

#36.25

3/19/70

Memorandum 70-30

Subject: Study 36.25 - Condemnation (The Right to Take - Byroads)

Attached to this memorandum is a copy of the tentative recommendation and the background study relating to byroads, together with the comments received after distribution of the recommendation (Exhibits I-VI). The Commission previously considered these materials at the June 1969 meeting and directed the staff to amend Section 1238.8 to deal with the problem of the effect on damages of an offer by a condemnor to furnish an access road under that section. This has been accomplished. See page 11 of the tentative recommendation. However, no action was taken at the June meeting with respect to providing a private person with power to condemn land for access purposes. Accordingly, the recommendation continues merely to authorize the creation of byroads under the Street Opening Act of 1903 and thereby withholds the right of eminent domain from private persons for this purpose. This latter aspect of the recommendation is pertinent to the Commission's general consideration of the right to take and we have therefore taken the liberty of bringing these materials before you again.

There is a wide difference in the views expressed concerning the right of a private person to condemn for byroads. The State Bar Committee on Governmental Liability and Condemnation, after a joint meeting of the Northern and Southern sections, expressed the view that a private person should have such a right and, moreover, that the test should be one of "economic," not "strict," necessity. This position was repeated in part by Mr. Homer L. McCormick, Jr., a partner in Rutan & Tucker, who stated (Exhibit I, page 2):

There are few if any legislative bodies or public entities who are willing to take on additional condemnation cases simply to expedite the development of property that may be landlocked. To be sure, if a contemplated condemnation action by a public entity is responsible for the landlocking of a parcel of land, the public entity should be expected to use your proposed sections, but in other events the property owner is likely only to find a deaf ear when he seeks that sort of help. If the Commission has any evidence to indicate that it is better to allow only public entities to acquire access roads to landlocked parcels, then I think the Commission should state what evidence it has that this result is desirable. Those of us who represent property owners in rapidly developing counties would certainly arrive at the opposite conclusion. If the Commission is not disposed to provide in the law that private individuals can condemn a so-called byroad when they are able to show strict necessity, then at least the Commission should not change what many of us believe is the existing law allowing such condemnations without substantial evidence that such change is necessary.

On the other hand, we did receive letters that approved the entire recommendation generally (see Exhibits II, III, and V) and the minutes of an earlier meeting of the Northern section of the Bar Committee on Governmental Liability and Condemnation reflect that the Northern section specifically endorsed the Commission's tentative recommendation and disapproved the power of private persons to condemn. Also, letters from Mr. Joseph K. Horton, of Horton & Foote (Exhibit VI), not only endorse the vesting of the power of eminent domain in a public body rather than a private person, but further suggest that additional statutory limitations be placed on the exercise of the power. Specifically, Mr. Horton suggests:

that in order to establish such an easement certain factors must be present: [(1) the dominant owner] . . . must be innocent . . .; (2) irreparable injury must not result to the party against whom the easement is established; and . . . (3) the hardship to the one establishing the easement must be greatly disproportionate to the hardship caused the one against whom the easement is established. . . .

Finally, the Commission should note the approach of Senate Bill 110, introduced by Senator Carrell at the 1970 legislative session (see attached Exhibit VII). This bill is identical to Senate Bill 68 which was introduced

by Senator Carrell in 1969 and died in committee--apparently because the Commission had the topic under current study. Senate Bill 110 permits condemnation "of an easement by the owner of private property for which there is a strict necessity for an easement for access to a public road from such property." Senate Bill 68 was opposed by the State Bar Committee as being too restrictive and as restricting existing law; the same bill was vigorously opposed by Mr. Horton as being too liberal. It seems obvious that we will be unable to please everyone; the question remains whether the Commission desires to make any changes in its present recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack I. Horton
Associate Counsel

Memo 70-30

EXHIBIT I

RUTAN & TUCKER

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

POST OFFICE BOX 1976

811 NORTH BROADWAY

SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92702

(714) 543-9411 • 635-2200

JAMES B. TUCKER, SR.
1868-1950

OF COUNSEL
W. K. LINDSAY

LOS ANGELES OFFICE
SUITE 533 BANK OF CALIFORNIA BUILDING
550 SOUTH FLOWER STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
TELEPHONE (2-3) 620-0482

LAGUNA HILLS OFFICE
SUITE 300 ROSSMOOR BUILDING
23521 PASEO DE VALENCIA
LAGUNA HILLS, CALIFORNIA 92653
TELEPHONE (714) 835-2200

January 27, 1969

IN REPLY PLEASE REFER TO

A. W. RUTAN
MILFORD W. DANL
NORMAN H. SWEDEGAARD
H. RODGER HOWELL
JAMES B. TUCKER
GARVIN F. SKALLENBERGER
JAMES R. MOORE
HERBERT W. WALKER
ALEXANDER BONIC
ROBERT L. RISLEY
ROBERT C. TODD
NICA E. VOCCA
FRITZ R. STRADLING
HARRY J. KEATON
HOMER L. MCCORMICK, JR.
EDMUND S. CASEY
HOWARD F. HARRISON
JAMES E. ERICSON
JOHN M. VINCENT
WILLIAM R. BIEL

RICHARD A. CERNUTI
LEONARD A. HAMPPEL
JOHN B. KURLBUT, JR.
MICHAEL W. MRELL
COLLEEN M. CLAIRE
MILFORD W. DANL, JR.
JOHN J. HYLAK
THOMAS P. BURKE
JOHN G. OLMARRA, JR.
BRUCE D. WALLACE
J. NICHOLAS COUNTER III
LARRY F. GOLDSBY
RODOLFO MONTEJANO
RONALD P. ARRINGTON
STUART T. WALORP

California Law Revision Commission
School of Law of Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Gentlemen:

Recently I received the Commission's "Tentative Recommendation Relating to Inverse Condemnation--The Privilege to Enter, Survey and Examine Property" and "Tentative Recommendations Relating to Condemnation Law and Procedure--The Right to Take (Byroads)". You requested my comments relating to these recommendations.

Our firm represents some 25 public agencies on the condemnor's side of condemnation cases. In addition, we represent a large number of property owners. We have no quarrel with your concept or proposals relating to the privilege to enter, survey and examine property, except wherein you propose that the court might require upon application by the condemnor that an order to enter property be conditioned upon a security deposit where that security deposit would include an amount to reimburse the owners of the property for costs and attorney's fees. Although I personally would be happy to see the entire law changed so that property owners are compensated for attorneys fees in all cases involving direct as well as inverse condemnation, your concept would certainly change the existing law. If attorney's fees are to be paid in order to secure the right to use property temporarily for surveys, why should they not be paid when we have a temporary easement, for example, for construction purposes? Why not when a permanent taking occurs? Just compensation has been held not to include attorneys fees to date. If your proposal were made I think that most attorneys for property owners would simply take the position in every case where a survey is sought that they would refuse entry. Thereafter, the public agency would apply for a court order and the property owner's attorney would come into court and claim that a security deposit be put up and also that he be awarded attorneys fees. It seems to me that this provision relating to attorneys fees should receive further consideration by the Commission.


RUTAN & TUCKER

California Law Revision Commission
January 27, 1969
Page Two

Your second recommendation relating to byroads in our opinion adds to the flexibility of condemning agencies in that they would be able to acquire access roads onto otherwise landlocked parcels without the question of public use and necessity being raised. Unfortunately, however, the recommendations of the Commission purport to change the probable existing law that a private individual could condemn an access route so that a parcel of landlocked property could be developed. Your own study points out that this change is contemplated. As your study also points out on page 10: "Maximum utilization of land is important." You state on page 3 of your tentative recommendations relating to byroads that the "Commission has concluded that if there is any need for the acquisition of a byroad by condemnation, the appropriate legislative body rather than a private person should initiate the proceedings: by deleting the word "byroads" from § 1238 of the CCP and expressly providing that a public agency can acquire byroads and by statements such as the above it can be expected that courts in the state would hold that a private person could not condemn a byroad. Any court interpreting these new proposals is certain to consider the Law Revision Commission's recommendations as part of "legislative history", if nothing else. In our opinion this proposed change is an extremely undesirable change.

There are few if any legislative bodies or public entities who are willing to take on additional condemnation cases simply to expedite the development of property that may be landlocked. To be sure, if a contemplated condemnation action by a public entity is responsible for the landlocking of a parcel of land, the public entity should be expected to use your proposed sections, but in other events the property owner is likely only to find a deaf ear when he seeks that sort of help. If the Commission has any evidence to indicate that it is better to allow only public entities to acquire access roads to landlocked parcels, then I think the Commission should state what evidence it has that this result is desirable. Those of us who represent property owners in rapidly developing counties would certainly arrive at the opposite conclusion. If the Commission is not disposed to provide in the law that private individuals can condemn a so-called byroad when they are able to show strict necessity, then at least the Commission should not change what many of us believe is the existing law allowing such condemnations without substantial evidence that such change is necessary.

Sincerely,



Homer L. McCormick, Jr.

36,10-7

Memo 90-30

JOHN D. MAHARG
COUNTY COUNSEL

EXHIBIT II

MADISON 5-3611

JOHN H. LARSON
SPECIAL ASSISTANT

CLARENCE H. LANGSTAFF
DAVID D. MIX
EDWARD H. GAYLORD
ROBERT C. LYNCH
JOEL R. BENNETT
A. R. EARLY
JAMES W. BRIGGS
DONALD K. BYRNE
ASSISTANTS

OFFICES OF
THE COUNTY COUNSEL
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY
SUITE 648 HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

February 7, 1969

HENRY W. GARDETT
ALFRED C. DE FLOO
JOHN D. GARDIN
WILSON R. STODDARD
EDWARD A. NUBERT
TERRY C. SMITH
RONALD L. SCHNEIDER
PETER R. BRICHMAN
JEAN LOUISE WEBSTER
JEROME A. JOHNSON
DAVID M. ZIEB
GORDON W. TREMARNE
DEWITT W. CLINTON
PAUL G. BERNIER
RAYMOND W. SCHNEIDER
NORMAN J. SILBERT
S. ROBERT ANDROSS
WILLIAM F. STEWART
RON APPERSON
MARTIN E. WEEKES
BERNARD F. GRUMP
RICHARD P. GARWAY
ALLAN S. MORITZICK
JOHN F. KEATING
WILLIAM L. OWEN
WAYNE R. HARRISH
JERALD WHEAT
MICHAEL DOUGHERTY
ELAINE MARIE BRILLO
BIRCH HOLYON
CHARLES VINSON TACKETT
RONALD D. RUBERT
LAWRENCE L. KOFFMAN
RUSSELL HOWELL
MARIANNE BUFFINGTON
LARRY A. CURTIS
WILLIAM A. KERR
ROBERT R. RICH
PETER BROWN BOLAN
LYNARD C. KINGJOSA
ERIC OLSON
ROBERT W. BOGOLF
ROBERT E. TAYLOR
BETTY T. CHU
WALTER M. LEIGHTON
THOMAS H. MALCOLM
JOE BEN HUBBENS
DAVID W. BREES
DAVID J. SERRANO
RICHARD G. BRUNGARD
MICHAEL LANGS
DEPUTIES

Mr. John H. DeMouilly
Executive Secretary
California Law Revision Commission
School of Law
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Re: California Law Revision Commission
Condemnation Law and Procedure
The Right to Take (Byroads)

Dear Mr. DeMouilly:

This office has reviewed your tentative recommenda-
tion relating to Condemnation Law and Procedure - The Right
to Take (Byroads), as revised November 26, 1968. This
office approves the tentative recommendation.

Very truly yours,

JOHN D. MAHARG
County Counsel

By *Terry C. Smith*
Terry C. Smith
Deputy County Counsel

TCS:jac

Memo 70-30

EXHIBIT III

G. J. CUMMINGS
PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
LICENSE NO. M. E. 2424
648 CARLTON AVENUE
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94610

PHONE AREA CODE (415) 832-4843

FEB. 4-69.

CALIF. LAW REVISION COMMISSION,
SCHOOL OF LAW
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIF. 94305.

ATT: MR. JOHN H. DEMOULLY.
EXECUTIVE SEC'Y.

GENTLEMEN:

REGARDING # 65 AND INVERSE CONDEMNATION:
THE PRIVILEGE TO ENTER, SURVEY, AND EXAMINE PRO-
PERTY, I AGREE WITH THE RECOMMENDED LEGISLATION
AS OUTLINED AND REVISED DEC. 15TH, 1968 BY THE
LAW REVISION COMMISSION.

REGARDING # 36: THE RIGHT TO TAKE BY-ROADS
PROPERTY UNDER CONDEMNATION, AS REVISED NOV. 26TH
1968, THE ASSUMPTIONS BY THE COMMISSION ARE, IN
MY OPINION WELL TAKEN. I WOULD APPROVE THE REC-
OMMENDATION AS PROPOSED BY THE COMMISSION.

LAND ACCESS IS A SITUATION IS A SITUATION
THAT HAS LONG BEEN AN IMPEDIMENT TO THE BEST
UTILIZATION OF A GREAT AMOUNT OF LAND IN THE
UNITED STATES.

SINCERELY YOURS

G. J. Cummings

ES	

MEMO 70-30

EXHIBIT IV

JEFFREY S. PEELER
 JOHN H. ROBINSON
 MELVIN D. WILSON
 DAVID P. EVANS
 JAMES E. LUDLAM
 GERALD S. KELLY
 JESSE R. O'HALLCY
 BRUCE E. CLARK
 MURRAY S. MARVIN
 STUART T. PEELER
 BRUCE A. DEVAN, JR.
 RALPH E. ERICKSON
 CHARLES F. FORKES
 THOMAS J. KELLY
 RICHARD T. APPEL
 GEORGE C. HADLEY
 THOMAS H. COLLINS
 PETER C. BRADFORD
 DONALD J. DREW

RICHARD D. BISH
 LEONARD T. CASTRO
 J. PATRICK WHALEY
 MICHAEL W. CONLON
 MICHAEL M. MURPHY
 WILLIAM J. EMANUEL
 EDWARD A. LANDRY
 JOHN B. BROWNING
 DONALD R. GAIL
 E. ROBERT FERGUSON
 LAUDER W. HODGES
 JOSEPH A. BAUNDERS
 RONALD G. TRAYNER
 JEFFREY R. NATSEN
 ROBERT E. THOMPSON
 ROGER S. DAYHILLER
 FRANK H. SMITH, JR.
 GALE S. GUTHRIE

1990-1998

LEROY A. GARRETT
1908-1982

MORTIMER A. SLINE
OF COUNSEL

MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT
 ATTORNEYS AT LAW
 ONE WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
 TELEPHONE (213) 629-3322
 CABLE "PEELGAR"

May 27, 1969

California Law Revision Commission
 School of Law
 Stanford, California 94305

Attention: John H. DeMouilly, Executive Secretary

Gentlemen:

The California State Bar Committee on Govern-
 mental Liability and Condemnation, at a joint meeting,
 took the following action on matters which have been under
 consideration by the Law Revision Commission, and this
 memo is being submitted as the position of the entire
 State Bar Committee.

...

(3) Re Senate Bill No. 68, the State Bar
 Committee unanimously agreed that the word "byroads" in
 C.C.P. §1238.8 and 1238.9 be disapproved, and that Section
 4 of Senate Bill No. 68 be disapproved for the following
 reasons:

(a) Present law is adequate.

(b) The proposed C.C.P. §1238.8 and 1238.9 are more restrictive than present law.

(c) Further study is necessary if the present law is going to be changed or broadened.

(d) This Committee is in favor of the concept of liberalizing this portion of the law of eminent domain, but the proposed changes do not accomplish that goal.

...

(6) The Committee unanimously agreed as follows re Senate Bill No. 68, "The Right to Take: Byroads":

(a) The Committee is in favor of liberalizing this portion of the law of eminent domain, but does not feel that the proposed changes in Senate Bill No. 68 accomplish this goal and suggest that further study be made with the following in mind:


(1) Avoid the requirement of the approval of any public agency as a condition upon which a private condemnor must proceed, i.e., the Superior Court should have sole jurisdiction.

(2) "Strict necessity" should not be the criterion to bringing an eminent domain action for either a public or private condemnor but economic necessity should be the test.

(3) All existing statutes of special application re byroads should be repealed to be superseded by this proposed statute of general application.

...

Very truly yours,


George C. Hadley
Chairman

GCH:mm



Memo 70-30

EXHIBIT V

County of San Diego

OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL

302 COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

February 10, 1969

ROBERT G. BERREY
ASSISTANT COUNTY COUN

DEPUTIES
DUANE J. CARRIS
DONALD L. CLARK
JOSEPH KASE, JR.
LAWRENCE KAPLOF
LLOYD M. HARMON, JR.
BETTY E. BOONE
PARKER O. LEACH
WILLIAM C. GEORGE
ROBERT B. HUTCHINSON
JAMES E. SMITH
JOHN MC EVOY
ARNE HANSEN

ERTRAM MC LEES, JR.
COUNTY COUNSEL

Mr. John H. DeMouilly
California Law Revision Commission
School of Law
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Dear Mr. DeMouilly:

- Re: Tentative Recommendations:
- (a) Inverse Condemnation - Privilege to Enter, Survey and Examine Property
 - (b) Condemnation Law and Procedure - Right to Take Byroads

We have reviewed the tentative recommendations furnished by your office in the above referenced matters on which you have requested comments. We agree with the proposals as submitted to the Law Revision Commission.

Our office has been faced with the problem on the right of a condemning agency to survey and examine property, even after a complaint in eminent domain has been filed. Moreover, school districts do not have the right of prior possession in eminent domain proceedings and their right to enter and make surveys is not clear under existing law. The amendments to Sections 1242 and 1242.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure will clarify these issues.

This office also has had problems in specific cases where school districts have considered possible acquisition of additional property to provide access to property not taken. In the past we have advised school districts that they have no authority to acquire property for use other than school buildings and grounds unless otherwise specifically authorized. (See Education Code Section 15304 which authorizes acquisition of property by a school district for streets in front of property owned by the district when required for school purposes; and Section 15251 which authorizes a school district to acquire land for a "school approach" which is not more than one-half mile in length and is entirely outside the boundaries of any

ES	
AES	

Mr. John H. DeMouilly


-2-

February 10, 1969

city.) The proposed amendments will clarify this problem.

Very truly yours,

BERTRAM McLEES, JR., County Counsel

By 
DONALD CLARK, Deputy

DC:AM

cc: Terry C. Smith
Deputy County Counsel
648 Hall of Administration
Los Angeles, California

Memo 78-30

EXHIBIT VI

LAW OFFICES
HORTON & FOOTE

1800 CALIFORNIA FEDERAL PLAZA
8670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90036
TELEPHONE 836-1147

April 22, 1969

California Law Revision Commission
School of Law
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Gentlemen:

I am advised that you are studying possible proposed laws relative to landlocked property.

We respectfully submit herewith our views in regard to any proposal such as set forth in 1969 Senate Bill No. 68 which we strongly oppose.

To give the right of eminent domain, a heretofore limited prerogative of the Sovereign, as proposed without any regard to equities, can lead to deprivation and damage to private property most unjustly. To illustrate, we need only refer to a situation where a developer, due entirely to a landlocked situation which he had occasioned, can cut through adjoining, fully developed and occupied single family residential property, depriving the owner of the full and rightful use of his home site, for personal gain in developing property to the rear thereof. Equities must and should be considered.

As you well know, this State has for years recognized the law pertaining to a way of necessity. This has been carefully developed by the courts and a broad and unfair extension of the same, under the guise of eminent domain should not be sanctioned. The California law is clear that a way of necessity is based on the inferred intent of the parties. This is discarded entirely in this proposal. For example, the land may be bordering an existing road easement which may be vacated and abandoned by the landowner or the land may be bordering a public street and the portion bordering the same conveyed by the landowner and such owner could, under this section, exercise eminent domain against an innocent third party, perhaps destroying to a considerable extent the privacy of his home, to such party's detriment. A landowner could even have provided, in connection with the conveyance, that there should be no right of way and still claim direct or by successor under this act.

We now note that the Court of Appeal has decided a case which emphasizes our position. The case is Miller v. Johnston, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division 1, February 8, 1969 (as yet unreported in the advance decisions). The case considers the


April 22, 1969

establishment of an easement for access under common law for equitable principles. It stresses that in order to establish such an easement certain factors must be present, the first of which is:

"Defendant (in such case the party seeking to establish the easement) must be innocent - the encroachment must not be the result of defendant's willful act, and perhaps not the result of defendant's negligence."

Second; irreparable injury must not result to the party against whom the easement is established, and third; the hardship to the one establishing the easement must be greatly disproportionate to the hardship caused the one against whom the easement is established and this must clearly appear in the evidence and proved by the party asserting the right to the easement.

Yours sincerely,



Joseph K. Horton
of HORTON & FOOTE

JKH:nk

LAW OFFICES
HORTON & FOOTE

1860 CALIFORNIA FEDERAL PLAZA
3670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90036
TELEPHONE 938-1147

May 14, 1969

Mr. John H. DeMouilly
Executive Secretary
California Law Revision Commission
School of Law
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Re: Landlocked Property

Dear Mr. DeMouilly:

Thank you for your letter of April 24, 1969 in response to mine of April 22nd.

I have reviewed the tentative recommendation revised November 26, 1968 and a study relating to the use of the power of eminent domain to acquire byroads. It is noted that the recommendation of the Commission vests such power of eminent domain in the public body rather than a private person. This, I believe, to be far better and more likely to prevent inequities. I feel it is a considerable improvement over 1968 Senate Bill #18.

It appears that the tentative recommendation is the tentative action on Recommendation 4 of the study, although the recommendation is dated prior to the date of the study. If I am in error in this respect, please advise me.

We also submit that provision should be made to prevent inequities as discussed in our letter of April 22nd. Otherwise the public body might become the tool to inflict unwarranted and inequitable damage to one person for the private gain of another.

I should like to have each member of the Commission receive a copy of this letter, as well as our letter of April 22nd, and if this is not to be done, or if you would like to have us furnish you with extra copies, please let me know.

Again thanking you, I am

Yours very truly,



Joseph K. Horton
of HORTON & FOOTE

JKH:mf

Memo 70-30 EXHIBIT VII

SENATE BILL

No. 110

Introduced by Senator Carrell

January 13, 1970

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

An act to amend Section 1238 of, and to add Sections 1238.8 and 1238.9 to, the Code of Civil Procedure, relating to eminent domain.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

- 1 SECTION 1. Section 1238 of the Code of Civil Procedure is
2 amended to read:
3 1238. Subject to the provisions of this title, the right of
4 eminent domain may be exercised in behalf of the following
5 public uses:
6 1. Fortifications, magazines, arsenals, Navy yards, Navy and
7 Army stations, lighthouses, range and beacon lights, coast
8 surveys, and all other public uses authorized by the govern-
9 ment of the United States.
10 2. Public buildings and grounds for use of a state, or any
11 state institution, or any institution within the State of Cali-
12 fornia which is exempt from taxation under the provisions of
13 Section 1a, of Article XIII of the Constitution of the State of
14 California, and all other public uses authorized by the Legis-
15 lature of the State of California.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 110, as introduced, Carrell (Jud.). Eminent domain.

Amends Sec. 1238, adds Secs. 1238.8 and 1238.9, C.C.P.

Deletes provisions authorizing the exercise of the right of eminent domain in behalf of byroads.

Provides that an owner of property for which there is a strict necessity for an easement for access to a public road from such property may acquire, by eminent domain proceedings, an easement for access to a public road and that it shall afford the most reasonable access consistent with other uses of the burdened land and the location of already established roads and shall include the right to install or have installed utility facilities therein. Makes these provisions inapplicable to prescribed lands in the state park system and for the acquisition of a private or farm crossing over a railroad track.

1 3. Any public utility, and public buildings and grounds,
 2 for the use of any county, incorporated city, or city and
 3 county, village, town, school district, or irrigation district,
 4 ponds, lakes, canals, aqueducts, reservoirs, tunnels, flumes,
 5 ditches, or pipes, lands, water system plants, buildings, rights
 6 of any nature in water, and any other character of property
 7 necessary for conducting or storing or distributing water for
 8 the use of any county, incorporated city, or city and county,
 9 village or town or municipal water district, or the inhabitants
 10 thereof, or any state institution, or necessary for the proper
 11 development and control of such use of said water, either at
 12 the time of the taking of said property, or for the future
 13 proper development and control thereof, or for draining any
 14 county, incorporated city, or city and county, village or town;
 15 raising the banks of streams, removing obstructions therefrom,
 16 and widening and deepening or straightening their channels;
 17 roads, highways, boulevards, streets and alleys; public moor-
 18 ing places for watercraft; public parks, including parks and
 19 other places covered by water, and all other public uses for
 20 the benefit of any county, incorporated city, or city and
 21 county, village or town, or the inhabitants thereof, which may
 22 be authorized by the Legislature; but the mode of apportion-
 23 ing and collecting the costs of such improvements shall be such
 24 as may be provided in the statutes by which the same may be
 25 authorized.

26 4. Wharves, docks, piers, warehouses, chutes, booms, ferries,
 27 bridges, toll roads, ~~byroads~~, plank and turnpike roads; paths
 28 and roads either on the surface, elevated, or depressed, for
 29 the use of bicycles, tricycles, motoreycles and other horseless
 30 vehicles, steam, electric, and horse railroads, canals, ditches,
 31 dams, poundings, flumes, aqueducts and pipes for irrigation,
 32 public transportation, supplying mines and farming neighbor-
 33 hoods with water, and draining and reclaiming lands, and for
 34 floating logs and lumber on streams not navigable, and water,
 35 water rights, canals, ditches, dams, poundings, flumes, aque-
 36 ducts and pipes for irrigation of lands furnished with water
 37 by corporations supplying water to the lands of the stock-
 38 holders thereof only, and lands with all wells and water therein
 39 adjacent to the lands of any municipality or of any corpora-
 40 tion, or person supplying water to the public or to any neigh-
 41 borhood or community for domestic use or irrigation.

Authorizes, in any case in which the state, a county, city, public district or other public agency in this state exercises the right of eminent domain, the taking of additional property in an amount reasonably necessary to provide access to a public road from any property which is not taken and for which there is a strict necessity for an easement of access to a public road from such property.

Declares public right to use and enjoy such easements. Imposes duty of maintenance of easement on owner of the property for which the easement is taken.

Vote—Majority; Appropriation—No; Sen. Fin.—No; W. & M.—No.

- 1 5. Roads, tunnels, ditches, flumes, pipes, aerial and surface
2 tramways and dumping places for working mines; also outlets,
3 natural or otherwise, for the flow, deposit or conduct of tail-
4 ings or refuse matter from mines; also an occupancy in com-
5 mon by the owners or possessors of different mines of any
6 place for the flow, deposit, or conduct of tailings or refuse
7 matter from their several mines.
8 6. Byroads leading from highways to residences, farms,
9 mines, mills, factories and buildings for operating machinery,
10 or necessary to reach any property used for public purposes.
11 7.
12 6. Telegraph, telephone, radio and wireless lines, systems
13 and plants.
14 8.
15 7. Sewerage of any incorporated city, city and county, or
16 of any village or town, whether incorporated or unincorpor-
17 rated, or of any settlement consisting of not less than 10
18 families, or of any buildings belonging to the state, or to any
19 college or university, also the connection of private residences
20 and other buildings, through other property, with the mains
21 of an established sewer system in any such city, city and
22 county, town or village.
23 9.
24 8. Roads for transportation by traction engines or road loco-
25 motives.
26 10.
27 9. Oil pipelines.
28 11.
29 10. Railroads, roads and flumes for quarrying, logging or
30 lumbering purposes.
31 12.
32 11. Canals, reservoirs, dams, ditches, flumes, aqueducts, and
33 pipes and outlets natural or otherwise for supplying, storing,
34 and discharging water for the operation of machinery for the
35 purpose of generating and transmitting electricity for the
36 supply of mines, quarries, railroads, tramways, mills, and
37 factories with electric power; and also for the applying of
38 electricity to light or heat mines, quarries, mills, factories,
39 incorporated cities and counties, villages, towns, or irrigation
40 districts; and also for furnishing electricity for lighting, heat-
41 ing or power purposes to individuals or corporations; together
42 with lands, buildings and all other improvements in or upon
43 which to erect, install, place, use or operate machinery for the
44 purpose of generating and transmitting electricity for any of
45 the purposes or uses above set forth.
46 13.
47 12. Electric powerlines, electric heat lines, electric light
48 lines, electric light, heat and powerlines, and works or plants,
49 lands, buildings or rights of any character in water, or any
50 other character of property necessary for generation, trans-

1 mission or distribution of electricity for the purpose of fur-
2 nishing or supplying electric light, heat or power to any
3 county, city and county or incorporated city or town, or irri-
4 gation district, or the inhabitants thereof, or necessary for the
5 proper development and control of such use of such electricity,
6 either at the time of the taking of said property, or for the
7 future proper development and control thereof.

8 ~~14.~~
9 13. Cemeteries for the burial of the dead, and enlarging
10 and adding to the same and the grounds thereof.

11 ~~15.~~
12 14. The plants, or any part thereof, or any record therein
13 of all persons, firms or corporations heretofore, now or here-
14 after engaged in the business of searching public records, or
15 publishing public records or insuring or guaranteeing titles
16 to real property, including all copies of, and all abstracts or
17 memoranda taken from, public records, which are owned by,
18 or in the possession of, such persons, firms or corporations or
19 which are used by them in their respective businesses; pro-
20 vided, however, that the right of eminent domain in behalf of
21 the public uses mentioned in this subdivision may be exercised
22 only for the purposes of restoring or replacing, in whole or in
23 part, public records, or the substance of public records, of any
24 city, county and county, or other municipality, which
25 records have been, or may hereafter be, lost or destroyed by
26 conflagration or other public calamity; and provided further,
27 that such right shall be exercised only by the city, county and
28 county, or municipality whose records, or part of whose
29 records, have been, or may be, so lost or destroyed.

30 ~~16.~~
31 15. Expositions or fairs in aid of which the granting of
32 public moneys or other things of value has been authorized
33 by the Constitution.

34 ~~17.~~
35 16. Works or plants for supplying gas, heat, refrigeration
36 or power to any county, city and county, or incorporated city
37 or town, or irrigation district, or the inhabitants thereof, to-
38 gether with lands, buildings, and all other improvements in
39 or upon which to erect, install, place, maintain, use or operate
40 machinery, appliances, works and plants for the purpose of
41 generating, transmitting and distributing the same and rights
42 of any nature in water, or property of any character necessary
43 for the purpose of generating, transmitting and distributing
44 the same, or necessary for the proper development and control
45 of such use of such gas, heat, refrigeration, or power, either
46 at the time of the taking of said property, or for the future
47 proper development and control thereof.

48 ~~18.~~
49 17. Standing trees and ground necessary for the support
50 and maintenance thereof, along the course of any highway,
51 within a maximum distance of 300 feet on each side of the

1 center thereof; and ground for the culture and growth of
2 trees along the course of any highway, within the maximum
3 distance of 300 feet on each side of the center thereof.

4 ~~19.~~

5 18. Propagation, rearing, planting, distribution, protection
6 or conservation of fish.

7 ~~20.~~

8 19. Airports for the landing and taking off of aircraft, and
9 for the construction and maintenance of hangars, mooring
10 masts, flying fields, signal lights and radio equipment.

11 ~~21.~~

12 20. Any work or undertaking of a city, county, or city and
13 county, housing authority or commission, or other political
14 subdivision or public body of the state: (a) to demolish, clear
15 or remove buildings from any area which is detrimental to
16 the safety, health and morals of the people by reason of the
17 dilapidation, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or design, lack
18 of ventilation or sanitary facilities of the dwellings predomi-
19 nating in such areas; or (b) to provide dwellings, apartments
20 or other living accommodations for persons or families who
21 lack the amount of income which is necessary (as determined
22 by the body engaging in said work or undertaking) to enable
23 them to live in decent, safe and sanitary dwellings without
24 overcrowding.

25 ~~22.~~

26 21. Terminal facilities, lands, or structures for the receipt,
27 transfer or delivery of passengers or property by any common
28 carrier operating upon any public highway in this state be-
29 tween fixed termini or over a regular route, or for other termi-
30 nal facilities of any such carrier.

31 Sec. 2. Section 1238.8 is added to the Code of Civil Proce-
32 dure, to read:

33 1238.8. Subject to the provisions of this title, the right of
34 eminent domain may be exercised in behalf of the following
35 public uses:

36 The acquisition of an easement by the owner of private prop-
37 erty for which there is a strict necessity for an easement for
38 access to a public road from such property. The easement
39 which may be taken shall afford the most reasonable access to
40 the property for which the easement is taken consistent with
41 other uses of the burdened land and the location of already
42 established roads, and shall include the right to install or have
43 installed utility facilities therein. The public shall be entitled,
44 as of right, to use and enjoy the easement which is taken. The
45 owner of the property for which the easement is taken shall
46 maintain any such easement.

47 This section does not apply to lands of the state park system
48 as to which Section 5003.5 of the Public Resources Code ap-
49 plies.

1 This section shall not be utilized for the acquisition of a
2 private or farm crossing over a railroad track, the exclusive
3 remedy of an owner of a landlocked parcel to acquire a private
4 or farm crossing over such track being that provided in Section
5 7537 of the Public Utilities Code.

6 **Sec. 3.** Section 1238.9 is added to the Code of Civil Pro-
7 cedure, to read:

8 1238.9. In any case in which the state, a county, city, pub-
9 lic district or other public agency in this state exercises the
10 right of eminent domain, additional property may be taken in
11 an amount reasonably necessary to provide access to a public
12 road from any property which is not taken and for which
13 there is a strict necessity for an easement of access to a public
14 road from such other property. The easement which may be
15 taken shall afford the most reasonable access to the property,
16 consistent with other uses of the burdened land and the loca-
17 tion of already established roads. The public shall be entitled,
18 as of right, to use and enjoy any easement taken under this
19 section. The owner of the property for which the easement is
20 taken shall maintain any such easement.

21 Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a public
22 agency from restricting the use and enjoyment by the public
23 of any easement or right-of-way taken under any other provi-
24 sion of this title.

25 **Sec. 4.** The Legislature hereby declares its policy to elimi-
26 nate landlocked parcels of property in order to facilitate public
27 safety and to enable the beneficial use of all land in this state.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA LAW
REVISION COMMISSION

TENTATIVE RECOMMENDATION

relating to

CONDEMNATION LAW AND PROCEDURE

The Right to Take (Byroads)

CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION
School of Law
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

WARNING: This tentative recommendation is being distributed so that interested persons will be advised of the Commission's tentative conclusions and can make their views known to the Commission. Any comments sent to the Commission will be considered when the Commission determines what recommendation it will make to the California Legislature.

The Commission often substantially revises tentative recommendations as a result of the comments it receives. Hence, this tentative recommendation is not necessarily the recommendation the Commission will submit to the Legislature.

NOTE

This recommendation includes an explanatory Comment to each section of the recommended legislation. The Comments are written as if the legislation were enacted since their primary purpose is to explain the law as it would exist (if enacted) to those who will have occasion to use it after it is in effect.

Revised ~~NOVEMBER 1968~~ ^{MARCH 19, 1970}

TENTATIVE

RECOMMENDATION OF THE CALIFORNIA

LAW REVISION COMMISSION

relating to

CONDEMNATION LAW AND PROCEDURE

The Right to Take (Byroads)

As enacted in 1872, Code of Civil Procedure Section 1238 authorized takings for "byroads" in subdivision (4) and for "byroads leading from highways to residences and farms" in subdivision (6). Subdivision (6) was expanded in 1895 to cover "byroads leading from highways to residences, farms, mines, mills, factories and buildings for operating machinery, or necessary to reach any property used for public purposes." In an appropriate case, Civil Code Section 1001 would appear to authorize a private person to maintain an action to acquire private property for the "byroad" described in subdivision (6).¹

The need for resort to eminent domain to acquire property for byroads is partially alleviated by the common law doctrine of "ways of necessity." Nevertheless, situations exist where a landowner lacks adequate access to an established road and does not have a common law way of necessity. Use of the general authority of Civil Code Section 1001 to acquire property for byroads has not received judicial sanction and no explicit special statutory procedure now exists whereby either a public entity or an individual may condemn to provide byroads. The Commission therefore recommends that the provisions in

1. For additional background information, see the research study (attached) prepared by the staff of the Law Revision Commission.

subdivisions (4) and (6) of Section 1238 relating to byroads be deleted and that more explicit statutory provisions relating to byroads be enacted. Specifically, the Commission recommends:

1. The Street Opening Act of 1903 (Streets and Highways Code Sections 4000-4443) should be amended to make clear that a byroad may be opened in the manner therein provided. This act, if it does not already permit opening of byroads, is readily adaptable for this purpose and provides a complete statutory procedure covering notice, review, compensation, and assessment. To provide explicit recognition that the initiative for the opening of new roads, including byroads, frequently comes from private persons and to codify the present practice in at least some counties, a provision should be added to the Street Opening Act of 1903 to make clear that private persons may present requests for specific improvements to be undertaken under the act.

These changes will make available an existing procedure whereby the cost of the improvement (including acquisition of land by condemnation) will be paid by the benefited property owner. Of course, the legislative body acting on the request to establish a byroad should have complete discretion to refuse to undertake the project and should be permitted, for example, to assess the benefited person not only for the cost of establishing the byroad but also for the cost of its maintenance. See, e.g., Streets and Highways Code Sections 969.5 and 1160-1197.

2. A public entity acquiring property for a public use should be permitted to acquire such additional property as is necessary to provide

access to property not taken. In certain situations, the acquisition of property for a public use may cut off access to property not taken. In such situations, it is fairly clear that the taking of additional property to provide access to the otherwise isolated parcel would be held to be a public use but in California no explicit statutory or decisional authority for such takings exists. A statutory provision recognizing that such authority exists is desirable for such takings often are the most satisfactory method of mitigating the adverse consequences when land is acquired for a public improvement and such authority would minimize the need for so-called "excess condemnation."²

3. The Commission has considered whether a private person should be authorized to initiate condemnation proceedings for a byroad. Under California law, a private person may initiate such proceedings to acquire a sewer easement³ and an argument could be made for the extension of this authority to the acquisition of a byroad. The Commission has concluded however that, if there is need for the acquisition of a byroad by condemnation, the appropriate legislative body rather than a private person should initiate the condemnation proceeding.⁴

2. See *People v. Superior Court*, 68 Adv. Cal. ___, 65 Cal. Rptr. 342, 436 P.2d 342 (1968).

3. *Linggi v. Garovotti*, 45 Cal.2d 20, 286 P.2d 15 (1955).

4. The right of any public condemnor, e.g., public utility to condemn access roads to property acquired for a public use should be unaffected by this recommendation. It should also be noted that this is, in any event, merely the first in a series of recommendations dealing with the proper extent of the power of eminent domain and will be submitted to the Legislature only as a part of comprehensive legislation dealing with that subject.

The Commission's recommendations would be effectuated by the enactment of the following measure:

An act to amend Section 1238 of, and to add Section 1238.8 to, the Code of Civil Procedure, and to amend Section 4008, and to add Sections 4008.1 and 4120.1 to, the Streets and Highways Code, relating to roads.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

Section 1. Section 1238 of the Code of Civil Procedure is amended to read:

1238. Subject to the provisions of this title, the right of eminent domain may be exercised in behalf of the following public uses:

1. Fortifications, magazines, arsenals, Navy yards, Navy and Army stations, lighthouses, range and beacon lights, coast surveys, and all other public uses authorized by the Government of the United States.

2. Public buildings and grounds for use of a state, or any state institution, or any institution within the State of California which is exempt from taxation under the provisions of Section 1a of Article XIII of the Constitution of the State of California, and all other public uses authorized by the Legislature of the State of California.

3. Any public utility, and public buildings and grounds, for the use of any county, incorporated city, or city and county, village, town, school district, or irrigation district, ponds, lakes, canals, aqueducts, reservoirs, tunnels, flumes, ditches, or pipes, lands, water system plants, buildings, rights of any nature in water, and any other character of property necessary for conducting or storing or distributing water for the use of any county, incorporated city, or city and county, village or town or municipal water district, or the inhabitants thereof, or any state institution, or necessary for the proper development and control of such use of said water, either at the time of the taking of said property, or for the future proper development and control thereof, or for draining any county, incorporated city, or city and county, village or town; raising the banks of streams, removing obstructions therefrom, and widening and deepening or straightening their channels; roads, highways, boulevards, streets and alleys; public mooring places for watercraft; public parks, including parks and other places covered by water, and all other public uses for the benefit of any county, incorporated city, or city and county, village or town, or the inhabitants thereof, which may be authorized by the Legislature; but the mode of apportioning and collecting the costs of such improvements shall be such as may be provided in the statutes by which the same may be authorized.

4. Wharves, docks, piers, warehouses, chutes, booms, ferries, bridges, toll roads, byroads, plank and turnpike roads; paths and roads either on the surface, elevated, or depressed, for the use of bicycles, tricycles, motorcycles and other horseless vehicles, steam, electric, and horse railroads, canals, ditches, dams, poundings, flumes,

aqueducts and pipes for irrigation, public transportation, supplying mines and farming neighborhoods with water, and draining and reclaiming lands, and for floating logs and lumber on streams not navigable, and water, water rights, canals, ditches, dams, poundings, flumes, aqueducts and pipes for irrigation of lands furnished with water by corporations supplying water to the lands of the stockholders thereof only, and lands with all wells and water therein adjacent to the lands of any municipality or of any corporation, or person supplying water to the public or to any neighborhood or community for domestic use or irrigation.

5. Roads, tunnels, ditches, flumes, pipes, aerial and surface tramways and dumping places for working mines; also outlets, natural or otherwise, for the flow, deposit or conduct of tailings or refuse matter from mines; also an occupancy in common by the owners or possessors of different mines of any place for the flow, deposit, or conduct of tailings or refuse matter from their several mines.

~~6. Byroads leading from highways to residences, farms, mines, mills, factories and buildings for operating machinery, or necessary to reach any property used for public purposes.~~

7. Telegraph, telephone, radio and wireless lines, systems and plants.

8. Sewerage of any incorporated city, city and county, or of any village or town, whether incorporated or unincorporated, or of any settlement consisting of not less than 10 families, or of any buildings, belonging to the State, or to any college or university, also the

connection of private residences and other buildings, through other property, with the mains of an established sewer system in any such city, city and county, town or village.

9. Roads for transportation by traction engines or road locomotives.

10. Oil pipelines.

11. Railroads, roads and flumes for quarrying, logging or lumbering purposes.

12. Canals, reservoirs, dams, ditches, flumes, aqueducts, and pipes and outlets natural or otherwise for supplying, storing, and discharging water for the operation of machinery for the purpose of generating and transmitting electricity for the supply of mines, quarries, railroads, tramways, mills, and factories with electric power; and also for the applying of electricity to light or heat mines, quarries, mills, factories, incorporated cities and counties, villages, towns, or irrigation districts; and also for furnishing electricity for lighting, heating or power purposes to individuals or corporations; together with lands, buildings and all other improvements in or upon which to erect, install, place, use or operate machinery for the purpose of generating and transmitting electricity for any of the purposes or uses above set forth.

13. Electric power lines, electric heat lines, electric light lines, electric light, heat and power lines, and works or plants, lands, buildings or rights of any character in water, or any other character of property necessary for generation, transmission or

distribution of electricity for the purpose of furnishing or supplying electric light, heat or power to any county, city and county or incorporated city or town, or irrigation district, or the inhabitants thereof, or necessary for the proper development and control of such use of such electricity, either at the time of the taking of said property, or for the future proper development and control thereof.

14. Cemeteries for the burial of the dead, and enlarging and adding to the same and the grounds thereof.

15. The plants, or any part thereof, or any record therein of all persons, firms or corporations heretofore, now or hereafter engaged in the business of searching public records, or publishing public records or insuring or guaranteeing titles to real property, including all copies of, and all abstracts or memoranda taken from, public records, which are owned by, or in the possession of, such persons, firms or corporations or which are used by them in their respective businesses; provided, however, that the right of eminent domain in behalf of the public uses mentioned in this subdivision may be exercised only for the purposes of restoring or replacing, in whole or in part, public records, or the substance of public records, of any city, city and county, county or other municipality, which records have been, or may hereafter be, lost or destroyed by conflagration or other public calamity; and provided further, that such right shall be exercised only by the city, city and county, county or municipality whose records, or part of whose records, have been, or may be, so lost or destroyed.

16. Expositions or fairs in aid of which the granting of public moneys or other things of value has been authorized by the Constitution.

17. Works or plants for supplying gas, heat, refrigeration or power to any county, city and county, or incorporated city or town, or irrigation district, or the inhabitants thereof, together with lands, buildings, and all other improvements in or upon which to erect, install, place, maintain, use or operate machinery, appliances, works and plants for the purpose of generating, transmitting and distributing the same and rights of any nature in water, or property of any character necessary for the purpose of generating, transmitting and distributing the same, or necessary for the proper development and control of such use of such gas, heat, refrigeration, or power, either at the time of the taking of said property, or for the future proper development and control thereof.

18. Standing trees and ground necessary for the support and maintenance thereof, along the course of any highway, within a maximum distance of 300 feet on each side of the center thereof; and ground for the culture and growth of trees along the course of any highway, within the maximum distance of 300 feet on each side of the center thereof.

19. Propagation, rearing, planting, distribution, protection or conservation of fish.

20. Airports for the landing and taking off of aircraft, and for the construction and maintenance of hangars, mooring masts, flying fields, signal lights and radio equipment.

21. Any work or undertaking of a city, county, or city and county, housing authority or commission, or other political subdivision or public body of the State: (a) to demolish, clear or remove buildings from any area which is detrimental to the safety, health and morals of the people by reason of the dilapidation, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or design, lack of ventilation or sanitary facilities of the dwellings predominating in such areas; or (b) to provide dwellings, apartments or other living accommodations for persons or families who lack the amount of income which is necessary (as determined by the body engaging in said work or undertaking) to enable them to live in decent, safe and sanitary dwellings without overcrowding.

22. Terminal facilities, lands, or structures for the receipt, transfer or delivery of passengers or property by any common carrier operating upon any public highway in this State between fixed termini or over a regular route, or for other terminal facilities of any such carrier.

Comment. Section 1238 is amended to delete subdivision (6) and to delete the reference to "byroads" from subdivision (4). These provisions are superseded by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1238.8 and revisions of the Street Opening Act of 1903 (Streets and Highways Code Sections 4000-4443). See Streets and Highways Code Sections 4008, 4008.1 and 4120.1 and the comments to those sections. The Street Opening Act of 1903 includes specific authority to exercise the right of eminent domain for byroads in Section 4090.

Sec. 2. Section 1238.8 is added to the Code of Civil Procedure, to read:

1238.8. (a) Where a public entity acquires property for a public use and exercises or could have exercised the right of eminent domain to acquire such property for such use, the public entity may exercise the right of eminent domain to acquire such additional property as is reasonably necessary to provide access to an existing public road from any property which is not acquired for such public use but which is cut off from access to a public road as a result of the acquisition by the public entity.

(b) Where a public entity furnishes or offers to furnish access pursuant to subdivision (a), the damage to the property which is not acquired for public use shall be determined as if such access were furnished, and the public entity shall furnish such access if the owner so requests.

Comment. Section 1238.8 provides explicit statutory recognition of the right of a public condemnor that acquires property for a public use to condemn such additional property as is necessary to provide access to property not taken which would otherwise lack access as a result of the acquisition. The access road need not be one that is open to the public. Although no explicit statutory or decisional authority for such a taking exists in California, the right to exercise the power of eminent domain for such purpose probably would be necessarily implied from the right to take property for the public improvement itself. Such a taking would be a taking for a public use. E.g., Department of Public Works v. Farina, 29 Ill.2d 474, 194 N.E.2d 209 (1963); Luke v. Mass. Turnpike Auth., 337 Mass. 304, 149 N.E.2d 225 (1958); May v. Ohio Turnpike Comm., 172 Ohio St. 555, 178 N.E.2d 920 (1962); Tracy v. Preston, Director of Highways, 172 Ohio St. 567, 178 N.E.2d 923 (1962).

Subdivision (b) of Section 1238.8 is included to insure that, where a condemnor provides an access road to property to replace lost access or offers to make such provision, the provision or offer will receive proper consideration as a mitigating factor in determining compensation for the damage, if any, to the property not acquired.

Sec. 3. Section 4008 of the Streets and Highways Code is amended to read:

4008. "Street" includes public street, avenues, roads, highways, byroads, squares, lanes, alleys, courts or places.

Comment. The addition of "byroads" to Section 4008 makes it clear that byroads--roads, open to public use, that furnish access to an existing public road from or primarily from otherwise isolated property--may be established under the Street Opening Act of 1903. See Section 4008.1 defining "byroad." This addition probably codifies existing law. cf. City of Oakland v. Parker, 70 Cal. App. 295, 233 Pac. 68 (1924).

Sec. 4. Section 4008.1 is added to the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

4008.1. "Byroad" means a road, open to public use, that furnishes access to an existing public road from or primarily from otherwise isolated property.

Comment. The definition of "byroad" in Section 4008.1 is based on the discussion in Sherman v. Buick, 32 Cal. 242 (1867). It adopts substantially the definition formerly incorporated in Section 1238(6) of the Code of Civil Procedure; however, any restriction in utilization of the property served by the byroad is eliminated.

Sec. 5. Section 4120.1 is added to the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

4120.1. The owner of any property that may be benefited by a proposed improvement may file with the legislative body a request that the improvement be undertaken. Such request may, but need not include the maps, plats, plans, profiles, specifications, and other information referred to in Sections 4120 and 4122.

Comment. Section 4120.1 is added to the Street Opening Act of 1903 to expressly authorize initiation of improvement proposals by individual property owners. Similar procedures already exist in many counties and cities.

THE USE OF THE POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN TO ACQUIRE BYROADS*

*This study was prepared for the California Law Revision Commission by the Commission's legal staff. No part of this study may be published without prior written consent of the Commission.

The Commission assumes no responsibility for any statement made in this study, and no statement in this study is to be attributed to the Commission. The Commission's action will be reflected in its own recommendation which will be separate and distinct from this study. The Commission should not be considered as having made a recommendation on a particular subject until the final recommendation of the Commission on that subject has been submitted to the Legislature.

Copies of this study are furnished to interested persons solely for the purpose of giving the Commission the benefit of the views of such persons, and the study should not be used for any other purpose at this time.

A STUDY
relating to
THE USE OF THE POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN
TO ACQUIRE BYROADS

As enacted in 1872, Code of Civil Procedure Section 1238 authorized takings for "byroads" in subdivision (4) and for "byroads leading from highways to residences and farms" in subdivision (6). Subdivision (6) was amended in 1895¹ to cover "byroads leading from highways to residences, farms, mines, mills, factories and buildings for operating machinery, or necessary to reach any property used for public purposes."²

The need for resort to eminent domain to provide byroads is partially alleviated by the common law doctrine of "ways of necessity." When the facts that give rise to a common law way of necessity are established, the right will be recognized; there is no need to institute eminent domain proceedings or to compensate the owner of the land over which the way of necessity is located.³ Nevertheless, subdivision (6) and the "byroad" provision of subdivision (4) are not merely statutory substitutes for the common law way of necessity. A way of necessity arises when a grantor conveys land shut off from access to a road by the grantor's remaining land or by his land and the land of a stranger or where a similar situation is created by a partition, either voluntary or involuntary.⁴ Situations, therefore, exist where a landowner lacks access to an established road and does not have a common law way of necessity.⁵ The right to take property by eminent domain for a "byroad" may provide a solution to this problem where the owner's efforts to purchase a right of access across his neighbor's land fail.

In the leading California decision, Sherman v. Buick,⁶ the taking of private property for a byroad was held proper where the road was in fact to be a public road, open to all who desired to use it, even though the road was designed to provide access for the land of a private person and he bore the cost of establishing and maintaining the road. In Sherman, the court held constitutional an 1861 act⁷ that authorized the county board of supervisors to take private property to establish "public" and "private" roads. The court held that the term "private road"⁸ was used merely to designate a particular kind of public road, and that, notwithstanding the somewhat inaccurate language,⁹ the use was public:

Roads, leading from the main road, which run through the county to the residences or farms of individuals, are of public concern and under the control of the Government. Taking private property for the purposes of such roads is not a taking for private use. They are open to everyone who may have occasion to use them, and are therefore public. Their character as public roads is unaffected by the circumstances, that in view of their situation, they are but little used, and are mainly convenient for the use of a few individuals, and such as may have occasion to visit them socially or on matters of business, nor by the circumstance that in view of such conditions the Legislature may deem it just to open and maintain them at the cost of those most immediately concerned instead of the public at large. The object for which they are established is none the less of a public character, and therefore within the supervision of the Government. To call them "private roads" is simply a legislative misnomer, which does not affect or change their real character. By-roads is a better name for them and one which is less calculated to mislead the uninitiated.

In drafting subdivision (6) of Section 1238, which superseded a part of the 1861 act referred to in the Sherman case, the 1872 Code Commissioners adopted the court's suggestion that roads used primarily for the convenience of a few individuals be described as "byroads."¹ The pertinent portion of the remainder of the 1861 act was compiled in Section 2711 of the 1872 Political Code, which read:

Private or by-roads may be opened for the convenience of one or more residents of any road district in the same manner as public roads are opened, whenever the Board of Supervisors may for like cause order the same to be viewed and opened, the person for whose benefit the same is required paying the damages awarded to the landowners, and keeping the same in repair.

In 1883, Section 2711 was repealed and substantially reenacted as Political Code Section 2692.¹¹ Section 2692 was amended in 1913¹² to include coverage for ways for "a canal" and in 1919¹³ the words "irrigation, seepage, or drainage" were inserted before "canal." The section was repealed in 1943,¹⁴ the portion relating to canals being compiled in Water Code Sections 7020-7026 and the portion relating to private or byroads not being continued. In 1949, Political Code Section 2692 was again repealed,¹⁵ and Streets and Highways Code Sections 1128-1133 were enacted by the same act¹⁶ to permit "private or by-roads" to be opened, laid out, or altered for "timber access purposes." A 1955 amendment¹⁷ made these sections applicable to any private or byroad but the sections were repealed in 1961.¹⁸ No special statutory procedure now exists¹⁹ whereby an individual or public entity may condemn to provide the "byroads" described in subdivision (6).

In City of Los Angeles v. Leavis,²⁰ it was held that a city could condemn property for a public street relying solely on Civil Code Section 1001 and Section 1238. Hence, although no appellate decision on this question has been found, it seems fairly clear that subdivision (6) of Section 1238 is itself authority for a public entity to exercise the power of eminent domain to provide "byroads."²¹ However, many cities and counties are reluctant to institute condemnation proceedings to provide a "byroad" even though the benefited person is willing to bear the cost of acquiring and maintaining the road.²²

Appellate courts in California have not decided whether a private person may maintain an action under Civil Code Section 1001 to acquire private property for the sort of byroad described in subdivision (6).²³ Nevertheless, a series of cases has established the proposition that such a byroad is a public use,²⁴ and the California Supreme Court held in Linggi v. Garovotti²⁵ that a private individual may maintain an eminent domain proceeding to provide a sewer connection for a single residence. Although landlocked property does not present the health hazard present in the Linggi case, it is likely that California would follow the holdings in numerous other states²⁶ and permit a private person to acquire a byroad in an appropriate case.

Private corporations have sought unsuccessfully in two cases to condemn access to land. In General Petroleum Corporation v. Hobson²⁷ the holder of an oil and gas prospecting permit granted by the state under a 1921 act²⁸ brought an eminent domain proceeding in the federal court to acquire an easement over private property from the highway

to the place where it planned to prospect for oil. A demurrer to the corporation's complaint was sustained. The corporation contended that the taking was a public use authorized both under the 1921 act and under the Code of Civil Procedure Section 1238. The 1921 act included a provision giving the right of eminent domain to permittees to acquire a right of way over private property, but the court held this provision void as not embraced within the title of the act. An alternative ground for the holding was that the complaint did not show that the taking was for a public purpose:

Nor can section 1238, subd. 5, C.C.P. of California, authorize the taking of private property for "roads * * * for working mines." Subdivision 6: "By-roads leading from highways to residences, farms, mines, mills, factories and buildings for operating machinery, or necessary to reach any property used for public purposes." The plaintiff has no working mines, nor any active industry, nor is it in any sense within any of the provisions of this section, nor is the property covered by the permit used or contemplated to be used for a public purpose, nor can the court assume a public use or purpose where none is claimed, or none can be reasonably deduced from conceded or established facts. *Sherman v. Buick*, 32 Cal. 241, 91 Am. Dec. 577, is not elucidating, nor is *Monterey County v. Cushing*, 83 Cal. 507, 23 P. 700; nor was this issue before the court in *County of Madera v. Raymond Granite Co.*, 139 Cal. 128, 72 P. 915. These cases are cited because particularly relied upon by the plaintiff. All cases cited have been examined, but have not [sic] application.

Eminent domain can only be invoked because the interest of the public is greater than the interest of the private individual, and may not be invoked by a private person for private gain or advantage. The plaintiff's permit prospecting for oil enterprise by reason thereof is speculative and wholly private, and the private property may not be taken for a private purpose. Clearly the complaint does not state a cause of action; complainant does not show that it has legal capacity to maintain the action, nor that the taking is for a public purpose. [Emphasis in original.]⁹

The meaning of this language is not entirely clear. It is clear, however, that the court concluded that the use for which the property was sought to be acquired--prospecting for oil--was not one within any of the provisions of Section 1238. The court may have overlooked the general authorization to condemn for "byroads" in subdivision (4). Some of the language indicates that the court also may have had in mind the well-established proposition that the mere fact that a particular use is listed in Section 1238 does not mean that the use is a public use under the facts of a particular case.³⁰ The court also seems to take the position that the residence, farm, mine, mill, factory or buildings for operating machinery referred to in subdivision (6) must already be in existence at the time access is sought to be condemned. This line of reasoning would not apply to subdivision (4) which authorizes exercise of the power of eminent domain for "byroads" without any

limitation or description such as that found in subdivision (6), but the court did not refer to subdivision (4). The opinion does not appear absolutely to preclude a private person from taking private property for a byroad described in subdivision (6). At the same time, the holding in the case would permit no significant application of the "byroad" authorization in subdivision (4).

In City of Sierra Madre v. Superior Court,³¹ a land developer sought to maintain a proceeding in the name of the city to acquire an access road to a planned subdivision in order to meet the requirements for subdivision approval. As the city had not authorized the proceeding, prohibition issued to prevent its prosecution. The opinion does not indicate whether the proceeding would have been permitted had the developer brought the suit in its own name.

In addition to establishing that the byroad would be a "public use" under the circumstances of the particular case, the condemnor would also have to show that the proposed taking is "necessary."³² Reasoning from the common law way of necessity cases³³ and the Linggi decision,³⁴ it seems safe to predict that the courts would not allow condemnation if there were any other reasonable alternative to the taking.

This survey demonstrates the uncertainty that now exists as to whether property may be taken to provide an access road from an established highway to the land of a private person. This uncertainty

should be eliminated in any revision of the law of eminent domain. The following recommendations are made in this connection:

1. The provision in subdivision (4) of Section 1238 of the Code of Civil Procedure relating to "byroads" and subdivision (6) of the same section should be eliminated. These provisions should be superseded by more explicit statutory provisions.

2. A statutory provision should be enacted to provide expressly that any public condemnor that acquires property for a public use may acquire by eminent domain such additional property as is necessary to provide access to property not taken which would otherwise become landlocked by the taking. It is fairly clear that the taking of property to provide access in this situation would be held to be a public use.³⁵ Although such a statute might be limited to takings for limited access highways, such a limitation is not recommended. Since it is the taking by the condemnor that creates the need for the access road, the condemnor should have authority to provide access where this would be the appropriate method of mitigating the adverse consequences of the taking. Any attempted abuse could be prevented by finding that the taking for the access road is not a public use under the facts of the particular case.³⁶ The California Supreme Court has recently taken a very liberal position toward "excess condemnation"³⁷ and a significant benefit of the recommended statutory provision would be elimination of the need for excess condemnation in some situations.

3. A procedure similar in substance to that provided by former Streets and Highways Code Sections 1128-1133 should be reenacted. These sections were repealed in 1961. They permitted the county board of supervisors to take property for a road, open to all who desired to use it, but required that the cost of acquisition, establishment, and maintaining the road be imposed on the person or persons primarily benefited. This procedure places the board of supervisors in the position of determining whether the access road should be established. On the other hand, it imposes the costs on the benefited persons. If this type of procedure were adopted, the statute should permit cities and other public entities concerned with road work to utilize the procedure.

A convenient means of accomplishing this recommendation would be to amend the Street Opening Act of 1903 (Street and Highways Code Sections 4000-4443) to make clear that byroads may be provided pursuant to that act. The act appears to be the one most readily adaptable for the opening of byroads since it provides a complete and satisfactory procedure covering notice, legislative and judicial review, compensation and assessment.

4. As an alternative to the preceding recommendation, private persons might be authorized to condemn easements that would be dedicated to public use, be open to the public, and provide ingress and egress from private property to established roads. Such a taking should be permitted only upon a showing of strict necessity and not where the person has another method of access, even though the latter is inconvenient. The burden of maintaining the access

road should be imposed on the person seeking access. Many of the other states authorize the use of the power of eminent domain to acquire property for such purposes. As maximum utilization of land is important, and as a strict showing of necessity might adequately protect the condemnee, this may be one of the few instances in which "private condemnation" would be justified. It is possible that this alternative would merely restate existing California law.

Senate Bill No. 18, introduced at the 1968 session of the California Legislature but not enacted, dealt with this problem and would have enacted the substance of items 1, 3, and 4 above.³⁸

THE DECLARED PUBLIC USES
BYROADS AND WAYS OF NECESSITY
FOOTNOTES

1. Cal. Stats. 1895, Ch. 98, § 1, p. 89.
2. It is interesting to trace the historical development of "byroads." In colonial times, statutes permitted individuals to condemn private property for access roads for their private use. As additional areas of the country were opened to settlement, similar statutes were enacted. It was generally assumed that these statutes were valid until the 1840's and 1850's when a narrowing of the concept of public use occurred; in all but a few states, the use of eminent domain to acquire land for private roads for the exclusive use of a few persons was held a private use. In California and some other states, the statutes were either construed or revised to permit the taking of lands for access roads only if the roads were open to public use. In a substantial number of states, constitutional provisions were adopted to permit the taking of private property by eminent domain for access roads. E.g., Ala. Const., Art. I, § 23 (1901); Ariz. Const., Art. II, § 17 (1910); Colo. Const., Art. II, § 14 (1876); Ga. Const., Art. I, § 2-301, para 1 (1877); Ill. Const., Art. IV, § 30 (1870); Kan. Const., Art. 12, § 4 (1859); La. Const., Art. III, § 37 (1921); Miss. Const., Art. 4, § 110 (1890); Mo. Const. of 1945, Art. I, § 28 (1875); N.Y. Const., Art. I, § 7, subd. (c) (1846); Okla. Const., Art. II, § 23 (1907); Wash. Const., Art. I, § 16 (1889); Wyo. Const., Art. 1, § 32 (1889). See also Fla. Const., Art. XVI, § 29 (1885); Ore. Const., Art. I, § 18 (1857). The California Constitutional Convention did not consider such a provision; only a passing reference was made in the debates to this problem. II Debates and Proceedings of the Constitutional

Convention of the State of California 1028 (1881) [1878-1879]

(Remarks of Mr. Shafter).

It has been recognized in California and elsewhere that the taking of property for use as a public road is a taking for a public use, even though the road is used primarily to provide access to the land of a single individual. E.g., *Sherman v. Buick*, 32 Cal. 241 (1867). 29A C.J.S. Eminent Domain § 34 (1965)("[T]he principle to be deduced from the cases bearing on the question seems to be that if the road, when laid out, is in fact a public road, open to all who may desire to use it, it is a public use, and valid, although the road is primarily designed for the benefit of an individual, and although the cost of laying out and maintaining such road is borne in whole or in part by the petitioners therefor."

[footnotes omitted]). Compare 26 Am. Jur.2d Eminent Domain § 47 (1966).

The historical development is traced in Nichols, The Meaning of Public Use in the Law of Eminent Domain, 20 Boston U. L. Rev. 615, 617-626 (1940). For an historical account in a particular state, see Notes, 11 Ala. L. Rev. 182 (1958)(Alabama); 33 Ky. L. J. 129 (1944) (Kentucky).

3. *Taylor v. Warnaky*, 55 Cal. 350 (1880); *Blum v. Weston*, 102 Cal. 362, 369, 36 Pac. 778, 780 (1894); *Reese v. Borghi*, 216 Cal. App.2d 324, 30 Cal. Rptr. 868 (1963).
4. E.g., *Mesmer v. Uharriet*, 174 Cal. 110, 162 Pac. 104 (1916) (partition); *Reese v. Borghi*, 216 Cal. App.2d 324, 332-333, 30 Cal. Rptr. 868, 873 (1963); *Tarr v. Watkins*, 180 Cal. App.2d 362, 4 Cal. Rptr. 293 (1960). See also *Daywalt v. Walker*, 217 Cal. App.2d 669, 675, 31 Cal. Rptr. 899, 902 (1963). A way of necessity continues only

- so long as the necessity exists. See generally *Martinelli v. Luis*, 213 Cal. 183, 1 Pac. 980 (1931); *Cassin v. Cole*, 153 Cal. 677, 679, 96 Pac. 277, 278 (1908).
5. In addition, the showing of "necessity" required to acquire a byroad by eminent domain may not be the same as that required to establish a common law way of necessity. The common law right exists only in cases of extreme necessity and not where the landowner has another means of access even though inconvenient. *Marin County Hosp. Dist. v. Cicurel*, 154 Cal. App. 2d 294, 302, 316 P.2d 32, 37 (1957). See also *Smith v. Shrbek*, 71 Cal. App.2d 351, 360, 162 P.2d 674, 678 (1945).
 6. 32 Cal. 242 (1867).
 7. Cal. Stats. 1861, Ch. 380, § 7, p. 392.
 8. "[T]he legislature of this state . . . [i]n the plan devised by them . . . have for the purpose of classification divided roads into 'public and private,' and provided how they may be laid out and established and how maintained. The former are to be laid out and maintained at the expense of the county or road district at large, and are therefore called 'public.' The latter at the expense of such persons as are more especially and directly interested in them, and therefore called 'private.' But the latter are as much public as the former, for any one can travel them who has occasion--and no more can be said of the former." 32 Cal. at 253. See also 45 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 98 (1965). Cf. *Brick v. Keim*, 208 Cal. App.2d 499, 503-504, 25 Cal. Rptr. 321, 323-324 (1962).
 9. 32 Cal. at 255-256.
 10. See Code Commissioners' Note to subdivision (6): "Subdivision 6 supersedes part of § 7 (Stats. 1861, p. 392), which prescribes the mode for laying out private roads. This clause has been drawn to make it conformable to the decision in *Sherman v. Buick*, 32 Cal.

- 241, 91 Am. Dec. 597." The same word--"byroad"--was also used in subdivision (4) of Section 1238.
11. Cal. Stats. 1883, Ch. 10, p. 5. Section 2692 was held constitutional. *Monterey County v. Cushing*, 83 Cal. 507, 23 Pac. 700 (1890); *Los Angeles County v. Reyes*, 3 Cal. Unrep. 775, 32 Pac. 233 (1893); *Lake County v. Allman*, 102 Cal. 432, 36 Pac. 767 (1895); *County of Madera v. Raymond G. Co.*, 139 Cal. 128, 72 Pac. 915 (1903).
 12. Cal. Stats. 1913, Ch. 61, § 1, p. 62.
 13. Cal. Stats. 1919, Ch. 73, § 1, p. 117.
 14. Cal. Water Code § 15002, Cal. Stats. 1943, Ch. 368, p. 1895.
 15. Cal. Stats. 1949, Ch. 883, § 6, p. 1652.
 16. Cal. Stats. 1949, Ch. 883, §§ 1-5, p. 1652.
 17. Cal. Stats. 1955, Ch. 1308, § 1, p. 2374.
 18. Cal. Stats. 1961, Ch. 1354, § 1, p. 3133.
 19. Streets and Highways Code Sections 969.5 and 1160-1197 provide a procedure for the improvement of a private easement or roadway not accepted or acceptable into the county highway system but upon which a permanent public easement is offered or a privately owned road where a right of way has been granted or leased to the county for its own use or for the use of the state or other public agency for public purposes, but these sections do not authorize condemnation. As to expenditure of public funds to maintain roads not accepted as county roads, see 45 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 98 (1965)..Cf. *City of Oakland v. Parker*, 70 Cal. App. 295, 233 Pac. 68 (1924).
 20. 119 Cal. 164, 51 Pac. 34 (1897).

21. The mere fact that individuals have subscribed money or given a bond to a public entity to contribute toward the expense of establishing a public road would not make the taking one for "private" use. E.g., *Santa Ana v. Harlin*, 99 Cal. 538, 541, 34 Pac. 224, 226 (1893); *City of Oakland v. Parker*, 70 Cal. App. 295, 233 Pac. 68 (1924).
22. But see *City of Oakland v. Parker*, 70 Cal. App. 295, 233 Pac. 68 (1924).
23. *People v. Superior Court*, 68 Cal.2d , 65 Cal. Rptr. 342, 436 P.2d 342 (1968), the leading California case on "excess condemnation," the Brief of Amicus Curiae in the Court of Appeal contended that the condemnor's rationale for the excess condemnation--that the remainder would be "landlocked"--was unsound:

The condemnor's theory contains a fatal legal flaw. That flaw is the failure to recognize that in California, as a matter of law, there is no such thing as a "landlocked" parcel.

Civil Code § 1001 provides that any person may exercise the power of eminent domain without further legislative action. C.C.P. § 1238 lists the various purposes for which such power may be used, including the acquisition of access to a highway.

An application of the above principle may be found in *Linggi v. Garovotti* (1955) 45 Cal.2d 20 where a private individual was permitted to condemn a sewer easement across his neighbor's land. . . .

It is, therefore, plain that just as Mr. Linggi did, the Rodonis [owners of remainder] can condemn an easement of access to Parcel 9 [the remainder], across neighboring land. The condemnor's "landlocked and therefore worthless" parcel theory therefore lacks merit. [Brief of Amicus Curiae in Court of Appeal at 7-8.]

The Department of Public Works did not dispute the possibility that the private owner could condemn a byroad,

but pointed out that no "jury would be favorably inclined towards the condemnor were it to leave a property owner in such a predicament." [Reply of Petitioner to Memorandum in Opposition of Real Parties in Interest and Amicus Curiae Brief, Court of Appeal, at 4.]

24. See cases cited in note 11 supra.
25. 45 Cal.2d 20, 286 Pac. 15 (1955).
26. E.g., *Komposh v. Powers*, 75 Mont. 493, 244 Pac. 298 (1926), *Derryberry v. Beck*, 153 Tenn. 220, 280 S.W. 1014 (1926), *State v. Superior Court*, 145 Wash. 307, 260 Pac. 527 (1927). See also note 2 supra.
27. 23 F.2d 349 (1927).
28. Cal. Stats. 1921, Ch. 303, p. 404.
29. 23 F.2d at 350.
30. See discussion, supra, at p. ____.
31. 191 Cal. App.2d 587, 12 Cal. Rptr. 836 (1961).
32. See discussion supra, at p. ____.
33. See note 5, supra.
34. *Linggi v. Garovotti*, 45 Cal.2d 20, 286 P.2d 15 (1955).
35. *Department of Public Works v. Farina*, 29 Ill.2d 474, 194 N.E.2d 209 (1963); *Luke v. Mass. Turnpike Auth.*, 337 Mass. 304, 149 N.E.2d 225 (1958); *May v. Ohio Turnpike Comm.*, 172 Ohio St. 555, 178 N.E.2d 920 (1962); *Tracy v. Preston, Director of Highways*, 172 Ohio St. 567, 178 N.E.2d 923 (1962).

36. See People v. Superior Court, 68 Cal.2d , 65 Cal. Rptr. 342.
436 P.2d 342 (1968).

37. Id.

38. The bill was amended after its introduction so that it would have amended Code of Civil Procedure Section 1238 to delete "byroad" from subdivision (4) and to delete subdivision (6) and would have added two new sections to the Code of Civil Procedure to read:

1238.8. Subject to the provisions of this title, the right of eminent domain may be exercised in behalf of the following public uses:

The acquisition of an easement by the owner of private property for which there is a strict necessity for an easement for access to a public road from such property. The easement which may be taken shall afford the most reasonable access to the property for which the easement is taken consistent with other uses of the burdened land and the location of already established roads, and shall include the right to install or have installed utility facilities therein. The public shall be entitled, as of right, to use and enjoy the easement which is taken. The owner of the property for which the easement is taken shall maintain any such easement.

This section does not apply to lands of the state park system as to which Section 5003.5 of the Public Resources Code applies.

This section shall not be utilized for the acquisition of a private or farm crossing over a railroad track, the exclusive remedy of an owner of a landlocked parcel to acquire a private or farm crossing over such track being that provided in Section 7537 of the Public Utilities Code.

1238.9. In any case in which the state, a county, city, public district or other public agency in this state exercises the right of eminent domain, additional property may be taken in an amount reasonably necessary to provide access to a public road from any property which is not taken and for which there is a strict necessity for an easement of access to a public road from such property. The easement which may be taken shall afford the most reasonable access to the property, consistent with other uses of the burdened land and the location of already established roads. The public shall be entitled, as of right, to use and enjoy the easement which is taken. The owner of the property for which the easement is taken shall maintain any such easement.