

Overage & Clawback

INTRODUCTION

Overage clauses and clawback provisions are designed to achieve full value in relation to land being sold where a subsequent purchaser achieves additional value at a later time. Overage may act either positively in that, if additional value is received, additional money will be given to the seller, or negatively, i.e. the purchaser will not develop or does not have a sufficient interest in land. In such case, there is no need for any overage clause as the seller has control over the situation and can charge what he likes.

Such provisions are quite topical at present, primarily because of the government white paper to allow permitted development rights between business use and residential.

DRAFTING OVERAGE & CLAWBACK PROVISIONS

Duration

The duration of the overage clause will depend very much on its facts. Clauses are often drafted for 80 years, referring to the old statutory perpetuity period but, except in exceptional circumstances, it is suggested that this is excessive. Perhaps 30 years for an airfield, or 5-10 years for a residential property, would be more appropriate.

The Trigger Event

Typically the event that triggers payment is the grant of a planning consent. The main advantage of this approach is certainty: the grant of planning permission is a publicly ascertainable event. But the grant of consent does not in itself give the purchaser the money with which to pay the uplift. There may be a considerable time gap between getting planning and implementing it.

The meaning of 'grant of planning' needs to be considered. A major development will normally go ahead by initially obtaining outline consent subject to subsequent approval of a number of reserved matters by the local authority. When these have been approved, the detailed consent will be granted. But which triggers overage? The outline consent or the detailed consent? It is important to be clear at the drafting stage: a detailed consent is often easier to value than an outline consent and it may be preferable to link the overage to that. See *Loxleigh v Dartford Borough Council [2019] EWHC 2063* in which overage was triggered by the obtaining of detailed planning permission. The Court decided this meant that when reserved matters in relation to outline planning permission were agreed.

For these reasons, overage may be better linked to the implementation, rather than the grant, of any planning consent. But what about development that is exempt from planning consent?



DAVITT
JONES
BOULD

REAL ESTATE LAW SPECIALISTS



Under **S.55(2) Town and Country Planning Act 1990**, certain integral works, the use of land for agriculture, forestry and certain types of demolition do not constitute development at all. Of more concern is the evolving status of permitted development rights in this country. Certain developments do not require planning permission, for example, under the **Town and Country Planning Act (Permitted Developments) Order 1995** as amended in 2008, 2013 and under the **Town and Country Planning Act (Consequential Provisions) Regulations 2014** in England, and in 2013 and 2014 in Wales.

In addition, as of 1 August 2020, purpose-built blocks of flats will be able to build two additional stories of no more than 7 metres in extent and the new building must be no more than 30 metres without planning. Mixed use premises can also add further flats as long as the premises currently have at least three stories and the additions will not amount to more than 30 metres in height. Offices, with exceptions, can also be converted into flats. All of this is subject to prior approval which can be refused because of flooding, external appearance, natural light, traffic and highway impact or defence assets.

There is also a massive change of use classes going on in England right now. On 1 September 2020 (with exceptions, the major ones being drinking establishments, hot food takeaways, theatres and cinemas which all require planning permission for change of use), Class A1 2 and 3 and Class B were subsumed within a new Class E. Changes of use within the new Class E are exempt from planning, subject to prior approval. Furthermore, on 4 December 2020 the Government published its proposals for permitted development between Class E and Class C3 (residential). This will be disastrous for overage.

From the developer's viewpoint, there may also be difficulties in relation to building regulations post Grenfell: see *London & Ilford Ltd v Sovereign Property Holdings Ltd [2018] EWCA Civ 1618*. Here overage was triggered on prior approval of permitted development. This was given for the conversion of an office block into 60 flats, but the development could not go ahead because building regulations approval was not given, mainly because of fire safety (this had been one of the knock-on effects of Grenfell). The overage was nevertheless payable because prior approval had been given and this was the trigger. This is a harsh decision but serves to underline the need to think carefully about the trigger event during the drafting process. In this case, the overage should have been made payable on completion of the development.

Quite apart from all of this is the situation in which a landowner carries out unauthorised development without the grant of planning consent or prior approval. If operational development is started, it is exempt from an enforcement notice after 4 years and, if there is a change of use or breach of planning condition, it is exempt after 10 years. In such cases there will be no formal grant of planning consent, but it may still be possible for the landowner to realise the value if the local authority decides not to serve an enforcement notice or is simply not aware that the development has taken place.

The alternative approach is to provide that a straightforward resale at an increased price for whatever reason will trigger a payment to the recipient. But, again, care must be taken to express clearly what constitutes resale: sale of the whole or of part only?

In the case of a housing development, it is easy to fall foul of a provision that hangs payment of an uplift on the sale of the property. In ***Renewal Leeds v Lowry Properties [2010] EWHC 2902*** the overage clause stated that no uplift was payable until the last house was sold. A development of 80 houses was built but the developer deliberately left the last four houses unsold. Renewal Leeds tried to buy the houses at market value but the developer refused to sell. The court implied a term that the developer should take all reasonable steps to sell and therefore the overage was payable, but it is suggested that this shouldn't have been left to implication. It is always better to deal with such matters expressly. See also ***Sparks v Biden [2017] EWHC 1994 (Ch)***.

One final point to mention is in relation to the interpretation of the type of event that will trigger the uplift. In ***Walker v Kenley [2008] EWHC 370*** overage was stated to be payable if 'residential flats' were built on the land. The buyer of the land wanted to build holiday flats. The question for the High Court was whether holiday flats fell within the meaning of residential flats, thus triggering the overage payment. Quite surprisingly, it was held that the term 'residential flats' suggested a degree of permanence, i.e., residence as a dwelling, and that this did not include holiday homes: no money was, therefore, payable. With the benefit of hindsight, it would have been much better to merely refer to 'flats' without the prefix of residential. It is suggested this was not an obvious outcome, but one to be heeded for the future.

Stamp Duty Land Tax and Land Transaction Tax

SDLT and LTT will attach to positive overage but not to negative. A best estimate of the total consideration based on the contingent event occurring, no matter how remote, must be made and the tax calculated accordingly. When the triggering event occurs, a further return must then be made. Developers should accommodate any extra SDLT liability in their tendering process.

How any estimate of final liability may be made is debatable but note that the client must be made aware that if a trigger event occurs, they will have to fill in a new return with a balancing payment. If the estimate were to tip the SDLT liability from one band to another, the higher payment must be paid initially.

On subsequent transfers where there is clawback post 1 December 2003, enquiry must be made as to whether a deferral was requested. If this has occurred, then the subsequent purchaser will have a further tax bill on the trigger event occurring. The CPSE Enquiries envisage that a request to see the Land Transaction Return must be made.



ENFORCEMENT

Between the original parties there will be a contract and the covenantor will be able to fully enforce. The problem lies in relation to the burden passing to subsequent purchasers as this cannot be contractually assigned. In the case of ***Akassus v Farmar & Shirreff [2003] EWHC 1275***, a firm of solicitors who failed to include provisions allowing enforcement against third party purchasers was held to be negligent, so it is important this is dealt with carefully.

Some form of property rights which is binding on the purchaser will therefore need to be created. The most common ways of achieving this are: -

1. Positive covenants

The problem here is that in freehold land a positive covenant will not burden third party purchasers. See ***Austerberry v Oldham Corporation [1885] Ch.D750***. There are many ways of circumventing this, e.g. estate rentcharges and the doctrine of mutual benefit and burden, i.e. if a right is claimed a corresponding obligation must be taken on. The classic example of this is in relation to maintenance of private roads and drains in small estates. This is not suitable however in relation to overage.

2. Direct covenants and restrictions

Here each new purchaser is required to enter into a direct covenant with the original seller or their successor. They are therefore contractually bound. This is secured by a restriction placed on the register to the extent that no disposition is to be registered unless the transferee produces to the Land Registry a deed of covenant in that form.

3. Overage charges

Here a charge is taken out against the property to secure the amount of overage payment. When the trigger event occurs, the charge automatically secures payment. If the landowner does not pay, the holder of the charge will have the same rights and remedies as any other mortgagee, including the ability to sell the land and take payment out of the proceeds.

The only problem with overage charges is that the mortgagee will require priority of payment over other charges, and subsequent mortgagees may be reluctant to accept an overage charge with priority. Overage charges are therefore of less use in relation to residential properties and properties where financing is required.

4. Restrictive covenants

Restrictive covenants are of dubious value for various reasons. In the long term in particular they may be discharged under **S.84 Law of Property Act 1925** if they become obsolete or if they prevent reasonable use and enjoyment of land. In event of discharge by the Land Tribunal damages may be awarded but may be limited. Moreover, in any court proceedings an injunction will not necessarily be awarded to prevent breach and again damages will be limited to the loss of value to neighbouring land. If there is little or no loss in value there will be no enforceability. See ***Wrotham Park Estates v Parkside Homes [1973]*** and also ***Stockport Borough Council v Alwiyah [1983] 52 P & CR 278***, in which compensation was based on the reduced value of the neighbouring land, not the increase in value of the land that got the planning. Compensation was therefore negligible.



Alexander Devine Children’s Cancer Trust v (1) Millgate Development Ltd and (2) Housing Solutions Ltd [2018] EWCA Civ 2679 here, thirteen units of social housing were built upon land which was subject to covenants not to use other than for car parking. The Court of Appeal reversed the Upper Tribunal decision and held that public interest in additional housing did not prevail over contractual provisions and the Court refused to discharge the covenant.

This has now been confirmed by the Supreme Court in ***Alexander Devine Children’s Cancer Trust v Housing Solutions Limited [2020] UKSC 45***. A cynical disregard of restrictive covenants would not be permitted, nor would a clear and unambiguous breach of a restrictive covenant. The Supreme Court stated that there were two stages. Firstly, whether the covenant prevented a reasonable use of the land. The covenant was unambiguous and in any case the developer chose to build the social housing on the land subject to the covenant when planning permission allowed them to build elsewhere. Secondly, whether it was reasonable to discharge the covenant. As there had been a cynical breach of covenant it would not be reasonable.

KEY CONTACTS



MADELEINE DAVITT, Senior Partner
Central Government

T: 020 3026 8295

E: madeleine.davitt@djblaw.co.uk



SUE MCCORMICK, Client Director
Local Government

T: 01823 328084

E: sue.mccormick@djblaw.co.uk



YVONNE HILLS, Client Director
Property & Investment Companies

T: 020 3026 3467

E: yvonne.hills@djblaw.co.uk

Davitt Jones Bould is the trading name of Davitt Jones Bould Limited. Registered in England (company registration No 6155025) Registered Office: 12-14 The Crescent, Taunton TA1 4EB.

A list of Directors is available for inspection at the registered office. This firm is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. We use the word "Partner" to refer not only to a shareholder or director of Davitt Jones Bould Limited, but also to include employees who are lawyers with senior standing and qualifications.

In giving any advice or carrying out any action in connection with Davitt Jones Bould Limited's business, persons identified as "Partners" are acting for and on behalf of Davitt Jones Bould Limited, and such persons are not acting in partnership with Davitt Jones Bould Limited nor with each other.