

GIBSON DUNN



Appellate and Constitutional Law Update

April 12, 2024

Supreme Court Holds That Legislatively Mandated Development Exactions Can Be Unconstitutional Takings

Sheetz v. County of El Dorado, No. 22-1074 – Decided April 12, 2024

Today, the Supreme Court held unanimously that land-development permit exactions subject to the Takings Clause must bear an essential nexus and rough proportionality to the expected impacts of the development, even if the exaction is imposed pursuant to legislation.

“The Takings Clause ... prohibits legislatures and agencies alike from imposing unconstitutional conditions on land-use permits.”

JUSTICE BARRETT, WRITING FOR THE COURT

Background:

The Supreme Court's prior decisions in *Nollan v. California Coastal Commission* and *Dolan v. City of Tigard* held that certain land-development exactions violate the Fifth Amendment's Takings Clause unless the government can show that the exaction bears (1) an "essential nexus" and (2) a "rough proportionality" to the expected impacts from the development.

George Sheetz applied for a permit from the County of El Dorado, California to build a house on his property. County legislation required Mr. Sheetz to pay a traffic impact mitigation fee as a condition of obtaining a permit, which was set according to a legislatively determined fee schedule that did not account for an individual project's actual impact on roads. Mr. Sheetz challenged the exaction as an unconstitutional taking under *Nollan* and *Dolan*. The California Court of Appeal held that the exaction was immune from constitutional scrutiny because it was authorized by generally applicable legislation, as opposed to an administratively imposed exaction.

Issue:

Is a building permit exaction authorized by legislation exempt from constitutional scrutiny under the test set forth in *Nollan* and *Dolan*?

Court's Holding:

No. The Takings Clause does not distinguish between legislative and administrative land-use permit conditions, and therefore legislatively mandated exactions are not exempt from the "essential nexus" and "rough proportionality" standards established by *Nollan* and *Dolan*.

What It Means:

- The Court's decision means that land-development exactions do not evade review under *Nollan* and *Dolan* merely because they are authorized pursuant to legislation.
- The Court's ruling gives property developers more opportunities to challenge legislative exactions as unconstitutional takings. The decision could lead to greater predictability in legislative exactions and a reduction in the types and amounts of impact fees and other exactions imposed, as local governments will need to assess whether legislation imposing exaction fees on private property development, if subject to the Takings Clause, comply with *Nollan* and *Dolan*'s mandates.
- The Court's decision unanimously declares that "[t]he Constitution's text does not limit the Takings Clause to a particular branch of government," which is consistent with the conclusion of Justice Scalia's 2010 plurality opinion in *Stop the Beach Renourishment, Inc. v. Florida Department of Environmental Protection* that judicial actions are subject to the Takings Clause.
- Justice Kavanaugh's concurring opinion, joined by Justices Kagan and Jackson, emphasized that the Court today expressly left open the question whether a permit condition imposed on a class of properties is subject to the same standard as a permit condition that targets a particular development. Justice Gorsuch, in another concurrence, offered his answer: *Nollan* and *Dolan* should not operate differently when an alleged

taking affects a class of properties rather than a specific development, as neither of those precedents involved the targeting of a particular development.

- Justice Sotomayor’s concurring opinion, joined by Justice Jackson, expressed the view that the Court had not decided the threshold question whether the traffic impact fee in this case would be a compensable taking if imposed outside of the permitting context.

Gibson Dunn Appellate Honors



The Court’s opinion is available [here](#).

Gibson Dunn’s lawyers are available to assist in addressing any questions you may have regarding developments at the Supreme Court. Please feel free to contact the following practice leaders:

Appellate and Constitutional Law Practice

Thomas H. Dupree Jr.
+1 202.955.8547
tdupree@gibsondunn.com

Allyson N. Ho
+1 214.698.3233
aho@gibsondunn.com

Julian W. Poon
+1 213.229.7758
jpoon@gibsondunn.com

Lucas C. Townsend
+1 202.887.3731
ltownsend@gibsondunn.com

Bradley J. Hamburger
+1 213.229.7658
bhamburger@gibsondunn.com

Brad G. Hubbard
+1 214.698.3326
bhubbard@gibsondunn.com

Related Practice: Real Estate

Eric M. Feuerstein
+1 212.351.2323
efeuerstein@gibsondunn.com

Alan Samson
+44 20 7071 4222 **Error! Hyperlink
reference not
valid.**asamson@gibsondunn.com

Jesse Sharf
+1 310.552.8512
jsharf@gibsondunn.com

Related Practice: Land Use and Development

Mary G. Murphy
+1 415.393.8257
mgmurphy@gibsondunn.com

Benjamin Saltsman
+1 213.229.7480
bsaltsman@gibsondunn.com

This alert was prepared by associates Connie Lee and Robert Batista.

Attorney Advertising: These materials were prepared for general informational purposes only based on information available at the time of publication and are not intended as, do not constitute, and should not be relied upon as, legal advice or a legal opinion on any specific facts or circumstances. Gibson Dunn (and its affiliates, attorneys, and employees) shall not have any liability in connection with any use of these materials. The sharing of these materials does not establish an attorney-client relationship with the recipient and should not be relied upon as an alternative for advice from qualified counsel. Please note that facts and circumstances may vary, and prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

If you would prefer NOT to receive future emailings such as this from the firm,
please reply to this email with "Unsubscribe" in the subject line.

If you would prefer to be removed from ALL of our email lists,
please reply to this email with "Unsubscribe All" in the subject line. Thank you.

© 2024 Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP. All rights reserved. For contact and other information, please visit us at gibsondunn.com