or economic factors. This approach is not sufficient for planning orderly urban development or renewal. For example, neither relocation planning nor the gathering of data that would make it possible are required by the public roads program. Although community renewal and antipoverty planning programs promise to make more detailed and discriminating use of social and economic data than has been typical of urban planning in the past, these programs will not penetrate all-important centers of metropolitan decisionmaking. They will, in fact, be largely limited to central cities or other localized jurisdictions where the worst urban blight and poverty exist. Since problems of health, recreation, relocation, and a host of other economic and social difficulties related to urban growth are not limited to such localities, planning for them should not be limited.

2. The Commission recommends State legislation to restrict zoning authority in metropolitan areas to larger municipalities and to county government and to require that such zoning authority be exercised in a manner to permit a wide range of housing prices within the area covered by each city or county.[32] The Commission also recommends that metropolitan planning agencies prepare plans and ordinances for adoption by individual local governments in the area, providing an appropriately wide range of housing prices.

Many local communities have been criticized for siphoning off lucrative types of development to increase their tax base, while excluding land uses likely to require more local expenditures to support than they would produce in tax revenue. For instance, the California cities of Emeryville, Vernon, Union City, Irwindale, Industry, and Commerce, are classic examples of cities devoted almost entirely to industry. It has been reported that Vernon, where over 70,000 people work but only 236 live, has an assessed valuation of about one-half million dollars per capita, affording a low tax rate for attracting new industry, in order to raise the assessed value and lower the tax rate even more.

The case of Vernon is extreme, but it differs only in degree from the widespread use of fiscal considerations as justification for local government development policies. This practice, known as fiscal zoning, is based primarily on the fact that most local governments depend quite heavily on real estate taxes to finance their programs.

Some other local governments seek to keep governmental costs at a minimum and protect existing rural surroundings by zoning exclusively for expensive homes on large lots. Elaborate relationships between housing costs, family incomes, number of schoolchildren, and other governmental services are figured in as arguments for or against zoning changes. Although zoning provisions requiring that buildings cost a minimum amount have been declared unconstitutional exercises of police power, fiscal reasoning is frequently disguised or not officially recognized as justification for zoning that is actually designed to carry out fiscal policy. The extent to which fiscal zoning is effective in creating or reinforcing socioeconomic disparities has not been statistically tabulated, but fiscal zoning has been documented in many cases and is certainly an important intergovernmental problem.

---

[32] See "County Powers in Relation to Local Planning and Zoning Actions," ACIR *1966 State Legislative Program* (Washington, D.C.: October 1965), pp. 250–262.