

THE LAW OF PRIVATE NUISANCE

It is said that a nuisance is an interference with the use and enjoyment of land. This definition is typically unhelpful. While a nuisance must fit this account, it is plain that not all such interferences are legal nuisances. Thus, analysis of this area of the law begins with a definition far too broad for its subject matter, forcing the analyst to find more or less arbitrary ways of cutting back on potential liability. Tort law is plagued by this kind of approach.

In the law of nuisance, today's preferred method of cutting back is to employ the notion of reasonableness. No one seems to know quite what 'reasonableness' means in this context, however. This is because, in fact, it does not mean anything. The notion is no more than the immediately recognisable symptom of our inadequate comprehension of the law.

This book presents a new understanding of the law of nuisance, an understanding that presents the law in a coherent and systematic fashion. It advances a single, central suggestion: that the law of nuisance is the method that the common law utilises for prioritising property rights so that conflicts between uses of property can be resolved.

Volume 10 in the series Hart Studies in Private Law

The Law of Private Nuisance

Allan Beever



• H A R T •
PUBLISHING

OXFORD AND PORTLAND, OREGON

2013

Published in the United Kingdom by Hart Publishing Ltd
16C Worcester Place, Oxford, OX1 2JW
Telephone: +44 (0)1865 517530
Fax: +44 (0)1865 510710
E-mail: mail@hartpub.co.uk
Website: <http://www.hartpub.co.uk>

Published in North America (US and Canada) by
Hart Publishing
c/o International Specialized Book Services
920 NE 58th Avenue, Suite 300
Portland, OR 97213-3786
USA
Tel: +1 503 287 3093 or toll-free: (1) 800 944 6190
Fax: +1 503 280 8832
E-mail: orders@isbs.com
Website: <http://www.isbs.com>

© Allan Beever 2013

Allan Beever has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 to be identified as the author of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of Hart Publishing, or as expressly permitted by law or under the terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction which may not be covered by the above should be addressed to Hart Publishing Ltd at the address above.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data Available

ISBN: 978-1-84946-506-9

Typeset by Hope Services, Abingdon
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International, Padstow

To Tana

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book was written during a magical period in which, perhaps due to an administrative blunder, I was not overburdened with teaching. I hope that at least some of the enthusiasm for the possibilities of academic life that I felt during that period have made their way onto these pages.

I would first like to give thanks to the other members of NIRG – Steven Churches, Jane Knowler and Charles Rickett – the reading group which laboured through an earlier draft of this material and challenged me to clarify and justify my views. I enjoyed it.

And a very grateful thank you to Richard Hart, Rachel Turner and all the others at Hart Publishing. Critics of *Rediscovering the Law of Negligence* have entirely failed to detect that book's greatest flaw: the absence, due to my forgetfulness, of an acknowledgement of the support that particularly Richard lent to that project. It is not at all difficult to see why Hart Publishing has made the enormous strides that it has. I feel privileged to be able to contribute to its stable once again.

And finally, a special thanks to my family for reasons that need not be mentioned. To Cathryn, Piri, Ineawa and especially here to the incandescent Tana.

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xi
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xv
<i>Table of Conventions, Treaties etc</i>	xvi
1 Introduction	1
I. General	1
II. Outlook	2
III. Scope	4
IV. Use	4
2 The Conventional View	5
I. A Debate: A Comment on Style	5
II. The View	6
III. An Account of the Law	7
IV. Two Specific Difficulties with the Conventional View	9
V. Conclusion	13
3 The Grounds of Liability	14
I. Finding the Ground	14
II. Examining the Ground	21
III. The Structure of Analysis	22
IV. The Case Law	25
4 Illustrations of the General Principle	28
I. The Rule of Give and Take, Live and Let Live	28
II. The Location	29
III. The Sensitivity of the Claimant	33
IV. The Duration of the Interference	37
V. Isolated Events	39
5 The Activity	43
I. The Description of the Parties' Activities	43
II. The Malice Doctrine	51
6 Coming to a Nuisance	59
I. <i>Bliss v Hall</i>	59
II. <i>Sturges v Bridgman</i>	60

III. <i>Miller v Jackson</i>	61
IV. <i>Kennaway v Thompson</i>	65
V. Why ‘Who Got There First?’ Does Not Matter	65
VI. <i>Miller v Jackson</i> Revisited	67
7 A Nuisance Coming to You	69
I. Three Views	69
II. The Traditional Law	70
III. The Slide to Negligence	71
IV. Criticism of the Contemporary Approach	76
V. An Alternative Approach	79
VI. Revisiting the Case Law	85
8 Fault and Foreseeability	95
I. Introduction	95
II. Fault, Negligence and Foreseeability	96
III. Foreseeability and Nuisance	100
IV. Justifying Strict Liability	105
9 The Rule in <i>Rylands v Fletcher</i>	107
I. The Relationship between Nuisance and <i>Rylands v Fletcher</i>	107
II. The Place of <i>Rylands v Fletcher</i> in the Modern Law	115
10 The Parties	118
I. Standing: Who Can Sue?	118
II. Identifying the Defendant: Who Can Be Sued?	125
11 Statutory Authority	137
12 Remedies	145
I. Injunctions	145
II. Remoteness	153
13 Conclusion	156
<i>Bibliography</i>	159
<i>Index</i>	161

TABLE OF CASES

Australia

<i>Animal Liberation (Vic) Inc v Gasser</i> [1991] 1 VR 51 (CA).....	134–136
<i>Burnie Port Authority v General Jones Ltd</i> (1994) 179 CLR 520 (HCA)	117
<i>Dollar Sweets Pty Ltd v Federated Confectioners Association of Australia</i> [1986] VR 383, 388	135–136
<i>Munro v Southern Dairies</i> [1955] VLR 332.....	39
<i>Newcastle CC v Shortland Management Services</i> [2003] NSWCA 156.....	48
<i>Sid Ross Agency Pty Ltd v Actors and Announcers Equity Association of Australia</i> [1971] 1 NSWLR 760 (CA)	135
<i>Sparke v Osborne</i> (1908) 7 CLR 51 (HCA)	70, 86–88
<i>Victoria Park Racing v Taylor</i> (1937) 58 CLR 479 (HCA)	50

Canada

<i>Devon Lumber Co Ltd v MacNeill</i> (1987) 45 DLR (4th) 300 (New Brunswick CA)	123
<i>McBryan v Canadian Pacific Railway Co</i> (1899) 29 SCR 359.....	85
<i>Motherwell v Motherwell</i> (1976) 73 DLR 62 (Alberta SC)	121–123
<i>Tock v St John's Metropolitan Area Board</i> [1989] 2 SCR 1181	143–144

New Zealand

<i>Bank of New Zealand v Greenwood</i> [1984] 1 NZLR 525 (HC)	150–152
<i>Clearlite Holdings Ltd v Auckland City Corp</i> [1976] 2 NZLR 729 (SC)	133–134
<i>French v Auckland City Corp</i> [1974] 1 NZLR 340 (SC).....	70, 77–78
<i>Matheson v Northcote College</i> [1975] 2 NZLR 106 (SC)	50–51, 63
<i>Molloy v Drummond</i> [1939] NZLR 499 (SC)	71, 86, 88
<i>Paxhaven Holdings Ltd v AG</i> [1974] 2 NZLR 185	134
<i>Ports of Auckland v Auckland City Council</i> [1999] 1 NZLR 600.....	139

United Kingdom	
<i>Allen v Flood</i> [1898] AC 1 (HL).....	52–53
<i>Allen v Gulf Oil Refining Ltd</i> [1981] AC 1001 (HL).....	137–142, 148
<i>Anchor Brewhouse Developments Ltd v Berkley House (Docklands Developments) Ltd</i> [1987] EGLR 173.....	90
<i>Anglian Water Services Ltd v Crawshaw Robbins Ltd</i> [2001] BLR 173.....	50
<i>Attorney-General v PYA Quarries</i> [1957] 2 QB 169.....	42
<i>Balfour v Barty-King</i> [1957] 1 QB 496.....	42
<i>Bamford v Turnley</i> (1862) 3 B & S 66, 122 ER 27.....	10–11, 13, 16, 19, 26, 28, 43, 116
<i>Bernstein v Skyviews & General Ltd</i> [1978] QB 479.....	90
<i>Bliss v Hall</i> (1838) 4 Bing (NC) 183, 132 ER 758.....	59–62
<i>Bolton v Stone</i> [1951] AC 850 (HL).....	10, 63–64, 101–102, 115
<i>Bower v Peate</i> (1876) LR 1 QBD 321.....	127–128
<i>Bradford v Pickles</i> [1895] AC 587 (HL).....	51, 53, 55–58
<i>British Celanese Ltd v A H Hunt (Capacitors) Ltd</i> [1969] 1 WLR 959.....	41
<i>Bryant v Lefever</i> (1879) 4 CPD 172 (CA).....	26, 44
<i>Cambridge Water Co v Eastern Counties Leather plc</i> [1994] 2 AC 264 (HL).....	39, 70, 101, 104–105, 107
<i>Christie v Davey</i> [1893] 1 Ch 316.....	9, 52–56, 58
<i>Clark v Chambers</i> (1878) 3 QBD 327.....	102
<i>Colls v Home and Colonial Stores Ltd</i> [1904] AC 179 (HL).....	32
<i>Cunard v Antifyre Ltd</i> [1933] 1 KB 551.....	39
<i>Dalton v Angus</i> (1881) 6 App Cas 740 (HL).....	48
<i>Davey v Harrow Corp</i> [1958] 1 QB 60 (CA).....	88
<i>Dennis v Ministry of Defence</i> [2003] EWHC 793, [2003] Env LR 34.....	147, 149
<i>Dobson v Thames Water Utilities Ltd</i> [2009] EWCA Civ 28, [2009] 3 All ER 319 (CA).....	124
<i>Donoghue (Pauper) v Stevenson</i> [1932] AC 562 (HL Sc).....	24, 74, 98–99
<i>Doughty v Turner Manufacturing Co Ltd</i> [1964] 1 QB 518 (CA).....	83, 115, 155
<i>Eastern and South African Telegraph Co Ltd v Cape Town Tramway Cos Ltd</i> [1902] AC 381 (PC).....	35
<i>Farrell v John Mowlem & Co Ltd</i> [1954] 1 Lloyd's Rep 437.....	102
<i>Fletcher v Rylands</i> (1865) 159 ER 737, 3 H & C 263.....	108, 115–116
<i>Foster v Warblington Urban District Council</i> [1906] 1 KB 648 (CA).....	121–122
<i>Gaunt v Fynney</i>	53–54
<i>Geddis v Proprietors of Bann Reservoir</i> (1877–1878) LR 3 App Cas 430 (HL)....	138
<i>Giles v Walker</i> (1890) 24 QBD 656.....	70, 86–88
<i>Gillingham v Medway (Chatham) Dock Co Ltd</i> [1993] QB 343.....	139–141
<i>Goldman v Hargrave</i> [1967] 1 AC 645 (PC).....	69, 73–74, 76–79, 90–93, 102
<i>Halsey v Esso Petroleum</i> [1961] 1 WLR 683.....	9–10, 13–15, 19, 26, 125, 134
<i>Hammersmith and City Railway Co v Brand</i> (1869–1870) LR 4 HL 171.....	138
<i>Harold v Watney</i> [1898] 2 QB 320 (CA).....	102

<i>Harrison v Southwark and Vauxhall Water Co</i> [1891] 2 Ch 409	37–38
<i>Heath v Mayor of Brighton</i> (1908) 98 LT 718	33
<i>Holbeck Hall Hotel Ltd v Scarborough BC</i> [2000] QB 836 (CA)	74–76, 90–92, 94
<i>Hollywood Silver Fox Farm Ltd v Emmett</i> [1936] 2 KB 468 (CA)	9, 52, 55–56, 58
<i>Hughes v Lord Advocate</i> [1963] AC 837 (HL Sc)	76
<i>Hunter v Canary Wharf</i> [1997] AC 655 (HL)	1, 18, 26, 118–124, 154
<i>Hussain v Lancaster CC</i> [2000] QB 1 (CA)	128–132
<i>Jaggard v Sawyer</i> [1995] 1 WLR 269 (CA)	150, 152
<i>Job Edwards Ltd v Birmingham Navigations Proprietors</i> [1924] 1 KB 341 (CA)	71–72, 78, 85–86, 93
<i>Kennaway v Thompson</i> [1981] QB 88 (CA)	26, 65, 151
<i>Khorasandjian v Bush</i> [1993] QB 727 (CA)	119–124
<i>Lamb v Camden London BC</i> [1981] 1 QB 625 (CA)	115
<i>Lambton v Mellish</i> [1894] 3 Ch 163	131
<i>Langford Properties Ltd v Surrey CC</i> [1970] 1 WLR 161	58
<i>Laws v Florinplace Ltd</i> [1981] 1 All ER 659	22
<i>Le Jones (Insurance Brokers) Limited v Portsmouth CC</i> [2002] EWCA Civ 1723, [2003] 1 WLR 427 (CA)	132–133
<i>Leakey v National Trust</i> [1980] 1 QB 485 (CA)	69, 74–75, 77–79, 91–92
<i>Lemmon v Webb</i> [1894] 3 Ch 1 (CA)	88–90
<i>Lippiatt v South Gloucestershire Council</i> [2000] QB 51 (CA)	129–130, 132
<i>Lyons (J) & Sons v Wilkins</i> [1896] 1 Ch 255 (CA)	135
<i>M’Alister (or Donoghue) (Pauper) v Stevenson</i> [1932] AC 562 (HL Sc).	
See <i>Donoghue (Pauper) v Stevenson</i> [1932] AC 562 (HL Sc)	
<i>Managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District v Hill</i> (1880–1881) LR 6 App Cas 193 (HL)	142
<i>Marcic v Thames Water Utilities Ltd</i> [2002] 2 All ER 55 (CA)	144, 148
<i>Matania v National Provincial Bank</i> [1936] 2 All ER 633 (CA)	126–127
<i>Mayor of Bradford (The) v Pickles</i> [1895] AC 587 (HL)	9
<i>Metropolitan Properties v Jones</i> [1939] 2 All ER 202	29
<i>Midwood & Co Ltd v Manchester Corp</i> [1905] 2 KB 597	41–42
<i>Miller v Jackson</i> [1977] QB 966 (CA)	17, 26, 61–62, 64–65, 67, 147–151
<i>Mint v Good</i> [1951] 1 KB 517 (CA)	128
<i>Murphy v Brentwood District Council</i> [1991] 1 AC 398 (HL)	115
<i>Neath Rural District Council v Williams</i> [1951] 1 KB 115	71, 86–87
<i>Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd v Morris</i> [2004] EWCA Civ 172, [2004] Env LR 41 (CA)	33
<i>Newcastle-Under-Lyme Corp’n v Wolstanton Ltd</i> [1947] Ch 427	121
<i>OBG Ltd v Allan</i> 2007 UKHL 21, [2008] 1 AC 1 (HL)	127
<i>Overseas Tankship (UK) Ltd v Morts Dock & Engineering Co Ltd (The Wagon Mound, No 1)</i> [1961] AC 388 (PC)	98, 102–103, 115
<i>Overseas Tankship (UK) Ltd v Morts Dock & Engineering Co Ltd (The Wagon Mound, No 2)</i> [1967] AC 617 (PC)	11, 64, 101–104, 115
<i>Page Motors Ltd v Epsom and Ewell</i> (1981) 80 LGR 337 (CA)	129

<i>Payne v Rogers</i> (1794) 2 HBl 350	128
<i>Pearson v Cox</i> (1876–1877) LR 2 CPD 369 (CA)	102
<i>Pemberton v Southwark London Borough Council</i> [2000] 1 WLR 1672 (CA)	118
<i>Pickering v Rudd</i> (1815) 4 Camp 218, 171 ER 70	90
<i>Polsue & Alfieri Ltd v Rushmer</i> [1907] AC 121 (HL)	31
<i>Qualcast (Wolverhampton) Ltd v Haynes</i> [1959] AC 743 (HL)	48
<i>Rapier v London Tramways</i> [1893] 2 Ch 588 (CA)	97, 100
<i>Read v J Lyons & Co Ltd</i> [1947] AC 156 (HL)	96, 118, 123
<i>Robinson v Kilvert</i> (1889) LR 41 Ch D 88 (CA)	35–37
<i>Rushmer v Polsue & Alfieri Ltd</i> [1906] 1 Ch 234 (CA)	31
<i>Rylands v Fletcher</i> (1868) LR 3 HL 330	6, 37, 39, 42, 95, 104, 107–108, 110–117, 137
<i>St Helen's Smelting Co v Tipping</i> (1865) 11 ER 1483 (HL)	9, 13–14, 25, 29
<i>Sedleigh-Denfield v O'Callaghan</i> [1940] AC 880 (HL)	16–17, 72, 74–75, 78–80, 82–87, 93, 126
<i>Seligman v Docker</i> [1949] Ch 53	71, 86, 88
<i>Sharp v Powell</i> (1872) LR 7 CP 253	102
<i>Shelfer v City of London Electric Lighting Company</i> [1895] 1 Ch 287 (CA)	146–147, 150–153
<i>Southport Corp v Esso Petroleum Co Ltd</i> [1953] 3 WLR 773	132
<i>Spartan Steel & Alloys Ltd v Martin & Co (Contractors) Ltd</i> [1973] QB 27 (CA)	50
<i>Spicer v Smee</i> [1946] 1 All ER 489	41–42
<i>Stevens v Anglia Water Authority</i> [1987] 1 WLR 1381	58
<i>Stone v Bolton</i> [1950] 1 KB 201 (CA)	101
<i>Sturges v Bridgman</i> (1879) 11 Ch D 852 (CA)	26, 30–31, 43–44, 60–62, 66, 68
<i>Tetley v Chitty</i> [1986] 1 All ER 663	128
<i>Thompson-Schwab v Costaki</i> [1956] 1 WLR 335	22
<i>Transco plc v Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council</i> [2003] UKHL 61, [2004] 2 AC 1	107, 113, 132, 136–137
<i>Vaughan v Menlove</i> (1837) 3 Hodges 51, 132 ER 490	35, 78–79
<i>Wagon Mound, No 1 (The)</i> . See <i>Overseas Tankship (UK) Ltd v Morts Dock & Engineering Co Ltd (The Wagon Mound, No 1)</i>	
<i>Wagon Mound, No 2 (The)</i> . See <i>Overseas Tankship (UK) Ltd v Morts Dock & Engineering Co Ltd (The Wagon Mound, No 2)</i>	
<i>Wheeler v Saunders Ltd</i> [1996] Ch 19 (CA)	139–140

United States of America

<i>Fontainebleau Hotel Corp v Forty-Five Twenty-Five Inc</i> 114 So 2d 357 (FL Dist CA 1959)	17, 26, 45, 48–50
<i>Hay v Cohoes</i> 2 NY 159 (NY CA 1849)	18–19
<i>Palsgraf v Long Island Railroad Co</i> 162 NE 99 (NY CA 1928)	24, 115
<i>Reaver v Martin Theatres</i>	49
<i>Rogers v Elliott</i> 15 NE 768 (MA SJC 1888)	33–36

TABLE OF LEGISLATION

Canada

Municipalities Act 1979	143
-------------------------------	-----

Germany

<i>BGB</i> (Civil Code)	
Div 3, Title 1	15

United Kingdom

Chancery Amendment Act 1858 (Lord Cairns' Act)	146
Defective Premises Act 1972	128
Family Law Act 1996	123
Gulf Oil Refining Act 1965	137, 139, 142
Human Rights Act 1998.....	124
Lord Cairns' Act. <i>See</i> Chancery Amendment Act 1858	
Matrimonial Homes Act 1967.....	123
Nuclear Installations Act 1965.....	111
Protection from Harassment Act 1997	120, 130–131

TABLE OF CONVENTIONS, TREATIES ETC

European Convention on Human Rights
Art 8 118, 124

1

Introduction

I. General

In an era of regulation, it is perhaps surprising that the law of private nuisance retains the vitality that it does. If my neighbour is annoying me, it is generally quicker and easier to have our dispute settled through other means. Why, then, has the law of nuisance not faded away? Why have the calls for the expansion of regulation not been sufficiently loud effectively to abolish this area of the law? What does the law offer us that regulation does not?

Moreover, though the social importance of the law of private nuisance has shrunk, this has not prevented important developments from occurring. On the contrary, especially in the United Kingdom, recent years have witnessed a number of important decisions from the courts, including *Hunter v Canary Wharf*,¹ one of the most significant cases of the last 100 years.

What is perhaps even more interesting is that, though the law of private nuisance continues to attract significant academic attention, the vast majority of this has been from law and economics scholars based in the United States. In the UK and elsewhere in the Commonwealth, the law of nuisance has been somewhat neglected. Thus, John Murphy begins his recent monograph on this area of the law by remarking that his was the first book-length examination of this law since 1996.²

I think it fair to say that, putting law and economics aside, this area of the law is under-theorised. As a result, the student of this law – whether scholar or practitioner – has little to guide her beyond the often conflicting, or at least apparently conflicting, case law. In particular, what is lacking is a sense of what this area of the law is about. We have no framework that seems to enable us to understand it. (This topic is pursued in detail in chapter two.)

This book is an attempt to provide such a framework. It is not a textbook on the law of private nuisance. Its analysis is by no means comprehensive. The book examines only those issues most important to our understanding of the law. And it aims to show that those issues, and by implication the others that are not canvassed, can be understood in a coherent and systematic fashion.

¹ *Hunter v Canary Wharf* [1997] AC 655 (HL).

² J Murphy, *The Law of Nuisance* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010) vii.

No doubt, there is much more to be said about the law of nuisance. And I particularly wish to resist the suggestion that this book is intended to provide some kind of mechanical formula for determining the law in this area. The book is best understood as advancing a suggestion: that the law of nuisance is better understood by rejecting the contemporary understanding of it and beginning again with an approach that focuses on the prioritising of property rights. The book is only a beginning. But it is a beginning that I hope academics and practitioners will find useful in developing their understanding of the law.

II. Outlook

Like any area of the law, the law of nuisance can be difficult to understand. A major reason for this is that common law subjects of this kind are not formulated as wholes then neatly presented to us. Rather, we receive the law as an accumulation of a great many judicial decisions. It is largely because of this that this material must be interpreted by academics, whose primary function is not simply to learn the decided cases but to make sense out of what they find. In that way, the legal academy performs the same function – aiding understanding – as the rest of the university and appropriately serves the rest of the legal community.

There is no reason, in principle, why purely descriptive accounts of the law cannot be genuinely explanatory. If the law has been developed in the courts so that it presents an explanation adequate to it, then the academic has no interpretive role to play. She may, of course, question the justifications offered for the law by the courts and perhaps suggest alternative, prescriptive, theories. But in those circumstances, representing the law requires only a form of journalism: a reporting of what has been expounded elsewhere.

In saying this, I do not mean to deride journalism or the journalistic skill as it applies to law. It can take great skill to depict the decisions of courts in a way that permits the reader easily and efficiently to develop her understanding. Many of the greatest textbooks are journalistic in this sense (though they are never solely journalistic).

The problem is that law is seldom such that purely descriptive accounts are genuinely explanatory. Judges, of course, give explanations for their decisions. And it is always important to give due consideration to the explanations offered. They will only very occasionally be far wide of the mark.³ But given that judges make decisions in response to particular problems that they are required to solve – cases, in other words – it is hardly surprising that the explanations they provide frequently conflict with other explanations provided by other courts looking to

³ cf AC Danto, *The Philosophical Disenfranchisement of Art* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1986) 44–45.