</u> [2008] 1 EGLR 80
- exceptional "consumer surplus cases" : subjective value of covenant ; wayleave basis is permissible tool

#### Ground (aa): practical tips



St John's

- secure planning permission first: issues overlap
- > purpose of covenant?
- what could be built without offending covenant?
- > effect on development elsewhere?
- "condescend to particularity": inspect site / obtain reports, mock ups, etc.