

annexation laws made it difficult to annex any but unincorporated areas. These changes made great inroads on the territory available for annexation by central cities.

In the post-World War II population expansion, annexations have again become significant ways of expanding the boundaries of central cities. Recent annexations have been mainly of small areas, however. Annexation has come to be used mostly as a means of resolving the problems arising between the central city and its abutting unincorporated urban fringe, the type of uncontrolled development referred to in the section above on extraterritorial powers. However, there have been some large annexations by large cities. Thus in 1960 Kansas City, Mo., voters approved annexation of 187 square miles, more than doubling that city's size. In 1959 Oklahoma City added 193 square miles to its 88 square miles of territory, and in 1960 added 149 square miles more.²⁰ Major annexations of this type depend upon two conditions: liberal State annexation law, and the sizable and adjacent unincorporated territory.

The use of annexation powers must be considered in connection with two other procedures affecting the orderly development of unincorporated territory in metropolitan areas: extraterritorial regulation and incorporation of new units of government. As noted previously, extraterritorial regulation can be an important step paving the way for sound annexation. It establishes controls over unincorporated territory at the critical formation time in the development of a community, when decisions of great importance for the urban future of the area are made. Controls over new incorporations are necessary to assure that new units of government have the potential for providing adequate urban services, and that further fragmentation of government in the metropolitan area is minimized. Unless such controls are exercised, "defensive incorporations" may be undertaken to avoid annexation or regulation. For example, in St. Louis County, Mo., between 1945 and 1950, 44 new municipalities were incorporated—instigated in a large number of cases by builders who wished to be free of county zoning and building regulations.²¹

Consolidation has been a rarely used reorganization approach. Such use of the method as has been made by the larger cities occurred prior to 1900.²² Even among smaller units, while consolidations are commonly recommended by study groups, they are not often carried out. Examples of the few recent consolidations are Newport News and Warwick, Va., forming the new city of Newport News,²³ the town and village of Bennington, Vt., and the town and village of Springfield, Vt.²⁴

A principal reason for the decline in use of consolidation by the large cities was the movement toward the abolition or restriction of special legislation noted earlier in regard to annexation. The early large-scale consolidations were imposed upon the communities by special legislation, and as suburban communities organized and grew

²⁰ *Municipal Year Book 1961* (Chicago: International City Managers' Association, 1961), pp. 57-58.

²¹ Edward C. Banfield and Morton Grodzins, *Government and Housing in Metropolitan Areas* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958), p. 83.

²² Paul Studenski, *The Government of Metropolitan Areas* (New York: National Municipal League, 1930), pp. 65-155.

²³ *National Civic Review*, XLVI (September, 1957), p. 409.

²⁴ *National Civic Review*, XLVI (July 1957), p. 355.