

Regulatory Takings

The Issue

In 1995, the Legislature passed the Texas Real Private Property Rights Preservation Act (RPPRPA), providing compensation to property owners for loss of value due to new regulations on land use. Authors sought a method of protection and a deterrent against local government regulations that would damage the value of someone's property. Unfortunately, the act exempts municipalities. Since cities, due to re-zoning activities, are the largest condemners, this exemption practically renders the act ineffective.

Additionally, even when a condemner is not a municipality, the condemner does not have to compensate a private real property owner for the taking, unless a court decides that the land has been devalued by at least 25% of its original fair market value. This tells property owners to expect losses of almost a quarter of the value of their property due to regulatory impacts. For the last three legislative sessions, bills have been filed attempting to address some of the above issues. However, the bills have stalled in committee. The problems remain.

The Facts

- Article I, Section 17, of the Texas Constitution states, “No person's property shall be taken, damaged or destroyed for or applied to public use without adequate compensation being made, unless by the consent of such person.”
- The RPPRPA does not apply this constitutional protection to actions by municipalities—like zoning—that result in a reduction of property value, i.e., a taking. Section 2007.003(a) exempts the actions of municipalities from the provisions of the act.
- The RPPRPA, in Section 2007.002, excludes from the compensation requirement any government action that reduces the market value of private property up to 25%.
- Texas case law also makes it very difficult for property owners to receive compensation for regulatory takings. The Texas Supreme Court has stated that property owners do not acquire a constitutionally protected vested right in property uses.
- Dallas opted to re-zone around Ross Avenue to increase the number of luxury condominiums and improve the aesthetic

beauty of its eastern gateway to downtown. The practical effect was to prevent many of the property owners already working on Ross from continuing to operate their businesses. One operator was allowed to continue operating his auto body shop, but at a cost of close to \$100,000 in legal fees and property modifications. Another was sued by the city when he resisted and is being threatened with hundreds of thousands of dollars in fines.

Recommendations

- The Texas Real Private Property Rights Preservation Act should be amended to apply to municipalities.
- The numerical threshold of what qualifies as a taking under the act—a 25% reduction of the market value of the affected private real property—is an arbitrary number that should be reduced or eliminated.
- Condemners should have the ability to issue waivers as an alternative to financial compensation. Those waivers should specifically mention which property rights are being reinstated per the waiver. Doing so will allow the waiver to “run with the land” for future owners, as well as prevent municipalities from spending more.

Resources

[Private Property Interrupted](#) by Kathleen Hunker, Texas Public Policy Foundation (July 2014).

[“The Story of Texas Begins with Respecting Private Property”](#) by Kathleen Hunker, Austin American-Statesman (July 29, 2014).

[Regulatory Takings: The Next Step in Protecting Property Rights in Texas](#) by Ryan Brannan, Jay Wiley, and Bill Peacock, Texas Public Policy Foundation (July 2010).

[Private Real Property Rights Preservation Act Guidelines](#), Attorney General of Texas. Article 1, Section 17, Texas Constitution.

[Article 1, Section 17](#), Texas Constitution.

[Texas Real Private Property Rights Preservation Act](#).

[City of University Park v. Benners](#), 485 S.W.2d 773 (Tex.1972).