the bulk of the bill is footed by owners of improved property. Mr. Clark's study revealed that the average tax for land only on an improved lot was 2.7 times the average tax on a vacant lot, or on a land basis only, owners of improved lots paid 73.2% of the taxes while owning only 57.5% of the lots. The total assessed valuation of improved lots represented 81.6% of the valuation of all lots — therefore, owners of improved property paid virtually all the cost, maintenance and upkeep of streets, although the actual cost and maintenance was the same as between improved and vacant lots.

(3) Hand in hand with the costs of maintenance of streets and appurtenances goes the increased cost of police and fire protection as well as the increased cost of utility servicing. These increased costs are unnecessary premiums that must be borne by owners of improved lots in order to receive required services.

There are only two solutions to this problem of over-subdivision, neither of which is likely to come to pass in Metropolitan Los Angeles under present conditions. First, marginal or uneconomic subdivisions can be reverted to acreage. Extensive use of this excellent medium is highly improbable since it requires owners of this marginal property to give up all interest and equity they might have in such land without recompense in any form; second, some strong agency could be established to exercise control and restrictions in one uniform manner until the community has grown up to its proper supply. This step is also unlikely because of the bitter opposition of local realtors who cannot or will not profit by past experience and who all too apparently are more interested in immediate personal gain than in the economic welfare of the community.

d. Somewhat analogous to the woeful situation which has been created by over-subdivision is the fourth and highly detrimental characteristic of this real estate market, namely, a lack of well-planned and well-enforced zoning restrictions. This is not to be considered as a lack of zoning restrictions. On the contrary, Los Angeles in common with most large metropolitan communities throughout the country, but if possible to an even greater degree, is "over-zoned".

Last available figures for the City of Los Angeles reveal that 59% of the 450.75 square miles in the city are zoned and of the remaining unzoned area, all but 3.2 miles are protected by the interim residence district provisions of the Municipal Code which completely prohibit industrial activities and prohibit business activities in blocks over 50% developed with residential improvements in the areas coming within its purview. It is, therefore, manifest that the city is adequately zoned.

The evils of the present zoning pattern are numerous and merit at least passing attention. They may be summarized as follows:

(1) The zoning plan was not comprehensively organized and laid out with a view to the future requirements of the city before placing it into effect. It represents, rather, a patchwork quilt of ill-conceived if well-intentioned classifications, plus the usual concessions to greed, special privilege and politics which are so inter-woven into the fabric of metropolitan life.

(2) Through this poorly designed zoning plan, areas grouped within the various zone classifications exceed the future needs of those classifications to such an extent that they are ridiculous and are a detriment to the proper neighborhood development of the city. For instance, in one area comprising less than 60% of the total area now zoned, there are approximately 600 miles of frontage zoned exclusively for business use, of which less than 200 miles are actually improved with any type of business structure, either office building or hamburger stand, and much of this 200 miles improved with business structures should never have been utilized for that purpose. One Los Angeles authority has stated that it would require a population of 17½ million persons to adequately support the vast amount of frontage zoned for business. Such a condition is patently unsound and must result in stagnation of the property thus zoned in excess of any possible future demand.