

6. Right to Quiet Enjoyment

This Policy Guideline is intended to provide a statement of the policy intent of legislation, and has been developed in the context of the common law and the rules of statutory interpretation, where appropriate. This Guideline is also intended to help the parties to an application understand issues that are likely to be relevant. It may also help parties know what information or evidence is likely to assist them in supporting their position. This Guideline may be revised and new Guidelines issued from time to time.

This guideline deals with a tenant's entitlement to quiet enjoyment of the property that is the subject of a tenancy agreement. At common law, the covenant of quiet enjoyment "promis(es) that the tenant . . . shall enjoy the possession and use of the premises in peace and without disturbance. In connection with the landlord-tenant relationship, the covenant of quiet enjoyment protects the tenant's right to freedom from serious interferences with his or her tenancy."<sup>1</sup> A landlord does not have a reciprocal right to quiet enjoyment.

The *Residential Tenancy Act* and *Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act*<sup>2</sup> (the Legislation) establish rights to quiet enjoyment, which include, but are not limited to:

- reasonable privacy
- freedom from unreasonable disturbance,
- exclusive possession, subject to the landlord's right of entry under the Legislation, and
- use of common areas for reasonable and lawful purposes, free from significant interference.

Every tenancy agreement contains an implied covenant of quiet enjoyment. A covenant for quiet enjoyment may be spelled out in the tenancy agreement; however a written provision setting out the terms in the tenancy agreement pertaining to the provision of quiet enjoyment cannot be used to remove any of the rights of a tenant established under the Legislation. If no written provision exists, common law protects the renter from substantial interference with the enjoyment of the premises for all usual purposes.

# Basis for a finding of breach of quiet enjoyment

Historically, on the case law, in order to prove an action for a breach of the covenant of quiet enjoyment, the tenant had to show that there had been a substantial interference with the ordinary and lawful enjoyment of the premises by the landlord's actions that rendered the premises unfit for occupancy for the purposes for which they were leased. A variation of that is inaction by the landlord which permits or allows physical interference by an outside or external force which is within the landlord's power to control.

The modern trend is towards relaxing the rigid limits of purely physical interference towards recognizing other acts of direct interference. Frequent and ongoing interference by the landlord, or, if preventable by the landlord and he stands idly by while others engage in such conduct, may form a basis for a claim of a breach of the covenant of quiet enjoyment. Such interference might include serious examples of:

• entering the rental premises frequently, or without notice or permission;

<sup>1 &</sup>quot;Black's Law Dictionary", Sixth Edition, 1990, p. 1248.

<sup>2</sup> Residential Tenancy Act, s. 28: Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act, s. 22.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCY POLICY GUIDELINE

Page 6-2



6. Right to Quiet Enjoyment

- · unreasonable and ongoing noise;
- · persecution and intimidation;
- · refusing the tenant access to parts of the rental premises;
- preventing the tenant from having guests without cause;
- intentionally removing or restricting services, or failing to pay bills so that services are cut off;
- forcing or coercing the tenant to sign an agreement which reduces the tenant's rights; or,
- allowing the property to fall into disrepair so the tenant cannot safely continue to live there.

Temporary discomfort or inconvenience does not constitute a basis for a breach of the covenant of quiet enjoyment.

It is necessary to balance the tenant's right to quiet enjoyment with the landlord's right and responsibility to maintain the premises, however a tenant may be entitled to reimbursement for loss of use of a portion of the property even if the landlord has made every effort to minimize disruption to the tenant in making repairs or completing renovations.

Substantial interference that would give sufficient cause to warrant the tenant leaving the rented premises would constitute a breach of the covenant of quiet enjoyment, where such a result was either intended or reasonably foreseeable.

A tenant does not have to end the tenancy to show that there has been sufficient interference so as to breach the covenant of quiet enjoyment, however it would ordinarily be necessary to show a course of repeated or persistent threatening or intimidating behaviour. A tenant may file a claim for damages if a landlord either engages in such conduct, or fails to take reasonable steps to prevent such conduct by employees or other tenants.

A landlord would not normally be held responsible for the actions of other tenants unless notified that a problem exists, although it may be sufficient to show proof that the landlord was aware of a problem and failed to take reasonable steps to correct it. A landlord would not be held responsible for interference by an outside agency that is beyond his or her control, except that a tenant might be entitled to treat a tenancy as ended where a landlord was aware of circumstances that would make the premises uninhabitable for that tenant and withheld that information in establishing the tenancy.

## • Harassment

Harassment is defined in the Dictionary of Canadian Law as "engaging in a course of vexatious comment or conduct that is known or ought reasonably to be known to be unwelcome".<sup>3</sup> As such, what is commonly referred to as harassment of a tenant by a landlord may well constitute a breach of the covenant of quiet enjoyment. There are a number of other definitions, however all reflect the element of ongoing or repeated activity by the harasser.

<sup>3 &</sup>quot;Dictionary of Canadian Law", Second Edition, Carswell Toronto, 1995, p. 542.



# • Application to a residential hotel or other license to occupy

6. Right to Quiet Enjoyment

If an arbitrator determines that an agreement is a residential tenancy under the Legislation, that tenant is entitled to the covenant of quiet enjoyment.

# • Claim for damages

In determining the amount by which the value of the tenancy has been reduced, the arbitrator should take into consideration the seriousness of the situation or the degree to which the tenant has been unable to use the premises, and the length of time over which the situation has existed.

The Supreme Court has decided that arbitrators have the ability to hear claims in tort, and that the awarding of monetary damages might be appropriate where the claim arises from the landlord's failure to meet his obligations under the Legislation. Facts that relate to an issue of quiet enjoyment might also be found to support a claim in tort for compensation in damages. An arbitrator can award damages for a nuisance that affects the use and enjoyment of the premises, or for the intentional infliction of mental suffering.

On application, an arbitrator may award aggravated damages where a very serious situation has been allowed to continue. Aggravated damages are those damages which are intended to provide compensation to the applicant, rather than punish the erring party, and can take into effect intangibles such as distress and humiliation that may have been caused by the respondent's behaviour.

# • Ending Tenancy for Breach of a Material Term

A breach of the covenant of quiet enjoyment has been found by the courts to be a breach of a material term of the tenancy agreement. A tenant may elect to treat the tenancy agreement as ended, however the tenant must first so notify the landlord in writing. The standard of proof is high – it is necessary to find that there has been a significant interference with the use of the premises. An award for damages may be more appropriate, depending on the circumstances.

# • Non-payment of Rent

A tenant may not refuse to pay rent because of a breach of the covenant of quiet enjoyment by the landlord, except as ordered by an arbitrator.