

'ZONING' LAWS ARE DENOUNCED

*Court to be Asked to Pass on
Constitutionality.*

*Realty Board Withdraws Its
Plea for Extension.*

*Hot Fight Waged Over Effort
to Bar Film Studio.*

Strong opposition of property owners throughout the city to the so-called "zoning" ordinances, which went into effect last May setting aside sections of the city inside of which residences alone may be built and preventing the establishment there of stores to compete with concerns already doing business within the areas, crystallized yesterday at the City Hall when the Realty Board, because of protests of prominent men, withdrew a proposed amendment which would have added a large section to the so-called "residence" district.

Notice was also given by Attorney Milton M. Cohen of the firm of Dominguez, Dehm and Cohen, representing Wilshire district property owners, that he will start an action in the courts to have the "zoning" ordinances set aside as unconstitutional.

CREATES MONOPOLY.

Mr. Cohen had previously filed a communication with the Council pointing out that the zoning ordinance as it now stands creates a monopoly in favor of those businesses already established within "residence" districts before March 1, 1920. Accepting this contention as sound, the Council yesterday, in an effort to make this part of the ordinance legal, at the suggestion of the City Attorney's office, amended the zoning ordinance to give all businesses now inside of "residence" districts until March 1, 1925, to move. Mr. Cohen said he is confident that long before that date the ordinance will have been declared illegal.

City Attorney Burnell said last evening that while the ordinance was drawn and presented to the Council at its order, the body was given warning at that time by him that it was doubtful if the ordinance would be sustained in the courts, and if it were, it would be an extension of the powers of the city not recognized up to this time, as regarding the control of legitimate businesses.

AUTOMATICALLY KILLED.

The proposition suggested by the governors of the Realty Board, was to set aside the entire area from First to Twelfth streets and from Vermont to the city limits as a "residence" district, inside of which it would be legal to build only single dwellings, one house to each lot. A large delegation appeared before the Public Welfare Committee of the City Council yesterday afternoon prepared to protest,

but as a communication had been received earlier in the day from President O. A. Vickrey of the Realty Board, withdrawing the communication, the plan was automatically killed.

The committee next took up a phase of the "zoning" method under which the permission of the City Council is needed to build a motion picture studio in the district bounded by First, Virgil, Juanita and Temple streets. This district is not now inside of a motion picture "zone," and a special "zone" must be created if a studio, which is to cost \$300,000, is to be permitted.

President Edward S. Curtis, the noted Indian photographer and artist, and president of the Cosmo-art Picture Company, which plans to build the studio, appeared before the committee and said in part:

"We propose to beautify this swamp. Nine-tenths of the people living and owning property in the immediate vicinity of this tract welcome our coming as the means of getting rid of a menace to their neighborhood, and they have signed our petition. Most of the land we shall make into a beautiful motion picture park where we shall do our work."

TO WIPE OUT DISGRACE.

Attorney John N. Metcalf, a resident of the neighborhood, representing the picture company, said, "I live in the district and I shall be glad to see this company wipe out that tract which is a disgrace to the city. No real opposition has developed from people actually in the adjacent neighborhood. And shall

(Continued on Fourteenth Page.)

CITY ZONE LAW IS CONDEMNED.

(Continued from First Page.)

Los Angeles take the stand that a motion-picture studio in itself is a menace to a neighborhood and treat it as a pariah? We are already turning studio owners to Culver City and other places outside of Los Angeles instead of welcoming this industry which brings millions of dollars here. Los Angeles is known as the greatest motion-picture producing center in the country, and we are now forcing the studios away."

Others who spoke in favor of the petition of the film company being granted were Attorney E. R. Young, former Councilman True, J. Goldberg, Mrs. F. J. Raibble, J. O. Chaney and A. S. Graff. The opposition was led by W. H. Cline, who presented a resolution adopted by the Board of Education opposing the building of the studio because of the proximity of the Virgil-street school. Mrs. C. C. Leslie, Frank F. Robb and N. J. Skinner.

The Council chamber was filled with men and women interested in the controversy and at times the hearing grew stormy with opponents standing on their feet and talking loudly to each other while Chairman Workman rapped on the table and said, "One at a time."

The committee took the matter under advisement pending the checking up by the City Engineer of a map submitted by Attorney Metcalf on behalf of the company showing that 90 per cent of the owners of property in the neighborhood had signed the petition asking for the granting of the corporation's request.