

N.C.P.I.-Civil. 835.22

EMINENT DOMAIN - ISSUE OF JUST COMPENSATION - PARTIAL TAKING BY PRIVATE OR LOCAL PUBLIC CONDEMNORS - FAIR MARKET VALUE OF PROPERTY BEFORE AND AFTER THE TAKING.

GENERAL CIVIL VOLUME

MAY 2006

N.C. Gen. Stat. § 40A

835.22 EMINENT DOMAIN - ISSUE OF JUST COMPENSATION - PARTIAL TAKING BY PRIVATE OR LOCAL PUBLIC CONDEMNORS - FAIR MARKET VALUE OF PROPERTY BEFORE AND AFTER THE TAKING.

*NOTE WELL: Use this instruction only where there has been a partial taking, the evidence relates to the difference in fair market value before and after the taking and there is no evidence as to the value of the property taken. These proceedings involve only private or local public condemnors pursuant to Chapter 40A of the North Carolina General Statutes.*

The issue reads:

"What is the amount of just compensation the [plaintiff(s)] [defendant(s)] [is] [are] entitled to recover from the [plaintiff] [defendant] for the taking of the [plaintiff(s)] [defendant(s)] property?"

On this issue the burden of proof is on the [plaintiff(s)] [defendant(s)].<sup>1</sup> This means that the [plaintiff(s)] [defendant(s)] must prove, by the greater weight of the evidence, the amount of just compensation owed by the [plaintiff] [defendant] for the taking of the [plaintiff('s)(s')] [defendant('s)(s')] property.

In this case, the [plaintiff] [defendant] has not taken all of the [plaintiff('s)(s')] [defendant('s)(s')] property. It has taken (*state size of property taken, e.g., five acres*) out of a (*state size of entire tract, e.g., 15-acre*) tract. The measure of just compensation to which the [plaintiff(s)] [defendant(s)] [is] [are] entitled where a part of a tract is taken is the difference between the fair market value of the entire tract immediately before the taking and the fair market value of the remainder immediately after the taking.<sup>2</sup>

-----

Fair market value is the amount which would be agreed upon as a fair price by an owner who wishes to sell, but is not compelled to do so, and a buyer who wishes to buy, but is not compelled to do so.

You must find the fair market value of the property immediately before the time of the taking and the fair market value of the remainder immediately after the taking- that is (*state date of taking*)- and not as of the present day or any other time.<sup>3</sup> In arriving at the fair market value of the property immediately before the taking, you should, in light of all the evidence, consider not only the use of the property at that time,<sup>4</sup> but also all of the uses to which it was then reasonably adaptable, including what you find to be the highest and best use or uses.<sup>5</sup> Likewise, in arriving at the value of the remainder immediately after the taking, you should, in light of all the evidence, consider not only the use of the property at that time, but also all of the uses to which it was then reasonably adaptable, including what you find to be the highest and best use or uses. Further, in arriving at the fair market value of the remainder immediately after the taking, you should consider the property as it [was] [will be] at the conclusion of the project.<sup>6</sup> You should consider these factors in the same way in which they would be considered by a willing buyer and a willing seller in arriving at a fair price.<sup>7</sup> You should not consider purely imaginative or speculative uses and values.

(The fair market value of the property immediately prior to the time of the taking does not include any [increase] [decrease] in value before (*state date of taking*) caused by [the proposed (*state improvement or project*) for which the property was taken] [the reasonable likelihood that the property would be acquired for (*state proposed improvement or project*)] [the condemnation proceeding in which the property was

taken].)<sup>8</sup>

(In determining the fair market value of the property, you may consider any decrease in value before the date of the taking caused by physical deterioration of the property within the reasonable control of the landowner and by *his* unjustified neglect.)<sup>9</sup>

(If the [plaintiff(s)] [defendant(s)] [is] [are] allowed to remove [timber] [a building] [(*state other permanent improvement*)] from the property, the value of the [timber] [building] [(*state other permanent improvement*)] shall not be included in the compensation you award. However, the cost of the removal of the [timber] [building] [(*state other permanent improvement*)] shall be added to the compensation.)<sup>10</sup>

(In determining the fair market value of the remaining property immediately after the time of the taking, you must take into account any decreases in value to the remaining property after (*state date of taking*) caused by (*state proposed project*) (including any work performed or to be performed under an agreement between the parties). Any such decreases in value shall reflect the time that will pass before the damage caused by the improvement or project will be actually realized.)<sup>11</sup>

(Use if the condemnor<sup>12</sup> introduces evidence of general or special benefits for purposes of offset:<sup>13</sup> You may also consider whether and the extent to which the remainder has benefited from (*state project*). Benefits can be either general or special.<sup>14</sup> General benefits are those which arise from the fulfillment of the public object which justified the taking. They are those benefits arising to the vicinity which result from the enjoyment of the facilities provided by the new public work and from the increased general prosperity resulting from such enjoyment. Special

-----

benefits are increases in the value of the remaining land which are peculiar to the owner's property and not shared in common with other landowners in the vicinity. They arise from the relationship of the land in question to the public improvement, and may result from physical changes in the land, from proximity to the new project, or in various other ways. Remote, uncertain or speculative benefits are not to be considered. The value of any such benefit shall reflect the time that will pass before the benefit caused by the improvement or project will be actually realized.)<sup>15</sup>

Your verdict must not include any amount for interest.<sup>16</sup> Such interest as the law allows will be added to your verdict by the court.

I instruct you that your verdict on this issue must be based upon the evidence and the rules of law I have given you. You are not required to accept the amount suggested by the parties or their attorneys.

Finally, as to this issue on which the [plaintiff(s)] [defendant(s)] [has] [have] the burden of proof, if you find, by the greater weight of the evidence, the difference in the fair market value of the entire tract immediately before the date of the taking and the fair market value of the remainder of the tract immediately after the date of the taking, then you will answer this issue by writing that amount in dollars and cents in the blank space provided. (However, if you find that the value of the remainder immediately after the taking is the same as, or greater than, the value of the entire tract immediately before the date of the taking, then it would be your duty to answer this issue by writing "zero" in the blank space provided.)<sup>17</sup>

1. On this issue, the burden of proof will always be on the property owner, whether in the capacity of plaintiff or defendant.

2. See N.C. Gen. Stat. § 40A-64. See also *Kirkman v. State Highway Comm'n*, 257 N.C. 428, 433, 126 S.E.2d 107, 111 (1962); *Barnes v. State Highway Comm'n*, 250 N.C. 378, 387, 109 S.E.2d 219, 227 (1959); *DeBruhl v. State Highway Comm'n*, 247 N.C. 671, 676, 102 S.E.2d 229, 233 (1958); *Gallimore v. State Highway Comm'n*, 241 N.C. 350, 354, 85 S.E.2d 392, 396 (1955).

The rule for measure of damages for part taking of a fee is also the rule ordinarily applicable to the assessment of damages in condemnations by railroad, highway and other rights-of-way in which the bare fee remaining in the landowner, for all practical purposes, has no value to him and the value of the easement is virtually the value of the land it embraces. See *Duke Power Co. v. Rogers*, 271 N.C. 318, 321, 156 S.E.2d 244, 247 (1967); *Highway Comm'n v. Black*, 239 N.C. 198, 203, 79 S.E.2d 778, 783 (1953).

3. The point in time when property is "valued" in a condemnation action is the "date of taking." *Metropolitan Sewerage Dist. of Buncombe County v. Trueblood*, 64 N.C. App. 690, 693-94, 308 S.E.2d 340, 342 (1983), cert. denied, 311 N.C. 402, 319 S.E.2d 272 (1984).

4. Occurrences or events that may affect the value of the property subsequent to the taking are not to be considered in determining compensation. *Metropolitan Sewerage Dist. of Buncombe County v. Trueblood*, 64 N.C. App. 690, 694, 308 S.E.2d 340, 342, cert. denied, 311 N.C. 402, 319 S.E.2d 272 (1983) (photographs of damage occurring after the actual taking inadmissible).

5. In valuing property taken for public use, the jury is to take into consideration "not merely the condition it is in at the time and the use to which it is then applied by the owner," but must consider "all of the capabilities of the property, and all of the uses to which it may be applied, or for which it is adapted, which affect its value in the market." *Nantahala Power Light Co. v. Moss*, 220 N.C. 200, 205, 17 S.E.2d 10, 13 (1941), and cases cited therein. "The particular use to which the land is applied at the time of the taking is not the test of value, but its availability for any valuable or beneficial uses to which it would likely be put by men of ordinary prudence should be taken into account." *Carolina & Y. R.R. Co. v. Armfield*, 167 N.C. 464, 466, 83 S.E. 809, 810 (1914); *Barnes v. State Highway Comm'n*, 250 N.C. 378, 387-88, 109 S.E.2d 219, 227 (1959).

6. *Department of Transp. v. Bragg*, 308 N.C. 367, 371, 302 S.E.2d 227, 230 (1983).

7. In *Board of Transp. v. Jones*, 297 N.C. 436, 438-439, 255 S.E.2d 185, 187 (1979), decided under N.C. Gen. Stat. § 136-112, the Supreme Court ruled that the statute established the exclusive measure of damages but does not restrict expert real estate appraisal witnesses "to any particular method of determining the fair market value of property either before or after condemnation." See generally *State Highway Comm'n v. Conrad*, 263 N.C. 394, 399, 139 S.E.2d 553, 557 (1965) (expert witnesses given wide latitude regarding permissible bases for opinions on value); *Department of Transp. v. Burnham*, 61 N.C. App. 629, 634, 301 S.E.2d 535, 538 (1983); *Board of Transp. v. Jones*, 297 N.C. 436, 438, 255 S.E.2d 185, 187 (1979); *In Re Lee*, 69 N.C. App. 277, 287, 317

---

S.E.2d 75, 80 (1984) (where expert was allowed to base his opinion as to value on hearsay information). *In Department of Transp. v. Fleming*, 112 N.C. App. 580, 583, 436 S.E.2d 407, 409 (1993), the expert witness was not allowed to state opinion regarding the value of land when the opinion was based entirely on the net income of defendant's plumbing business. The Court held that loss of profits of a business conducted on the property taken is not an element of recoverable damages in a condemnation. *Cf. City of Statesville v. Cloaninger*, 106 N.C. App. 10, 16, 415 S.E.2d 111, 115 (1992) (expert allowed to base opinion of value on the income from a dairy farm business conducted on the property condemned). The Court of Appeals stated in *Department of Transp. v. Fleming*, 112 N.C. App. at 584, 436 S.E.2d at 410: "It is a well recognized exception that the income derived from a farm may be considered in determining the value of the property. This is so because the income from a farm is directly attributable to the land itself." Accordingly, the rental value of property is competent upon the question of the fair market value of property on the date of taking. *Raleigh-Durham Airport Authority v. King*, 75 N.C. App. 121, 123, 330 S.E.2d 618, 619 (1985).

8. N.C. Gen. Stat. § 40A-65(a). Where the project is expanded before completion or changed to require the taking of additional property, see N.C. Gen. Stat. § 40A-65(b).

9. N.C. Gen. Stat. § 40A-65(c).

10. N.C. Gen. Stat. § 40A-64(c).

11. N.C. Gen. Stat. § 40A-66(b).

12. N.C. Gen. Stat. § 40A-66(a). *Board Transp. v. Rand*, 299 N.C. 476, 480, 263 S.E.2d 565, 568 (1980) and its predecessors state that the burden of proving the existence and the amount of offset from general or special benefits is on the condemnor. It would be anomalous, however, to separate the jury's calculation of "just compensation" into two issues. The Pattern Jury Instruction Committee believes that the Supreme Court's reference to "burden of proof" was intended to mean the "burden of production." Accordingly, this optional language should be used where the condemnor produces competent evidence of offsetting general or special benefits.

13. Failure to instruct on general or specific benefits can be reversible error. *Board of Transp. v. Rand*, 299 N.C. at 483, 263 S.E.2d at 570. See also *Charlotte v. Recreation Comm'n*, 278 N.C. 26, 31, 178 S.E.2d 601, 607 (1970); *Kirkman v. State Highway Comm'n*, 257 N.C. 428, 433, 126 S.E.2d 107, 111 (1962); *DeBruhl v. State Highway Comm'n*, 247 N.C. 671, 686, 102 S.E.2d 229, 240 (1958); *State Highway Comm'n v. Mode*, 2 N.C. App. 464, 472, 163 S.E.2d 429, 434 (1968).

14. The distinction between general and special benefits is not entirely clear. However, the general rule is that special benefits are those arising from the peculiar relation of the land to the public improvement, while general benefits are those arising to the vicinity in general.

Both general and special benefits may arise from a proposed use. Thus, if a new highway is constructed, the benefit to a particular lot by being protected from surface water, or by being left in a desirable size or shape, or by fronting upon a desirable street, is

N.C.P.I.-Civil. 835.22

EMINENT DOMAIN - ISSUE OF JUST COMPENSATION - PARTIAL TAKING BY  
PRIVATE OR LOCAL PUBLIC CONDEMNORS - FAIR MARKET VALUE OF  
PROPERTY BEFORE AND AFTER THE TAKING.

GENERAL CIVIL VOLUME

MAY 2006

N.C. Gen. Stat. § 40A

-----

---

a special benefit. The increase in values for business use of property in the neighborhood on account of traffic on the highway and the increased facility of communication is a general benefit, not peculiar to a particular lot.

15. N.C. Gen. Stat. § 40A-66(b).

16. The landowner may withdraw the amount deposited with the Court as an estimate of just compensation. Thus, the Court is only required to add interest on the amount awarded to the landowner in excess of the sum deposited. The interest is computed on the time period from the date of taking to the date of judgment. N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 136-113 and 40A-53. No interest accrues on the amount deposited because the landowner has the right to withdraw and use that money without prejudice to the landowner's right to seek additional just compensation. N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 136-113 and 40A-53 provide for the trial judge to add interest at 8% and 6% respectively per annum on the amount awarded as compensation from the date of taking to the date of judgment. *But see Lea Co. v. Board of Transp.*, 317 N.C. 254, 259, 345 S.E.2d 355, 358 (1986).

17. Give only if the condemnor has introduced competent evidence of offset by reason of general or special benefits.