DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Herbert Hoover, Secretary.

ZONING PROGRESS IN THE UNITED STATES.

PART I.

Zoning and the Courts

by

Edward M. Bassett.

PART II.

Report on Zoning Laws and Ordinances.

by the

Division of Building and Housing,

John M. Gries, Chief.

WASHINGTON
July, 1927.

ZONING PROGRESS IN THE UNITED STATES

C O N T E N T S

The compilation of Zoning Laws and Ordinances is by Norman L. Knauss, of the Division of Building and Housing.

ZONING AND THE COURTS

by

Edward M. Bassett.

Is zoning constitutional? One might as well ask "Is taxation constitutional?" Taxation that is arbitrary, unreasonable, partial or piecemeal is unconstitutional. Just so with zoning. The main difference is that sound methods of taxation have become well known. Zoning is a new science and its principles are being worked out by municipalities and the courts. This task is fraught with difficulty, partly because municipalities often insist on a kind of zoning that has no relation to the police power, that is, to the health, safety, morals or general welfare of the community. They try to use zoning to obtain for property owners advantages which should be embodied in private restrictions. Then, too, in foreign countries courts cannot set aside legislative enactments, but in this country under our written constitutions the regulation of property rights must be by due process of law, otherwise the courts will declare such regulations void. This means that police power regulations must be reasonable and impartial, and based on the health, safety, morals and general welfare of the community.[1] It is not strange that in this country the first ten years of the development of zoning should be beset with perils and disappointments. Taking the country as a whole, one must almost wonder that the courts

---

1. Lincoln Trust Co. v. Williams Bldg.Corp., 229 N.Y. 313 (1920)

have so rapidly sympathized with sound zoning and by their criticisms of defective methods and unreasonable regulations are so quickly compelling this new science to adapt itself to safe and lawful grooves.

UNREASONABLE ACTS UNDER THE GUISE OF ZONING.

Perhaps sometimes the courts seem to stand in the way of progress. On the other hand municipalities under the guise of zoning seek to uphold the most unreasonable and discriminatory ordinances. As an example, a hospital organization, treating non-contagious diseases, buys a ten-acre tract in a high-class residential suburban city, intending to erect a hospital in the middle of the tract. The residents, hearing of the project, urge the city officials to zone this land as a residence district from which hospitals are to be excluded. The officials yield to the almost unanimous request and the building commissioner then refuses a building permit to the hospital. Thereupon the hospital appeals to the court for protection. The city attorney tells the court that the hospital ought to go somewhere else because the residents are against it and it is an undesirable neighbor and may affect the value of real estate. The hospital can well retort, "If we cannot build in a residence district, where can we build? Would you force us into a business district where land is expensive and where there is the maximum street noise, or into an industrial district along with boiler factories and gas works?" "No," the city attorney answers, "we have created a low-class or multiple-family house

residence district. You can go in that, or you can locate somewhere outside of our city limits." The hospital trustees might well reply, "Your high-class residents ought to be willing to have adjuncts of civilized society like schools and hospitals near their own homes. It is unreasonable for you to try to push off your hospitals and schools into what you think is a low-class residence district or into the next town. You want to employ zoning to surround yourselves with the bright side of life and dump into a low-class district or into the next town every necessary agency for your own welfare which it is disagreeable to have next door. This is not an invocation of the police power for health, safety and the general welfare. It is an attempted invocation of the police power for personal preferences and sentiment." The courts are likely to uphold the hospital and frown upon that sort of zoning. This unreasonable sort of zoning assumes a thousand different phases. Regardless of repeated admonitions municipalities continue to err.

HEIGHT AND AREA REGULATIONS UNIFORMLY APPROVED BY COURTS.

The entire field of zoning outside of the subject of use has been upheld by the courts throughout this country. This embraces the subjects of height, area and bulk, courts and yards. Even if zoning accomplished no more than this, it would be a great advance on the chaotic conditions which existed prior to ten years ago. This is not to say that every case relating to height and area has been decided by the courts

favorably to the municipality. Sometimes a city zones before the state has passed an enabling act for zoning.[2] Sometimes the height zoning is for a particular preferential locality that it is desired to beautify.[3] Sometimes the regulation is not related to the health, safety and general welfare of the community as where an ordinance tries to prohibit one-story stores and force all stores to have two stories or more.[4] Sometimes the regulation is deliberately intended to protect obsolete one-family houses at the expense of the normal development of a multi-family house or business district.[5] But in every case where the municipality has been empowered to zone for height or area and has framed its regulations with some relation to access of light and air, fire protection or facility for fighting fire, the courts have upheld the ordinance.[6]

---

2. People ex rel. Friend v. City of Chicago, 103 N.E. 609 (1913); Matter of Barker v. Switzer, 209 App. Div. 151 (N.Y.,1924); State ex rel. Shad v. City of Jacksonville, 105 So. 733 (Fla. 1925).
3. Piper v. Ekern, 194 N.W. 159 (Wis., 1923).
4. Romar Realty Co. v. Board of Commissioners of Haddonfield, 114 Atl. 248 (N.J., 1921); Dorison v. Saul, 118 Atl. 691 (N.J.,1922).
5. Matter of Verplanck, Supreme Court, Westchester County, White Plains, N. Y., order of Mr. Justice Morschauser, May 4, 1923; Matter of Isenbarth v. Bartnett, 206 App. Div. 546 (N.Y.,1923);
6. Welch v. Swasey, 214 U S. 91 (1909); Cliffside Park Realty Co. v. Borough of Cliffside Park, 114 Atl. 797 (N.J.1921); State ex rel. Kiefisch v. Wisconsin Telephone Co., 195 N.W. 544 (Wis., 1923).

The subject of use is holding back zoning in New Jersey, Maryland and Georgia.[7] Elsewhere the courts are now uniformly upholding zoning for use.[8] The ordinary retail store in a residence district is the bone of contention in New Jersey, Maryland and Georgia. The highest court of New Jersey said that the prohibition of a store on a certain plot in a residence district under the zoning plan of the town of Nutley was not related to the health, safety and community welfare and that therefore in that instance the application of the zoning ordinance was unconstitutional and void.[9] A constitutional amendment authorizing zoning will come before the voters of New Jersey in September, 1927. Since the Goldman decision was handed down in Maryland the state legislature has passed a good state enabling act for zoning and it is expected that the courts will now

---

7. Ignaciunas v. Town of Nutley, 99N.J.L. 389, 125 Atl. 121 (1924); Goldman v. City of Baltimore, 128 Atl. 50 (1925); Smith v. City of Atlanta, 132 S. E. 66 (1926).
8. Hadacheck v. Sebastian, 239 U. S. 394 (1915); City of Des Moines v. Manhattan Oil Co., 184 N. W. 823 (Iowa,1921); Ware v. City of Wichita, 214 Pac. 99 (Kan., 1923); State ex rel. Civello v. City of New Orleans, 97 So. 440 (La.,1923); State ex rel. Carter v. Harper, 196 N. W. 451 (Wis., 1923); State of Ohio ex rel. Dantzig v. Durant, 21 Ohio Law Bull. and Rep. (No. 43) 395 (Court of Appeals,1923); Motor Home, Inc. v. Hedden, Superior Court, Los Angeles County, Calif , November 14, 1923; City of Memphis v. Gianotti, Supreme Court, Tennessee, Western Division, March 29, 1924; Santangelo v. City of Cincinnati, 25 Ohio N. P. (N. S.) 49; State ex rel. Beery v. Houghton, 204 N.W. 569 (Minn., 1925); City of Youngstown v. Kahn Brothers, 148 N.E. 842 (Ohio,1925); City of Wilmington v. Turk, 129 Atl. 512 (Del.,1925); U. S. ex rel. Steerman v. Oehmann, Supreme Court, District of Columbia, July 6, 1925; Spector v. Town of Milton, 145 N.E. 265 (Oct.1924); Zahn v. City of Los Angeles, 234 Pac. 388 (Feb.1925); City of Aurora v. Burns, 149 N.E. 784 (1925);
Appeal of Junge, Superior Court of Pa., Mar.,1927; Hammond v. Springfield, 154 N.E. 82 (1926); Nectow v. Cambridge, Supreme Judicial Court of Mass., July,1927; Spencer-Sturla Co. v. Memphis, 290 S.W. 608 (1927).
9. Ignaciunas v. Town of Nutley, 125 Atl. 121 (N.J.,1924).

uphold use zoning.

ZONING BASED UPON AN ENABLING ACT

It can safely be said that the constitutionality of zoning based on an enabling act has been upheld by the courts of every state where it has been tested except in New Jersey and Georgia, and even there the doubt centers around the one narrow point of the exclusion of a store from a residence district.

St. Louis, where the Missouri adverse cases arose, zoned without a state enabling act for zoning.[10] Later a sound state enabling act was passed and the highest court has reversed its position.[11]

WHAT IS ZONING?

What is modern zoning in the United States? Ten years of study, experiment, practice, legislation and litigation make possible an answer. Nine years ago the creation of building districts without state enabling acts, and the enactment of piecemeal, interim and temporary ordinances without maps were all called zoning. So long as the municipality created different regulations for different districts, there was hope that the courts would support the ordinance because the name zoning was

---

10. City of St. Louis v. Evraiff, 256 S.W. 489 (1923); State ex rel. Better Built Home & Mortgage Co. v. McKelvey, 256 S.W. 495 (1923); State ex rel. Penrose Inv. Co. v. McKelvey, 256 S.W. 474 (1923).
11. State ex rel. Cadillac Co. v. Christopher, Supreme Court of Missouri, July, 1927.

applied to it. Such hope has proved fatuous. The courts have not heeded the name, but no one can say that they have failed to heed the realities of the police power and gradually extend its principles to the new needs of cities.

Modern zoning demands just two things; a good state enabling act for zoning,[12] and reasonable regulations in the ordinance based on the health, safety, morals and general welfare of the community.[13]

The state enabling act for zoning has been quite well crystallized. The Department of Commerce, Washington, and the Regional Plan of New York and Its Environs furnish all inquirers with carefully framed standard forms based on actual experience and the decided court cases. Each of these standard or model forms contains five elements now deemed absolutely necessary:

(1) The grant of power to regulate height, bulk, use, yards and courts and density of population;

(2) Required preliminary consideration of the needs of each district, public hearings, and the comprehensive and impartial application of the regulations;

(3) Requirement of more than a majority vote of the council to effect changes after written protest of property owners;

12. Opinion of Justices, 127 N. E. 525 (Mass.,1920); Clements v. McCabe, 177 N.W. 722 (Mich.,1920); Fitzhugh v. City of Jackson, 97 So. 190 (Miss., 1923).
13. Handy v. Village of South Orange, 118 Atl. 838 (N.J.,1922); People ex rel. Roos v. Kaul, 302 Ill. 317 (1922); Willerup v. Village of Hempstead, 120 Misc. 485 (N.Y., 1923); State ex rel. Vernon v. Town of Westfield, 124 Atl. 248 (N.J.,1923); Municipal Gas Co. of Albany v. Nolan, 208 App. Div. 753 (N.Y.,1924); Lees v. Cohoes Motor Car Co , 122 Misc. 373 (N.Y.,1924).

(4) Provision for a board of adjustment with power to vary the strict letter of the ordinance and maps in cases of practical difficulty and unnecessary hardship;

(5) Enforcement and penalties.

Space does not allow a discussion here of the need of a board of adjustment. In the early days of zoning this was considered a device merely for rounding off the sharp corners of the zoning requirements. Such a board is now considered absolutely necessary to the safe operation of a zoning ordinance.[14] It is the safety valve of the Zoning plan. A zoning ordinance like a steam boiler will sooner or later blow up if there is no safety valve. Where there is a functioning board of adjustment to which every aggrieved applicant for a permit may resort, litigation automatically assumes the form of court review of the discretion of the board instead of out and out attacks on the constitutionality of specific instances of regulation. Consequently where there is a board of appeals the courts become helpers in carrying out the intention of the zoning plan. They send the matter back to the board of adjustment with directions to issue a variance, the same as courts send back an excessive assessment for taxation to the board of assessors with directions to substitute a certain figure. Where there is no board of adjustment, instances are

14. People ex rel. Sheldon v. Board of Appeals, 234 N.Y. 484 (N.Y.,1923); In re Permit to American Reduction Company, Municipal Law Rep. (Pennsylvania) Vol. 15, No. 8, April,1924, (Court of Common Pleas, Allegheny County, Pittsburgh); Richard v. Zoning Board of Review of Woonsocket, 130 Atl.802 (R.I.,1925).

sure to arise which the courts must under the law declare unreasonable and arbitrary and therefore void.[15] It is not out of place to say that in Texas, and St. Louis (Missouri) when the adverse court cases arose, there were no boards of adjustment with power. In New Jersey the original enabling acts gave no power to the board of adjustment to vary, but the municipality within vague limits was authorized and expected to clothe the board with its proper powers. This method was so roundabout and ill-defined that cities did not insert the proper provisions in their ordinances, and the courts did not require applicants to resort to the board of adjustment in the first instance.[16] It is generally conceded that, if Greater New York did not have a functioning board of appeals in zoning, some specific instance of arbitrariness or unreasonableness would have gone to the courts about once a week during the last eleven years of the operation of the law. This would have meant about six hundred adverse dicisions of the courts. The zoning plan would have lost popular and official respect and would have been on the scrap heap long ago. Instead of such a result the zoning plan of Greater New York has worked smoothly for more than eleven years without a word of court criticism and without a court decision of unconstitutionality. This is undoubtedly due to the safety valve operation of

15. State ex rel. Westminster Presbyterian Church v. Edgcomb, 189 N.W. 617 (Neb.,1922).
16. An exception to this statement is the following case, wherein the city specifically inserted the broadest possible grant of power in the ordinance itself, - Allen v. City of Paterson, 123 Atl. 884 (N.J., 1924).

the board of adjustment.[17]

The next requirement mentioned is the framing of reasonable, impartial and comprehensive regulations by the municipality. It matters not how good the state enabling act may be if the city will not frame its ordinance within the law. It is in the power of the city to bring down upon itself the criticism of the courts by making a pretense of regulating for the sake of health, safety, morals and the general welfare. A recently proposed zoning ordinance of a suburban village asserted that thereby the village was divided into one residence zone or district from which all two-family and multi-family houses were excluded along with all churches and hospitals, stores, public garages, laundries and factories. This is zoning run wild. It

17. People ex rel. Cantoni v. Moore, 179 App. Div.121 (N.Y.,1917) People ex rel. N. Y. Central R. R. v. Leo, 105 Misc. 372 (N. Y., 1918); People ex rel. Beinert v. Miller, 188 App. Div. 113 (N. Y., 1919); People ex rel. Cockcroft v. Miller, 187 App. Div. 704 (N.Y.,1919); People ex rel. Sondern v. Walsh, 108 Misc. 193, 196 (N.Y.,1919); People ex rel. McAvoy v. Leo, 109 Misc. 255, (N.Y.,1919); People ex rel. Healy v. Leo, 194 App. Div. 973 (N.Y.,1920); People ex rel. Facey v. Leo, 230 N.Y. 602 (N.Y.,1921); People ex rel. Helvetia Realty Co. v. Leo, 231 N. Y. 619 (N.Y.,1921); People ex rel. Ruth v. Leo, 188 N. Y. Supp. 945 (N.Y.,1921); People ex rel. Forty-first & Park Ave. Corp. v. Walsh, 199 App. Div. 925 (N.Y., 1921); People ex rel. Broadway & Ninety-sixth Street Realty Co. v. Walsh, 203 App. Div. 468 (N.Y.,1922); People ex rel. Wohl v. Leo, 192 N.Y. Supp. 945 (N.Y.,1922); People ex rel. Kammensohn Holding Corp. v. Walsh, 120 Misc.467 (N.Y.,1923); People ex rel. Ventres v. Walsh, 121 Misc. 494 (N.Y.,1923); People ex rel. Parry v. Walsh, 121 Misc. 631 (N.Y.,1923); People ex rel. Sheldon v. Bd. of Appeals, 234 N.Y. 484 (1923); Matter of Kelmonson v. Mann, 237 N.Y. 615; People ex rel. Fordham Church v. Walsh 244 N.Y. 280 (1927).

is an abuse of the police power on its face. Perhaps this village would be happier if the law would help it palm off on its neighbors every building where people work or congregate including its churches, but we are fortunate in having courts that will say that such a community cannot resort to the police power to bring about such a result however much it is desired.

The sooner municipalities can understand that zoning is not a panacea, the better it will be for all concerned. Zoning is doing its proper task and the courts are helping it along, but it cannot be stretched to cover the entire field of private restrictions, or to carry out all the ideals proper and improper of exclusive residential communities.

RECENT NOTEWORTHY DECISIONS.

Until 1924 courts throughout the country were opposed to the exclusion of multi-family houses from one-family detached house districts. The first strong approval was the Brookline (Mass.) case in 1924.[18] Since then this exclusion has been so generally upheld that it may be considered lawful throughout the country.[19] Cases upholding front-yard requirements are closely allied to this subject and many of them refer to the lawfulness of protecting one-family house

---

18. Brett v. Brookline, 145 N. E. 269.
19. Miller v. Los Angeles, 234 Pac. 381 (1925); Deynzer v. Evanston, 149 N. E. 790 (1925).

districts.[20]

The constantly accelerating tendency of the courts to approve comprehensive zoning ordinances based on state enabling acts culminated in 1926 in the overwhelming declaration in favor of zoning by the United States Supreme Court in the Euclid case.[21] Nearly every phase of modern zoning is referred to. Since this notable decision this court has upheld the highest courts of California and Minnesota in the Zahn and Beery cases sustaining the zoning ordinances of Los Angeles and Minneapolis.

At the present time it may be said that the courts of the following states uphold the constitutionality of zoning: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Washington and Wisconsin. Many additional states have enabling acts and zoned cities, and doubtless their higher courts will uphold zoning when test cases reach them.

---

20. Pritz v. Messer, 149 N. E. 30 (Ohio,1925); Wulfsohn v. Mount Vernon, 241 N. Y. 288 (1925); Hayes v. Hoffman, 211 N.W. 271 (Wis.,1926); Gorieb v. Fox, 134 S.E. 914 (Va., 1926); Kaufman v. Akron, Common Pleas, Summit Co., Ohio, Jan., 1927; Siegemund v. Boston, Supreme Judicial Court (Mass., May,1927); R. B. Construction Co. v. Baltimore, Court of Appeals (Md., Mar., 1927).
21. Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co., 272 U.S. 365(Ohio, Nov., 1926).

July 1, 1927.

REPORT ON ZONING LAWS AND ORDINANCES

by the

DIVISION OF BUILDING AND HOUSING.

More than thirty million people, comprising in excess of 55 per cent of the urban population of the United States, now have the protection afforded by zoning ordinances, according to the results of a survey just completed. The 553 cities, towns and villages reported as zoned, on July 1, 1927, are well distributed throughout the country.

The remarkable spread of zoning, and its recognition by legislatures and courts, has taken place practically since 1916, when New York City enacted the first comprehensive zoning ordinance in the United States regulating the use, height and area of buildings in various districts. However, Boston, Mass., regulated the height of buildings as early as 1904, while Los Angeles, Calif., adopted use zoning regulations in 1909.

Viewing zoning progress in the United States from a legislative standpoint, 46 states and the District of Columbia have laws which permit municipalities to zone themselves, although in some cases only groups of cities or specific cities are granted the necessary powers. Of the 46 states, 28 have used all or a large part of "A Standard State Zoning Enabling Act" by the Advisory Committee on Zoning of the Department of Commerce, which was issued in 1924.

Zoning ordinances have been adopted by cities, towns and villages of all sizes. Of the sixty-eight largest cities having over 100,000 population each, 52 of that number, headed by New York, Chicago, St. Louis, Boston, Baltimore, Pittsburgh and Los Angeles, have zoning ordinances in effect. The city of Cleveland, Ohio, adopted an interim zoning ordinance late in 1926, and is now preparing a comprehensive ordinance regulating the use, height and area of buildings. New Orleans, La., while it has a piece-meal zoning ordinance now in effect, is preparing a comprehensive ordinance. Louisville, Ky., is actively engaged in preparing a comprehensive ordinance. Philadelphia, Pa., and Detroit, Mich., the two largest unzoned cities, are now making zoning studies; and there are many other cities, towns and villages having zoning authority that are now seriously studying the subject.

Grouped according to population the 553 zoned municipalities are classified as follows:

52 municipalities having over 100,000 population.

46 municipalities having from 50,000 to 100,000 population.

75 municipalities having from 25,000 to 50,000 population.

96 municipalities having from 10,000 to 25,000 population.

97 municipalities having from 5,000 to 10,000 population.

138 municipalities having from 1,000 to 5,000 population.

49 municipalities having less than 1,000 population.

Arranged according to the number of zoned municipalities New York leads with ninety-three cities, towns and villages; New Jersey is second with seventy-five; Illinois is third with fifty-six; California and Massachusetts are tied for fourth with fifty-four; Pennsylvania is sixth with thirty-two; Ohio is seventh with twenty-nine; Wisconsin is eighth with twenty-two; Michigan is ninth with nineteen; and Indiana is tenth with fifteen. Then follow Connecticut with twelve; Florida, Iowa and Rhode Island with nine each; Kansas with six; Missouri, North Carolina and Virginia with five each; Nebraska with four; Colorado, Minnesota, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon and Washington, with three each; Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, New Hampshire, Tennessee and Utah, with two each; and Delaware, the District of Columbia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Nevada and South Carolina, with one each.

Four cases in which the principle of dividing cities into districts or "zones", in which the use, height and area of buildings are regulated, has been upheld by the United States Supreme Court within the past twelve months, have served to strengthen the legal position of zoning. Mr. Edward M. Bassett, who is a member of the Advisory Committee on City Planning and Zoning appointed by Secretary Hoover, in his discussion of zoning and the courts, lays emphasis on the growing number of states, now amounting to twenty-two, whose highest courts have upheld comprehensive zoning ordinances.

The first of the four court cases mentioned above was that of the Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Company, 272 U. S. 365, decided November 22, 1926, wherein the constitutionality of zoning was upheld by the Supreme Court in a written opinion.

The second case, Beery v. Houghton, decided on March 21, 1927 (no written opinion) involved the exclusion of a four-family apartment house from a one-family residence district, in the city of Minneapolis.

A third case before the United States Supreme Court was that of Zahn v. Board of Public Works of Los Angeles (2 U. S. Daily, 803) wherein a business building was excluded from a residence district. That case, involving a store in a residence district, was decided against zoning in the lower state court but that decision was overturned by the highest appellate court of the state. The case was appealed to the United States Supreme Court which sustained the decision of the appellate court.

The fourth decision by the Supreme Court was rendered May 31, of this year, in the case of Gorieb v. Fox et al., members of the City Council of Roanoke, Va. (2 U.S.Daily 597). The Supreme Court sustained the constitutionality of the ordinance of the city of Roanoke, Va., under which a property owner desiring to erect a building was required to set it back a specified distance from the street.

On the following pages is a complete list of zoned municipalities, arranged by States, with details as to the character of the ordinances and the years during which they were adopted, together with references to the legislation in different states under which zoning is authorized.

"Comp." means a comprehensive zoning ordinance regulating use, height and area of buildings. The last column gives the date of adoption.

ALABAMA

Laws of 1923, Regular Session, No. 435.
Applies to municipalities having a population of 100,000 or more.
Laws of 1923, Regular Session, No. 443.
Applies to "municipal corporation."

Birmingham	Comp.	1926
Montgomery	Use	1924

ARIZONA

Laws of 1925, Chapter No. 80.
Applies to "cities and towns."
Laws of 1927, Chapter No. 27.
Amending Laws of 1925, Chapter No. 80.
Applies to "cities and towns."

Chandler	Comp.	1926
Tucson	Interim	1927

ARKANSAS

Laws of 1924, Act No. 6.
Applies to "cities of the first class."

Little Rock	Use	1924
Pine Bluff	Use	1925

CALIFORNIA

Laws of 1917, Chapter 734.
Applies to "any incorporated city and town."

Alameda	Comp.	1919-23
Albany	Use	1924
Arcadia	Comp.	1926
Bakersfield	Use	1923
Berkeley	Use	1920
Burbank	Use and Height	1923
Burlingame	Use and Height	1923
Chula Vista	Use	1927
Compton	Use	1927

CALIFORNIA (Continued)

Coronado	Comp.	1920
Davis City	Comp.	1926
Fresno	Use	1923
Glendale	Use	1922
Inglewood	Use	1924
Long Beach	Comp.	1921-22-25
Los Angeles	Use	1909-16-21-22
Los Angeles County	Use	1927
Mayfield	Comp.	1924
Monrovia	Use	1923
Monterey	Comp.	1927
Oakland	Use	1919
Palo Alto	Comp.	1918-22
Pasadena	Comp.	1922-24
Petaluma	Use	1925
Piedmont	Use	1917
Pittsburgh	Use (Interim)	1923
Pomona	Use	1917-20
Redondo Beach	Use	1913
Redwood City	Use	1921
Richmond	Use	1923-24
Riverside	Comp.	1925
Sacramento	Use and Height	1917-19-23
San Buenaventura	Comp.	1924
San Diego	Use	1923
San Francisco	Use	1921
San Gabriel	Use	1922
San Leandro	Use and Area	1925
San Marino	Use	1926
San Mateo	Use	1922
San Rafael	Use and Area	1924
Santa Ana	Use	1927
Santa Barbara	Comp.	1920-22-23-25
Santa Clara	Comp.	1925
Santa Cruz	Use	1924
Santa Monica	Use	1922
Selma	Use	1923
Sierra Madre	Use	1923
South Pasadena	Use and Height	1923
So. San Francisco	Use	1925
Stockton	Use	1923
Torrance	Use and Height	1923
Turlock	Use	1917-21
Venice	Use	1923
Visalia	Use	1924
Whittier	Use	1923

COLORADO

Laws of 1923, Chapter 182.
Applies to "each city and incorporated town."
Laws of 1923.
Amendment to Charter of City of Denver, authorizes zoning.

Colorado Springs	Use	1925
Denver	Comp.	1925-26
Pueblo	Use	1923

CONNECTICUT

Special Acts of 1921, No. 478.
Applies to New Haven.
Laws of 1923, Chapter 279.
Applies to "The cities of Bridgeport, Norwalk, Waterbury and Stamford and the town of Stamford without the limits of the city of Stamford, the towns of Fairfield, Greenwich, Enfield and West Hartford."
Special Acts of 1925, No. 242. (Superseding Laws of 1923, Chapter 279)
General Enabling Act applying to "each city, town or borough."
Special Acts of 1925, No. 408.
Applies to town of Greenwich.
Special Acts of 1925, No. 462.
Applies to town of Darien.
Special Acts of 1925, No. 467 (H.B. 163)
Applies to the Pawcatuck Fire District.
Special Acts of 1925, No. 469.
Applies to the town of West Hartford.
Special Acts of 1925, No. 484.
Applies to the city of Hartford.
Special Acts of 1925, No. 487.
Applies to the city of New London.
Special Acts of 1925, No. 494.
Applies to the city of Norwich and the town of Norwich.
Special Acts of 1925, No. 490.
Amending Special Acts of 1921, No. 478.
Applies to the city of New Haven. (Repealing Sections 1-2-3-4-5 of said Act) (After Jan. 1,1926, all powers vested in Zoning Commission are vested in City Plan Commission, said Zoning Commission ceasing to exist.)
Special Acts of 1927, No. 192.
Amending Special Acts of 1925, No. 469.
Applies to the town of West Hartford.

CONNECTICUT (Continued)

Special Acts of 1927, No. 211.
Amending Special Acts of 1925, No. 484.
Applies to Hartford.
Special Acts of 1927, File No. 407.
Amending Special Acts of 1925, No. 494.
Applies to the city of Norwich and the town of Norwich.
Special Acts of 1927, No. 240.
Applies to the town of Stratford. Authorizes zoning.
Special Acts of 1927, S. B. No. 625.
Amending Chapter 279, of the Public Acts of 1923 as amended by Chapter 242 of the Public Acts of 1925. Applies to the city of Bridgeport.

Bridgeport	Comp.	1925-26
Darien	Comp.	1925
East Hartford	Comp.	1927
Enfield	Comp.	1925
Fairfield	Comp.	1925
Greenwich	Comp.	1926
Hartford	Use (Interim)	1925
New Britain	Comp.	1925
New Haven	Comp.	1926
Norwich	Comp.	1925
Stamford	Comp.	1926
West Hartford	Comp.	1924

DELAWARE

Laws of 1923, Chapter 114.
Applies to "cities and incorporated towns."

Wilmington	Comp.	1924

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

66th Congress, 2d Session, 1920, Chapter 92.
Applies to Washington.

Washington	Comp.	1920.

FLORIDA

Amendments to charters of Bradentown, Jacksonville, Maitland, Miami Beach, Orlando, St. Petersburg, Sanford and Tampa authorize zoning.

FLORIDA (Continued)

Laws of 1925, Chapter 10565 (No. 543) (P.1710)
Special Act, enabling Fort Myers and E. Fort Myers to adopt zoning.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 10676 (No. 654)
Special Act, authorizing zoning in Haines City, and appointment of Zoning Commission.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 10752 (No. 730)
Amendment to charter of City of Lakeland.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 10809 (No. 787) (P.2643)
Special Act, creating zoning commission in Leesburg, Lake County.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 10827 (No. 805) (P.2702)
Special Act, creating planning commission in Leesburg.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 10904 (No. 882) (P.3037)
Special Act, providing additional sections for the charter of Manatee.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 11049 (No. 1027)
Special Act, applying to communities in the County of Pinellas. Authorizes zoning. (Applies to city of West Palm Beach.)
Laws of 1925, Chapter 11057 (No. 1035) (P.3799)
Special Act, creating city planning commission in city of Palmetto, and authorizing zoning.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 11061 (No. 1039) (P.3824)
Special Act, providing for zoning in city of Palatka.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 11064 (No. 1042) (P.3836)
Special Act, providing creation of city planning board in Palatka.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 11157 (No. 1135) (P.4322)
Special Act, creating zoning commission in city of Sebring.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 11175 (No. 1153) Secs. I and II, P. 4386.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 11212 (No. 1190)
Special Act, authorizing city of St. Cloud to adopt zoning regulations.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 11307 (No. 1285)
Special Act, authorizing zoning in West Palm Beach, city planning board to act as zoning commission.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 11576.
Special Act, providing for a city planning commission in Key West.

FLORIDA (Continued)

Bradentown	Use	1923
Ft. Lauderdale	Comp.	1926
Ft. Myers	Comp.	1926
Jacksonville	Comp.	1925
Orlando	Comp.	1924-27
St. Augustine	Comp.	1925
Seabreeze	Comp.	1924
Vero Beach	Comp.	1926
West Palm Beach	Comp.	1926

GEORGIA

Laws of 1921, No. 97.
Amendment to charter of city of Atlanta authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1922, No. 402.
Amendment to charter of city of Macon authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1922, No. 520.
Amendment to charter of city of Savannah authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1923, Act No. 448, Secs. 3a-3f.
Amendment to charter of city of Dublin authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1923, Act No. 303, Sec. 34 (8).
Amendment to charter of city of Albany authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1923, Act No. 556, Secs. 1-4.
Amendment to charter of city of College Park authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1923, Act No. 585.
Amendment to charter of city of East Lake authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1923, Act No. 215, Sec. 8.
Amendment to charter of city of Columbus. (Contains zoning provisions re advisory capacity Board of City Planning as to three-mile extraterritorial limits of city.)
Laws of 1923, No. 332, Sec. 28.
Amendment to charter of city of Valdosta authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1924, Act No. 331.
Amendment to charter of city of Albany authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1924, Act No. 342.
Amendment to charter of city of Manchester authorizes zoning.

GEORGIA (Continued)

Laws of 1925, Act No. 97.
Amendment to charter of the city of Monroe authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1925, Act No. 145.
Amendment to charter of city of Waycross, creating Park, Tree and Zoning Commission, authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1925, Act No. 146.
Amendment to charter of city of Waycross, authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1925, Act No. 191.
Amendment to charter of city of Columbus, authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1925, Act No. 280.
Applies to counties having "not less than 200,000 inhabitants." Authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1925, Act No. 284, Sec. 12.
Amendment to charter of city of East Point authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1925, Act. No. 298, Sec. 75.
Amendment to charter of city of Macon authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1925, Act No. 320.
Amendment to charter of city of Cairo authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1925, Act No. 326.
Amendment to charter of city of Augusta authorizes zoning.

Atlanta	Comp.	1922
Savannah	Comp.	1925

IDAHO

Laws of 1925, Chapter 174.
Applies to "cities of the first class."
Laws of 1927, Chapter 14.
Amending laws of 1925, Chapter 174.
Applies to "second class cities."

ILLINOIS

Laws of 1921, H. B. No. 184.
Applies to "each city, village and incorporated town."
Laws of 1923, H. B. No. 478. An amendment to Laws of 1921, H.B. No. 184, providing for board of appeals, protests and prevention of violation.

ILLINOIS (Continued)

Laws of 1925, S. B. No. 213.
An amendment to laws of 1921, H. B. No. 184.
Applies to "each city, village and incorporated town."

Aurora	Comp.	1923-26
Barrington	Comp.	1926
Batavia	Use	1924
Berwyn	Comp.	1923
Blue Island	Comp.	1926
Carbondale	Use	1922
Champaign	Comp.	1926
Chicago	Comp.	1923
Cicero	Comp.	1923
Clarendon Hills		1926
Crystal Lake	Comp.	1927
Decatur	Comp.	1922
Deerfield	Comp.	1924
De Kalb	Comp.	1926
Des Plaines	Use and Area	1923
Downers Grove	Comp.	1923
Elmhurst	Comp.	1924
Evanston	Comp.	1921-27
Freeport	Comp.	1926
Flossmoor	Comp.	1925
Glencoe	Comp.	1921
Glen Ellyn	Comp.	1923
Glenview	Comp.	1924
Harvey		1926
Highland Park	Comp.	1922
Hinsdale	Comp.	1923
Homewood	Comp.	1926
Jacksonville		1924
Kenilworth	Comp.	1923
La Grange	Comp.	1923
La Grange Park	Comp.	1925
Lake Bluff	Comp.	1922-23
Lake Forest	Comp.	1923
Libertyville	Comp.	1925
Lombard	Comp.	1924
Lyons	Comp.	1924
Maywood	Comp.	1922
Melrose Park	Comp.	1924
Mount Prospect	Comp.	1923
Mundelein	Comp.	1925
Naperville	Comp.	1924
Northbrook	Comp.	1926
Oak Park	Comp.	1921-23
Palatine	Comp.	1926
Palos Park	Comp.	1924
Park Ridge	Use and Area	1922

ILLINOIS (Continued)

River Forest	Comp.	1922
Riverside	Comp.	1922
Rockford	Comp.	1923
Springfield	Comp.	1924
Villa Park	Comp.	1923
Waukegan	Comp.	1924
Western Springs	Comp.	1923
Wheaton	Comp.	1923
Wilmette	Comp.	1922
Winnetka	Comp.	1922-24

INDIANA

Laws of 1921, Chapter 225.
Applies to "each city."
Laws of 1925, Chapter 125.
Amendment to Laws of 1921, Chapter 225.

Anderson	Comp.	1923
Elkhart	Comp.	1925
Evansville	Comp.	1925
Gary	Comp.	1925
Highland	Comp.	1926
Indianapolis	Comp.	1922
Kokomo	Comp.	1925
Michigan City	Comp.	1926
Mishawaka	Comp.	1925
Muncie	Comp.	1923
Richmond	Comp.	1923
South Bend	Comp.	1923
Terre Haute	Comp.	1925
Valparaiso	Comp.	1925
West Lafayette	Comp.	1927

IOWA

Laws of 1917, Chapter 138.
Applies to "cities of the first class, including cities under commission form of government and cities under special charter."
Laws of 1923, Chapter 134 (Code of Iowa, 1924, Chapter 324. Secs. 6452-6473).
Applies to "any city or town."

IOWA (Continued)

Ames	Comp.	1925
Cedar Rapids	Comp.	1925
Clinton	Use	1926
Council Bluffs	Comp.	1927
Davenport	Comp.	1925
Des Moines	Comp.	1926
Iowa City	Use and Area	1925
Red Oak	Use and Area	1925
Waterloo	Use	1924

KANSAS

Laws of 1921, Chapter 100.
Applies to "cities of the first class having population exceeding 20,000."
Laws of 1925, Chapter 100.
Superseding R.S. 1923, Sec. 13-1101.
Applies to cities of the first and second class.
Laws of 1927, Chapter 110.
Amending Sec. 1 of Chapter 100, Laws of 1925.
Applies to third class cities. Authorizes zoning.

Hutchinson	Comp.	1921
Kansas City	Comp.	1924
Manhattan	Use	1925
Salina	Use and Area	1925
Topeka	Comp.	1923-25
Wichita	Use and Area	1922

KENTUCKY

Laws of 1922, Chapter 99, City Planning Law authorizes zoning. Applies to cities of Lexington, Covington, Newport and Paducah.
Laws of 1924, Chapter 87. City Planning Law authorizes zoning. Applies to the city of Louisville.

Lexington	Use	1927

LOUISIANA

Laws of 1918, Act No. 27.
Applies to "cities of over 50,000 inhabitants."
Constitution of 1921, Article 14, Sec. 29.
Applies to "all municipalities."
Laws of 1924, Act No. 118.
Applies to "cities of more than 25,000 population."
Laws of 1926, Act No. 240.
Applies to all incorporated cities, towns and villages.

Shreveport	Comp.	1925

MAINE

Public Laws of 1925, Chapter 209.
Applies to "cities of over 35,000 inhabitants and village corporations."
Public Laws of 1927, Chapter 172. (Amending Chapter 209 P.L. 1925).
Applies to "cities, towns and villages."

Portland	Comp.	1926

MARYLAND

Laws of 1924, Chapter 103.
Applies to Takoma Park.
Laws of 1924, Chapter 560.
Applies to Cumberland.
Laws of 1927, Chapter 705
Applies to cities and incorporated towns containing more than 10,000 inhabitants.
Authorizes zoning.

Baltimore	Comp.	1923
	Interim - Use	1925-26

MASSACHUSETTS

Acts of 1898, Chapter 452.
Acts of 1904, Chapter 333.
Acts of 1905, Chapter 383.
Acts of 1907, Chapter 416.
Acts of 1912, Chapter 582.
Acts of 1914, Chapter 786.
Acts of 1915, Chapter 333.
Acts of 1919, Chapter 156.
General Laws of 1920, Chapter 40, Secs. 25-30 incl.
Applies to "a city or town."
General Laws of 1920, Chapter 143, Sec. 3.
Acts of 1922, Chapter 40.
Acts of 1923, Chapter 462, Sec. 11.
Applies to height regulations in the city of Boston.
Constitution of 1922, Article LX.
Acts of 1924, Chapter 133.
Amendment to Chapter 40, General Laws, relates to appeals under zoning regulations.
Acts of 1924, Chapter 488.
Applies to city of Boston (comp. zoning ordinance for Boston.)
Acts of 1925, Chapter 116.
Amendment to Sec. 25 of Chapter 40, General Laws. Applies to use of structures and premises in specified districts.
Acts of 1925, Chapter 130.
Applies to building line regulations in cities and towns.
Acts of 1925, Chapter 219.
Applies to the city of Boston.
Acts of 1926, Chapter 350, Secs. 1 - 2.
Applies to height regulations in the city of Boston.
Acts of 1926, Chapters 59 and 216. (Amending Chapter 40, General Laws 1922, Sec. 30.)
Acts of 1927, Chapter 247. (Amending Chapter 40, General Laws 1922, Sec. 30A).
Applies to permits applied for after a zoning ordinance or an amendment thereto has been initiated.
Acts of 1927, Chapter 220. (Amending Boston zoning law.)

Andover	Interim	1927
Arlington	Comp.	1924
Belmont	Comp.	1925
Boston	Comp.	1904-23-24
Brockton	Comp.	1920

MASSACHUSETTS (Continued)

Brookline	Comp.	1922-24
Cambridge	Comp.	1924
Chelsea	Use	1924
Dedham	Use	1924
Everett	Comp.	1926
Fairhaven	Comp.	1926
Falmouth	Comp.	1926
Gloucester	Interim	1926
Haverhill	Comp.	1925
Holyoke	Use	1923
Hudson	Use	1927
Lexington	Comp.	1924
Longmeadow	Comp.	1922
Lowell	Comp.	1922-26
Lynn	Comp.	1924-25-26
Malden	Comp.	1923-26
Marblehead	Interim	1927
Marlborough	Interim	1927
Medford	Comp.	1925
Melrose	Comp.	1924
Milton	Use and Area	1922-26
Needham	Comp.	1925
New Bedford	Comp.	1925
Newburyport	Interim	1925
Newton	Comp.	1922-25
North Adams	Comp.	1922-25
Norwood	Comp.	1927
Oak Bluffs	Interim	1927
Paxton	Use	1924
Petersham	Interim	1927
Reading	Comp.	1926
Revere	Use (Interim)	1925
Salem	Use	1925
Somerville	Comp.	1925
Springfield	Comp.	1921-22-23-24
Stoneham	Comp.	1925
Swampscott	Use	1924
Taunton	Use (Interim)	1925
Wakefield	Comp.	1925
Walpole	Comp.	1925
Waltham	Comp.	1925
Watertown	Comp	1926
Wellesley	Use	1925
Westfield	Use (Interim)	1922
West Springfield	Comp.	1923
Winchester	Use and Height	1924
Winthrop	Use	1922
Woburn	Comp.	1925
Worcester	Use	1923-24

MICHIGAN

Public Acts 1921, No. 207.
Applies to "cities and villages."
Amendment to charter of the city of Saginaw authorizes zoning.

Ann Arbor	Comp.	1923
Battle Creek	Comp.	1924
Dearborn	Use	1922
E. Grand Rapids	Comp.	1922-24
Flint	Comp.	1926
Grand Haven	Comp.	1923
Grand Rapids	Comp.	1923
Grandville	Use	1922
Grosse Pointe Shores	Comp.	1924
Holland	Comp.	1926
Ironwood	Interim	1925
Jackson	Comp.	1923
Kalamazoo	Use	1925
Lansing	Comp.	1927
Midland	Comp.	1925
Muskegon	Comp.	1925
Owosso	Comp.	1925
Sturgis	Use	1927
Ypsilanti	Comp.	1925

MINNESOTA

Laws of 1913, Chapter 98.
Establishes restricted residence districts under the police power.
Applies to cities of 50,000 inhabitants and over (cities of the first class).
Laws of 1913, Chapter 420.
Establishes restricted residence districts and industrial districts and applies to cities of 50,000 inhabitants and over that do not have home-rule charters (applies to Minneapolis only.)
Laws of 1915, Chapter 128.
Establishes restricted residence districts by right of eminent domain. Applies to cities of the first class (50,000 inhabitants and over).
Laws of 1919, Chapter 292.
Creating a City Planning Department for the city of Minneapolis.

MINNESOTA (Continued)

Laws of 1919, Chapter 297.
An amendment to Chapter 128, Laws of 1915, relative to benefits and damages assessed.
Laws of 1921, Chapter 217.
Regulates location, size and use of buildings in cities having 50,000 inhabitants or over (cities of the first class). (Comprehensive Zoning Enabling Act.)
Laws of 1923, Chapter 133.
An amendment to Chapter 128, Laws of 1915, to vacate and remove restrictions.
Laws of 1923, Chapter 364.
An amendment to Chapter 217, Laws of 1921 (Comprehensive Zoning Enabling Act).
Laws of 1925, Chapter 284.
An amendment to Laws of 1921, Chapter 217, amended by Laws of 1923, Chapter 364.

Duluth	Comp.	1925
Minneapolis	Comp.	1920-24
St. Paul	Comp.	1922

MISSISSIPPI

General Laws of 1924, Chapter 195.
Applies to "municipalities of over 5,000 inhabitants."
General Laws of 1926, Chapter 308 (H.B. No.696)
Amending Chapter 195, General Laws of 1924.

MISSOURI

Laws of 1921, S. B. 61, Secs. 1-8.
Applies to "cities or towns having a population of 50,000 or less."
Laws of 1921, S. B. 332, Secs. 1-9.
Applies to "cities having a population of not less than 200,000 nor more than 600,000."
Laws of 1925, No. 307. (H.B. No. 295, amended by S. Amendment No. 1) Repealing Laws of 1921, at pages 178 and 481 (S.B. 332 and S.B. 61)
Applies to "all incorporated cities, towns and villages in counties having not less than 50,000 population."

MISSOURI (Continued)

Laws of 1927, No. ___ (Amending Laws of 1925)
Permitting all municipalities in counties having more than 15,000 inhabitants to zone.

Kansas City	Comp.	1923
Richmond Heights	Comp.	1922
St. Louis	Comp.	1926
University City	Comp.	1922
Webster Groves	Comp.	1923

NEBRASKA

Laws of 1921, Chapter 116, Article III, Secs. 64-67. Applies to "cities of the metropolitan class."
Laws of 1927, Chapter ___.
Applies to cities of the first class of over 5,000 and less than 25,000 inhabitants, all cities of the second class, and villages.

Fremont	Use and Area	1925
Lincoln	Use and Height	1926
Omaha	Comp.	1920-24
Scottsbluff	Interim	1926

NEVADA

Laws of 1923, Chapter 125.
Applies to "all cities and incorporated towns."

Reno	Use	1924

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Laws of 1925, Chapter 92.
Applies to "municipalities."

Keene	Comp.	1926
Manchester	Comp.	1927

NEW JERSEY

Laws of 1917, Chapter 54.
Applies to "cities of the first class."
Laws of 1918, Chapter 146.
Applies to "cities of the first and second class."
Laws of 1920, Chapter 240.
Applies to "each and every municipality."
Laws of 1921, Chapter 82.
Applies to "each and every municipality."
Laws of 1921, Chapter 276.
Applies to "cities of the third and fourth class."
Laws of 1922, Chapter 162.
Applies to "each and every municipality."
Laws of 1922, Chapter 234.
Applies to "each and every municipality."
Laws of 1922, Chapter 279.
Applies to "boroughs."
Laws of 1924, Chapter 146.
Applies to "each and every municipality."
Laws of 1926, Chapter 315.
Supplement to Chapter 146, Laws of 1924.
Relates to duties of Board of Adjustment.
Laws of 1927, Chapter 203.
Supplement to Chapter 315, Laws of 1926.
Relates to duties of Board of Adjustment.

Audubon	Comp.	1924
Beachwood	Use	1921
Belleville	Use	1923
Bloomfield	Use	1923
Bogota	Comp.	1921
Boonton	Comp.	1922
Bound Brook	Comp.	1921
Bradley Beach	Use	1923
Caldwell	Comp.	1921
Cliffside Park	Comp.	1920
Clifton	Use	1921
Cranford Twp.	Comp.	1922
Cresskill	Use	1922
Deal	Comp.	1923
Demarest	Use	1922
Dunellen	Comp.	1923-24
East Orange	Comp.	1921-25
Elizabeth	Comp.	1922-23-24
Englewood	Comp.	1923
Fairview	Use	1921
Fanwood	Use	1924
Fort Lee	Comp.	1921
Freehold	Comp.	1924
Garwood	Comp.	1922
Glen Ridge	Comp.	1921-23

NEW JERSEY (Continued)

Glen Rock	Comp.	1923-24
Hackensack	Comp.	1922
Haworth	Use	1921
Hawthorne	Use	1922
Highland Park	Comp.	1923-24
Hightstown	Use	1922
Hillside	Comp.	1922
Hoboken	Comp.	1922
Ho-Ho-Kus	Comp.	1923
Irvington	Comp.	1922
Jersey City	Comp.	1922
Kearny	Comp.	1922
Lakewood	Comp	1923
Leonia	Use	1921
Linden	Use and Height	1921
Long Branch	Use	1921
Lyndhurst Twp.	Use	1922
Madison	Comp.	1922
Maplewood	Use	1921
Maywood	Use and Area	1922
Merchantville	Use	1923
Metuchen	Use	1925
Milburn	Comp.	1923
Montclair	Comp.	1921-24
Newark	Comp.	1920
New Brunswick	Comp.	1924
North Plainfield	Comp.	1923
Nutley	Comp.	1922
Orange	Comp.	1922
Passaic	Comp.	1922-24
Paterson	Comp.	1921-24
Plainfield	Comp.	1923-24
*Rahway	Use	1920-21
Pompton Lakes	Use	1923
Ridgefield Park	Comp.	1922-24
Ridgewood	Comp.	1923-24
Roselle	Comp.	1922
Roselle Park	Comp.	1921-24
Rutherford	Comp.	1922
Sea Girt	Use	1920
South Orange Twp.	Comp.	1922
Summit	Comp.	1923
Tenafly	Use and Area	1922
Totowa	Use	1922
Verona	Use	1922
Weehawken Twp.		1923
Westfield	Comp.	1921
West Hoboken	Comp.	1922
West Orange	Comp.	1921
West New York	Comp.	1922

*Height and area regulations in residence districts adopted in 1921.

NEW MEXICO

Laws of 1927, Chapter 27.
Authorizes cities to zone.

NEW YORK

Laws of 1914, Chapter 470.
Amendment to charter of city of New York.
Secs. 242a-242b. Authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1916, Chapter 497.
Amendment to charter of city of New York.
Secs. 242a-242b.
Provides for changing the zoning regulations.
Laws of 1917, Vol. 2, Chapter 483.
Applies to "any city except a city of the first class."
Laws of 1917, Chapter 505.
Amendment to the charter of city of Rochester.
Authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1920, Chapter 743.
Applies to "any city except a city of the first class."
Laws of 1921, Vol. 2, Chapter 464.
Applies to "villages."
Laws of 1922, Chapter 332.
Applies to "towns."
Laws of 1923, Chapter 550.
Applies to towns.
Laws of 1923, Chapter 564.
Amending laws of 1909.
Applies to "villages."
Laws of 1923.
Amendment to the charter of city of Buffalo, relative to zoning regulations.
Amendment to charter of city of Syracuse.
Authorizes zoning.
Laws of 1924, Chapter 295.
Amending charter of Greater New York, authorizing enforcement of building district regulations of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment.
Laws of 1924, Chapter 492.
Amending the laws of 1909. Applies to "villages."
Laws of 1925, Chapter 394.
Amendment to General City Law. Authorizes regulation of density of population in given areas.
Laws of 1926, Chapter 714.
Applies to towns.

NEW YORK (Continued)

Laws of 1926, Chapter 719.
Amending the laws of 1924, Chapter 492.
Applies to "villages "
Laws of 1927, Chapter 504.
Amendment to General City Laws

Albany	Comp.	1924-26
Amsterdam	Comp.	1926
Asharoken	Comp.	1927
Auburn	Use	1925
Baldwinsville	Use and Height	1925
Batavia	Comp.	1926
Binghamton	Comp.	1922
Brightwaters	Comp.	1922
Bronxville	Comp.	1922-23
Buffalo	Comp.	1922-23-25
Cayuga Heights	Use	1925
Cedarhurst	Comp.	1925
Dansville	Use and Area	1927
Dobbs Ferry	Comp.	1924
Eastchester Town	Use	1923
East Rockaway	Use and Area	1924
Elmsford	Comp.	1924
Endicott	Use and Area	1922
Farmingdale	Use	1922
Floral Park	Use	1922
Freeport	Comp.	1924
Fulton	Comp.	1922
Garden City	Comp.	1922-24
Glen Cove		1926
Glens Falls	Use	1925
Gloversville	Comp.	1921
Great Neck	Use	1922
Greenburgh	Comp.	1924
Hamburg	Comp.	1927
Harrison	Comp.	1923
Hastings	Comp.	1923
Hempstead	Comp.	1922
Hudson		1927
Irvington	Use	1922-23
Ithaca	Comp.	1923
Jamestown	Use	1922-23-24
Kenmore	Use	1924
Kingston	Use	1925
Larchmont	Comp.	1921
La Salle	Comp.	1924
Lawrence	Comp.	1923
Long Beach	Use	1922
Lowville	Use	1925

NEW YORK (Continued)

Lynbrook	Comp.	1923-24-26
Malone	Use	1927
Mamaroneck	Comp.	1925
Mamaroneck Town	Comp.	1922
Mineola	Use	1921
Mount Pleasant	Comp.	1927
Mount Vernon	Comp.	1922
Newburgh	Comp.	1923
New Rochelle	Comp.	1921-25
New York	Comp.	1916-24
Niagara Falls	Comp.	1920
North Pelham	Comp.	1921
North Tarrytown	Use and Area	1926
Oneida	Use	1924
Ossining	Use	1921
Owego	Use	1926
Patchogue	Comp.	1925
Pelham	Use	1924
Pelham Manor	Use	1921-22-24
Penn Yan	Use	1925
Perry	Use	1926
Plandome	Comp.	1924
Pleasantville	Comp.	1927
Port Chester	Comp.	1922
Pottsdam	Use and Area	1925
Rochester	Use	1919-20
Rockville Center	Comp.	1924
Rome	Use	1924
Rye	Comp.	1923
Saltaire	Comp.	1922
Sands Point	Use	1922
Saratoga Springs	Use	1923-24
Scarsdale	Comp.	1922
Schenectady	Comp.	1927
Seneca Falls	Use	1925
Skaneateles	Use and Area	1926
Spring Valley	Use	1926
Syracuse	Use	1922
Tarrytown	Use	1923
Ticonderoga	Comp.	1926
Troy	Comp.	1923
Tuckahoe	Comp.	1923
*Union Corners	Use	1923
Utica	Comp.	1923-24
Watertown	Use	1922
*Waverly	Use	1923
White Plains	Comp.	1920-27
Williston Park	Comp.	1927
*Wilmont	Use	1923
Yonkers	Comp.	1920

*These three places are part of Eastchester Town to which one zoning ordinance applies.

NORTH CAROLINA

Laws of 1921, Chapters 169 and 246, P. L. SS. City planning laws authorizing zoning.
Apply to any city or town in the counties of Buncombe, New Hanover and Wake.
Laws of 1923, Chapter 250.
Applies to "cities and incorporated towns."
Laws of 1925, Chapter 246.
Amendment to Chapter 169, P. L. SS 1921
Applies to "any city or town in the county of Wayne."
Laws of 1927, Chapter 90.
Amending Sec. 2776 (u) of the Consolidated Statutes (Vol. 3) relative to notice of public hearing on proposed changes in zoning ordinances.

Durham	Comp.	1926
Greensboro	Comp.	1926
High Point	Comp.	1926
Raleigh	Comp.	1923
Southern Pines	—	1926

NORTH DAKOTA

Laws of 1923, Chapter 175.
Applies to "all cities having a population in excess of six thousand inhabitants by the Federal Census of 1920, or by any subsequent Federal Census."

Bismarck	Comp.	1924
Fargo	Comp.	1925
Jamestown	Use	1925

OHIO

Laws of 1919, Vol. 108, Part 2, Secs. 4366-7 to 4366-12, incl.
Applies to "any municipality."

Akron	Comp.	1922
Ashtabula	Comp.	1923
Bay Village	Comp.	1922
Bexley	Comp.	1923

OHIO (Continued)

Bratenahl	Comp.	1923
Brooklyn Heights	___	1927
Cincinnati	Comp.	1924
Cleveland Heights	Comp.	1921-22-23-24
Columbus	Comp	1923
Dayton	Comp.	1926
East Cleveland	Comp.	1919-22
Euclid Village	Comp.	1922
Grandview Heights	Comp.	1922-23
Hamilton	Comp.	1926
Idlewood	Comp.	1922
Lakewood	Comp.	1922-24-25
Lima	Use	1924
Lorain	Comp.	1926
Madison	Comp.	1923
Mansfield	Use (Interim)	1920
Marion	Use	1925
Maumee	Comp.	1925
Oakwood	___	1925
Oberlin	Comp.	1927
Toledo	Comp.	1923
Warren	Comp.	1923-25
Willoughby	Use	1921
Worthington	Comp.	1923
Wyoming	Comp.	1925

OKLAHOMA

Laws of 1923, Chapter 178.
Applies to "cities and incorporated villages."

Oklahoma City	Use	1923
Ponca City	Comp.	1927
Tulsa	Comp.	1923

OREGON

General Laws 1919, Chapter 300.
Applies to "any incorporated city or town."

Medford	Comp.	1923
Portland	Comp.	1924
Salem	Use	1926

PENNSYLVANIA

Laws of 1915, Act 175.
Applies to "any city of the first class."
Laws of 1919, Act 270.
Applies to "cities of the second class."
Laws of 1919, Act 274, Section 9.
Applies to "cities of the first class."
Laws of 1921, Act 236.
Applies to "cities of the second class."
Laws of 1923, Act 33.
Applies to "cities of the third class."
Laws of 1923, Act 93.
A supplement to laws of 1919, Act. 270, providing for a board of appeals.
Laws of 1923, Act 382.
Applies to "boroughs and townships of the first class."
Laws of 1925, Act 200.
Amending P. L. 54, Laws of 1923. Provides for Boards of Appeal, penalties and enforcement.
Laws of 1927, Act 69. Supplements and supersedes Acts 270 of 1919; 236 of 1921, and 93 of 1923. Applies to "cities of the second class." (Pittsburgh)

Aldan	Use	1925
Avalon	Comp.	1926
Beaver	Use	1925-27
Bellevue	Comp.	1925
Ben Avon	Comp.	1924
Bethlehem	Comp.	1926
Chester	Use	1925
Connellsville	Use	1924
Crafton	Comp.	1926
Edgewood	Comp.	1925
Edgeworth	Use	1925
Emsworth	Comp.	1925
Farrell	Use	1927
Haverford Twp.	Comp.	1925
Ingram	Comp	1925
Johnstown	Comp.	1926
Landsdowne	Use and Area	1926
Monaca	Comp.	1925
Lower Merion Twp.	Comp.	1927
Monessen	Comp.	1925
Narberth	Comp.	1924-25
New Castle	Comp.	1925
Oil City	Interim	1924
Osborne	Use and Area	1927
Pittsburgh	Comp	1923

PENNSYLVANIA (Continued)

Prospect Park	Comp.	1925
Scranton	Comp.	1924
Sewickley	Use	1925
State College	Comp.	1927
Swissvale	Use and Area	1925
Westview	Comp	1925
Wyomissing	Comp.	1925

RHODE ISLAND

Acts of 1921, Chapter 2069.
Applies to "any city."
Acts of 1923, Chapter 2315.
An amendment to Acts of 1921, Chapter 2069.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 643.
Amendment to Chapter 57, General Laws, as amended by Chapter 430 of the Revised Public Laws 1923.
Applies to all cities and towns.
Laws of 1925, Chapter 746, Section 2.
Amendment to Chapter 2299, Public Laws of 1922, and of Chapter 538 of the Revised Public Laws of 1923.
Applies to the town of Westerly.

Barrington	Comp.	1926
Cranston	Comp.	1924
East Providence	Comp.	1926
Newport	Use	1922
North Smithfield	Comp.	1926
Pawtucket	Interim	1926
Providence	Comp.	1923
Westerly	Comp.	1925
Woonsocket	Comp	1923

SOUTH CAROLINA

Acts of 1921, No. 417
Park commission law authorizing zoning.
Applies to Spartanburg.
Acts of 1924, No. 642.
Applies to "cities and towns."

Columbia	Comp.	1924

SOUTH DAKOTA

Laws of 1927, H. B. No. 53.
Applies to municipalities.

TENNESSEE

Private Acts of 1921, Chapter 165.
Applies to "all municipalities having a population in excess of 160,000 inhabitants."
Private Acts of 1925, Chapters 93, 248 and 298, amending Private Acts of 1923, Chapter 412.
Charter amendment for city of Knoxville.
Authorizes zoning.
Private Acts of 1925, Chapter 209.
Charter amendment for city of Nashville.
Authorizes zoning.
General and Special Laws of 1927, Chapter 549. (H.B. No. 864)
Applies to Jackson City. Authorizes zoning.

Chattanooga	Comp.	1927
Memphis	Comp.	1922

TEXAS

Acts of 1921, Chapter 87.
Applies to "cities or towns having more than 5,000 inhabitants."
Acts of 1922.
Amendment to the charter of city of Houston.
Authorizes zoning.
General and Special Laws of 1927, Chapter 283.
Applies to "cities and incorporated villages."
Authorizes zoning.

UTAH

Laws of 1925, Chapter 119.
Applies to "cities."

Provo City	Comp.	1926
Salt Lake City	Use	1920

VIRGINIA

Laws of 1922, Chapter 43.
Applies to "any city."
Laws of 1926, Chapter 197, Repealing Laws of 1922, Chapter 43.
Applies to "cities and towns."
Laws of 1927, S. B. No. 6.
Applies to Arlington County. Authorizes zoning.

Lynchburg	(Interim)	1926
Norfolk	Comp.	1924
Petersburg	(Interim)	1922
Richmond	Comp.	1922-23-27
Suffolk	Use	1924

WASHINGTON

(Cities of the first class are zoned under general home-rule provisions of the State Constitution, which have been construed to permit it.)

(Remington & Ballinger's) General Statutes, Sec. 7507.

Olympia	Use and Area	1923
Seattle	Comp.	1923
Tacoma	Use	1919

WEST VIRGINIA

Laws of 1927, S. B. No. 261.
Amendment to charter, city of Charleston.
Authorizes zoning.

WISCONSIN

Laws of 1913, Chapter 457.
Provides for use districts in "cities in counties having a population of 150,000 or more."
Laws of 1913, Chapter 743.
Provides for use districts in "cities of 25,000 inhabitants or more."
Laws of 1917, Chapter 404 (Revised Statutes 1919, Chapter 64cc, Sections 959-17n to 959-17p. incl.)
Applies to "every city."

WISCONSIN (Continued)

Laws of 1917, Chapter 507 (Revised Statutes 1919, 61.35) Applies to "any village in any county having a population of 250,000 or more."
Laws of 1921, Chapter 242, Sections 226,227. Revised and renumbered Sec. 62.23-(5) to 62.23-(6). Applies to "every city."
Laws of 1923, Chapter 388.
Applies to "any county "
Laws of 1923, Chapter 424.
Applies to the heights of buildings in cities of the first class.
Laws of 1927, Chapter 246.
Amends Par. (d) of subsection (5) of Sec. 62.23.
Laws of 1927, Chapter 369.
Amends Sec. 61.35 of the Statutes, to make the provisions of Sec. 62.23 apply to villages.
Laws of 1927, Chapter 375.
Relates to zoning by counties, outside of city and village limits.
Laws of 1927, Chapter 408.
Relates to Board of Adjustment in enforcing county zoning ordinances.

Appleton	Comp.	1923
Beloit	Comp.	1924
Cudahy	Use	1919
Eau Claire	Comp.	1923
Green Bay	Comp.	1925
Janesville	Comp.	1922-23
Kenosha	Comp	1924
Kenosha County	Comp.	1926
La Crosse	Use	1921
Madison	Comp.	1922
Milwaukee	Comp.	1920-24
Neenah	Use	1915
Oconomowoc	Comp	1926
Oshkosh	Comp.	1926
Racine	Use	1916
Sheboygan	Comp.	1926
Shorewood	Use	1919
Sturgeon Bay	Comp.	1927
Two Rivers	Use and Area	1926
Waukesha	Comp.	1923
Wausau	Comp.	1924
Wauwatosa	Comp.	1921
West Allis	Use	1925

WYOMING

Acts of 1923, Chapter 78.
Applies to "incorporated cities, towns and villages "
