## Private Land Use Controls

### Servitude Categories
- **Major:**
  - Easement
  - Covenant
    - Real Covenant
    - Equitable Servitude
- **Minor:**
  - Profit
  - License

### Functional Description
- **A is given right to enter B’s land** (easement)
- **A is given right to enter B’s land and take something of value** (profit)
- **A is given the right to**
  - enforce a restriction on the use of B’s land
  - Require B to perform some act on B’s land
  - Require B to pay money for the upkeep of specified facilities
common field system

Willard v. First Church . . . (Cal. 1972)
- Dispute
- Chain of title

Map showing chain of title with McGuigan, Petersen, and Willard.
Willard v. First Church . . . (Cal. 1972)

- Common law rule at issue

- Outcome and status of the c/l rule?

A reservation is a regrant
- O to A and her heirs, reserving an easement in O

Types of easements
- Appurtenant
- In gross
Holbrook v. Taylor (Kentucky 1976)

- Dispute
- Easement by prescription?
- Easement by estoppel?

Van Valkenburgh v. Lutz (N.Y. 1952)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Majority</th>
<th>Dissent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Actually possess or occupy (§39) – use of the kind appropriate to the property, triggers owner’s cause of action</td>
<td>Seems to find the uses insufficient</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive of others rights (§39) – exclusive entry and use</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Open and notorious – visible, sufficiently public to warn owner</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Claim of title (§§39-40) - claim of right, hostile, adverse, without owner’s permission</td>
<td>Actions and admissions did not establish this</td>
<td>Established by acts, in particular extensive clearing and log/brush barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Continuous uninterrupted occupation (§34) for statutory period (§34) – pattern of occupation of an actual owner</td>
<td>Times are long enough, but actions don’t qualify</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Van Sandt v. Royster (Kan. 1938)
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Van Sandt v. Royster (Kan. 1938)

- English courts view
  - Implied reservation
  - Implied grant

- Approach the Kansas Court adopts
  - Restatement Approach
    - Factors, comment and illustrations on page 800-01

- Outcome

- Types of easements – note 1, pg. 688
Othen v. Rosier (Texas 1950)

- 3 part test
  - Unity of ownership
  - Necessity, not mere convenience
  - Necessity existed at time of severance

- Othen’s success in proving these elements?

---

Othen v. Rosier (Texas 1950)

- Easement for Othen by prescription?

---

Notes – Easement by Necessity

- 1

- 2., pg. 695

- 3 & 4
Notes – Easements by Prescription

- How different / same as adverse possession?

- Requirement for exclusive use (pg. 699)?
  - Exclusivity for easements by prescription (“adverse using”) does not require a showing that only the claimant made use of the way, but that the claimant’s right to use the land does not depend on a like right in others

- Note 4, pg. 699

Brown v. Voss (Wash. 1986)

- Type of easement?

- Is the use for parcel C misuse of the easement?

- Implications and outcome

- Dissent
Notes to Brown v. Voss

- Note 2, pg. 724
  - Easement holder is entitled to use the servient estate in a manner reasonably necessary for convenient enjoyment of the servitude.
  - Manner, frequency and intensity of the use may change over time to take advantage of developments in technology and to accommodate normal development of the dominant estate.
  - Unless authorized by terms, holder is not entitled to cause unreasonable damage or interfere unreasonably with its enjoyment.

- Notes 3 - 5

Negative Easements and Real Covenants

- Negative easements
  - Historical precursors to covenants
  - Types limited (see pg. 736)
    - At c/l: light, air, sublateral or adjacent support, water in artificial stream

- Covenants
  - Real covenant developed in America
    - Promise respecting the use of land that runs with the land at law
    - Benefit running to successors
    - Burden running to successors (more onerous test)
    - Horizontal and vertical privity
**Real Covenants - Privity, Benefits and Burdens**

- Horizontal privity requirement
  - Modern trend – not required
  - c/l – required for burden to run
- Note/problem 1, pg. 744

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real Covenants</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Formalities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Notice</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Touch &amp; Concern</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Horiz.Privity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vert.Privity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equitable Servitudes – Tulk v. Moxhay**

- Promises by Elms
  - Maintain Leicester Square garden
  - Do not build over/on the garden
  - Allow Leicester Square inhabitants, upon payment, to have admission to the garden
- Moxhay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equitable Servitudes</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Formalities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Notice</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Touch &amp; Concern</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Horiz.Privity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vert.Privity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.earthcam.com/uk/england/leicester/
Sanborn v. McLean (Mich. 1925)
- Casebook Section is entitled "Creation of Covenants"
  - Implied reciprocal servitude
    - Here, an implied reciprocal negative servitude
  - OR
  - Reciprocal negative easement
    - As the court calls it
- Dispute
  - State of McLean’s title?
- Common plan or scheme?
  - Common owner
  - Also incorporates concepts of (1) formalities, (2) intent, and the (4) touch and concern requirement from the previous list of elements for equitable servitudes
- Notice?
  - Actual?
  - Constructive?
  - Inquiry?
Neponsit (NPOA) v. “Bank” (NY 1938)

- T&C
  - Affect the quality or value of the property or its owner’s interest in it
  - This requirement ensures that purely personal obligations unrelated to the ownership of the relevant estate are not enforced as property rights
    - Neponsit mentions that often a covenant to pay money is purely personal
  - Normally, covenants with a direct physical effect on the property touch and concern it
  - Neponsit emphasizes that it is a facts and circumstances inquiry
    - NY holding to a general sort of inclination that affirmative covenants are likely to not T&C
    - Even with new “test” – a question of degree
      - Lots have easements to use common areas
      - Thus, burden of paying the cost can be tied to the lot which enjoys the benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real Covenants</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Burden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Formalities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Notice</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Touch &amp; Concern</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Horiz.Privity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vert.Privity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>