

## Dolan vs. City of Tigard

1994 - Extended Nollan's "essential nexus" test to require "rough proportionality" between impact and conditions. Conditions requiring land dedication for pedestrian/bike path is a taking because City didn't show that the dedication would lessen traffic generated by the new development

## Babbitt vs. Sweet Home Chapter of Communities for a great Oregon

1995- Applied the  
Endangered  
Species Act to  
land development

## Tahoe-Sierra Preservation Council Inc. vs. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

2002 - Sanctioned the use of Moratoria. Moratorium is not a takings per se, but should be analyzed under the multi-factor Penn Central test.

## Lucas vs. South Carolina Coastal Council

1992 - Compensation to be paid to a landowner when REGULATIONS deprive them of all economical use of land.

**Nollan vs.  
California  
Coastal  
Commission**

1987-Created the "essential nexus" Takings Test. The town required a conveyance of an easement for beach access as a condition of a building permit for a home. The court found that it was unrelated to the public interest, and was therefore a taking.

**First English  
Evangelical  
Church of  
Glendale vs. Los  
Angeles County**

1987- Compensation for temporary takings is invalidated in Court. Allows damages (as opposed to invalidation) as a remedy for regulatory takings.

**Williamson County  
Regional Planning  
Commission vs.  
Hamilton Bank**

1985 - Defined "Ripeness" in takings cases. Owner must seek all possible relief (variance and condemnation) before going to court for a takings case.

**Southern  
Burlington County  
NAACP vs.  
Township of Mt.  
Laurel**

**1983- Model Fair  
Housing Remedy  
for Exclusionary  
Zoning.**

**Loretto vs.  
Teleprompter  
Manhattan  
CATV Corp.**

1982- Any physical occupation (no matter how small) is a taking. Law required landowners to install cable TV in their apartments was deemed to be a taking.

**Metromedia  
vs. City of  
San Diego**

1981- Extended commercial speech to aesthetic regulations. Restricted both commercial and non-commercial billboards.

**Agins vs.  
City of  
Tiburon**

1980 - Alternative takings test to Penn Central Test. Open space ordinance in California did not constitute a taking.

**Penn Central  
Transportation  
Company vs.  
City of NY**

1978 - Validated Historic Preservation. Found that restrictions on the development of the Grand Central Terminal were not a taking since they could transfer their development rights to other properties.

**Tennessee  
Valley Authority  
vs. Hill**

1978 - (Snail Darter case).  
Upheld the Endangered  
Species Act of 1973 and  
prohibited the completion  
of the Tellico Dam.

**Village of Arlington  
Heights vs.  
Metropolitan  
Housing  
Development Corp.**

1977- Discriminatory  
INTENT is required to  
invalidate zoning actions  
with Racially  
Disproportionate  
impacts.

**Young vs.  
American  
Mini Theaters**

1976 - Opened up  
the possibility to  
regulate  
pornography via  
land use regulations

**Fasano vs. Board  
of County  
Commissioners of  
Washington  
County**

1973- Required  
zoning to be  
consistent with the  
Comprehensive  
Plan

## Just vs. Marinette County

1972 - A landowner has no absolute right to change the natural character of the land so as to use it for a purpose it was not suited for in its natural state and which injures the rights of others.

## Golden vs. Planning Board of Ramapo

1972 - Adequate Public Facilities. Recognized Phased Growth. Sequential and orderly development in conjunction with the needs of the community and its ability to provide public facilities.

## Sierra Club vs. Morton

1972 - Opened up environmental suits to discipline Resource Agencies

## Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. vs. Volpe

1971 - Establishes the "hard look doctrine" for Environmental Impact Review. Also, said that building a federal highway through a public park was not okay if a feasible and prudent alternate route exists.

Cheney vs.  
Village 2 at  
New Hope Inc.

1968-  
Legitimized the  
PUD process.

Berman vs.  
Parker

1954 - Established  
Aesthetics and  
redevelopment as  
VALID PUBLIC  
PURPOSES for  
Eminent Domain

Village of  
Euclid vs.  
Amber Realty  
Company

1926 - Established  
zoning as a valid  
exercise of the  
Police Power

Pennsylvania  
Coal vs.  
Mahon

1922 - 1st time the  
Supreme Court  
says that  
regulation of land  
may be a taking.