#3888

To The Ensign Communities of Saltimers Construction. The Construction of the Construct

				ne R -	
				-1x1222	*********
group.	.house.	land	 	•	
<u></u>			 		
			 	et; height	

hereby notition that the coning status of the above described property he re-classified purposed to the

Front and side set backs of building from street lines: front 25 fret; side 15 1 25 feet Property to be posted as prescribed by Zoning Regulations. I, or we, agree to pay expenses of above re-classification, advertising, posting, etc., upon filing of this petition, and further a to be and are to be bound by the zoning regulations and restrictions of Baltimore County adopted pursuant to the Zoning Lav for Baltimore County.

> MISSOURI REALTY INC. melin Molun Address 514 Sf Paul Pl

ORDERED By The Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County, this XXXX .. 20th ay of July 19.56 that the subject matter of this petition be advertised, as required by the "Zoning Law of Baltimore County," in a newspaper of general circulation throughout Baltimore County, that property be posted, and that the public hearing hereon be had in the office of the Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County, in the Reckord Building, in Towson, Baltimore County, on the 20th day of August 19.56 at 11 o'clock A.M

8/20/56 HAM

Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County

OFFICE OF PLANNING

Inter-Office Corresponde

From . O. M. Stirling Jr. August 13, 1956.

To Wilsie H. Adam, Zoning Commissioner side of Diehl Avenue with the west side of Old Harford Road. 9th Distirct.

This property is adjacent to a proposed Geomy funior ligh School site and to the intersection which has been planned between two major highways (Ferring Parkway and the extension of Putty Hill Road). Because of the inportance of these projects and their impact on the Because of the inportance of these projects and their impact on the tension of the property of the Development and Office of Planning have the opportunity to approve the detailed just pair for development of the property.

OMS/gh

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

ZON	ING DEPARTMENT OF BALTIMORE COUNT	Y
	Towson, Maryland	#3888
+4		# 300
District 9	Date of	Posting 8-8-5C
6. 2-1.Be.	Really Ing	
Posted for: Can.		
Petitioner: Mussaure	seally 17mi	1.11. 11.1
Location of property Ben 96	and MIN VS of an decomment of	7. Y. M. M.S. Of
Dukt and ill L	Scally Inc. and I I S fan seenoused A	
Append and a second	of the onder 10 th ast out	May at the end of
Location of Signs: Lettle Zd.	e of the sof slad art, an	
Mulliana and		
Remarks:	0	
Posted by Glorge A	Hummel Date of return :-	8 9.56
Posted by C. Charles	A.L.	

A BILL

3888

AN ACT, to approve Zoning Reclassification No. 3888 , dated November 16, 1956 and to amend the official Zoning Map of Baltimore County, pursuant to Section 532(c) of the Code of Public Local Laws of Baltimore County, 1955

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the County Council of Baltimore County, Maryland, that Zoning Reclassification No. 3888 , dated November 16, 1958, reclassifying the property of Missouri Realty, Inc.

Orom WR-6 Residential" to "Residential Group" be and the same is hereby approved, said property being situate in the

Election District of Baltimore County and sore particularly described as follows:

BENDG all that parcel of land beginning for the same at a point on the West side of an unmaned road and the north side of Dishi Avenue produced westerly, and point of the Charlest and point of the Charlest and point of the Charlest and the Char

SECTION 2. And be it further enacted, that the official Zoning Map of Baltimore County is hereby amended in accordance with the reclassification described in Section 1 hereof, and the Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County is hereby directed and authorized to make said amendment upon the

SECTION 3. And be it further enacted, that this Act shall take effect forty-five days after its enactment.

Deviced by bound bounit July 1,1958

HE: PETITION RR REGLASSIFICATION FROM AN "R-6" Zone to an "R-0" Zone -W-S. Unnamed Road and N.S. Diehl Avo., 9th District - Hisaucri Bealty, Inc., Petitioner

OPINION

This is a petition to reclassify two tracts of land containing in the aggregate 26.5 Acres, from "R-6 Residence" to "Residence Group Residential".

The property is located to the west of Old Harford Road at the end of Diehl Avenue and Williams Avenue which run westerly from Old Harford Road. The subject tract adjoins a group housing zone on the east and a store on yard of the Ehrhardt & May Company. Present plans are that a new boulevard to be known as Perrir & Parkway will be located immediately to the west of the subject property, and the County plans a school ismediately to the west of this new road. There are other tracts zoned for group houses in the immediate area so that this does not present a situation where an exclusive cottage type area will be invaded by group housing.

It is clear that when Perring Parkway is completed it will act as a natural barrier for the protection of the cottage developments lying to the

It has been our policy to discourage additional group housing, but there is a demand for \boldsymbol{x} modest priced homes which group housing makes possible. If this reclassification were an area devoted exclusively to cottage development, and so zoned, we would not grant the reclassification. Since, however, there is another area already zoned for group housing in the immediate vicinity, we think it is reasonable that this property should have a similar classification.

ORDER For the reasons set forth in the aforegoing opinion, it is this 25 day of January, 1957, by the Board of Zoning Appeals of Baltimore County, ORDERED that the reclassification herein from "R-6 Residence" to "Residence Group Residential" be and the same is hereby granted.

IN THE MATTER OF PETITION FOR : RECLASSIFICATION, from an "R-6" Zone to an "R-6" Zone - W.S. : Unnamed Road and N.S Diehl Ave., 9th District - Missouri Realty, Inc. :

WILSIE H. ADAMS CONING COMMISSIONER F BALTIMORE COUNTY

.......... APPEAL

HR. COMMISSIONER:

PLEASE enter an appeal from your decision in the above-designated matter, to the Board of Zoning Appeals for Baltimore County.

Attorneys for Protestants

MP 1 5 56 AM

February 5, 1957

MERITAD of Smalkin, Sessian, Martin & Taylor, Attorneys for protestants, the sun of Fifty (\$50.00) Ballars, being cost of appeal to the Board of Zoning Appeals of Baltimore County I con the decision of the Zoning Commissioner granting the reclassification of property on the west side of an Unnessed Road and North wide of Dichl Avenue, 9th District, Missouri Scalty, Inc., Petitionor.

November 27, 1956

COUPTON

for petitioner, Missouri Realty, Inc., the sum of Thirty-five (835.00) dollars, being cost of petition, advertising and posting property on the West side of an unnamed road and the North side of Dichl Avenue, Winth District of Baltimore County.

RECEIVED of George William Stephens, Jr. and Associates,

Thank you.

\$35.00

01.622-110.00 01.633-825.00

SMALKIN, MESSIAN, MARTIN & TATLOR

88

WILLIAM LEE RANGE, JOHN W. MANGINSKI and VANCE KLOSTER

JOHN V. RECIDENT AND TAXON TO A TOTAL TO A T

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT

FOR BALTIHORE COUNTY

MYSCHLIAMROUS NO. 1705

OPINION

1111111111

This case involves the application for the reseming of 26 arres situate between calcide heed and the this farred hood, southwest of the intersection of the CHG Harford Hood and Satyr Sill Road. The proposed reclassification would permit this tract to be used for group or row houses. The fontay Constantons found there were changes in the character of the midphorehood since the adoption of the oxiginal soning. No client state that changes he referred to but he pointed out that the tract in question adjoins a group house zone, part of which has boun acquired by the Board of Romantion of Raitinova Commy. The Beard of Zoning Appeals rested its decision colady on the fact that there is another area already soon for group housing in the insection vicinity. It is clear that there was no error in the oxiginal soning, and the only change in the area in the smisteness of certain properties that are now seemed for upon housing.

The testinony discloses that there are three tracts in the vicinity smeef for group locating. The northerness contains 13 erres, what a mahemilal portion was conveyed to the Board of Récention of Reltinone County which hopes to construct an elementary school there some day. The testinony is that this twest now has little withing for row houses and it is not being developed (page 21,-dupplemental Transcript). Abother 25 erres parcel, seemed for group houses, is completely presented for public group homes. This is the tract aspects to the subject property mentioned in the Opinion of the Zoning Condesioner. The third parcel consists of 21.7 agree and group homes are now being constructed. However, this tract is separated from the subject property by a 5 are parcel owned by Baltimore City.

48 the present time there are no completed streets limiting the

uses and there is no evidence the: 13 vill ever be used for the erection of

subject property to Old Harford Road. There is a reasonable prospect that in short a years time Hiller Avenue will be constructed westerly from Old Harford Road to a point where it will dead end into the subject property; (Page 7 - Supplemental Transcript). The Court has doubt whether the proposed Hiller Avenue will be adequate to handle the traffic flow but the ques tion is, at least, fairly debateble and the Court will not substitute its judgment for that of the Board. However, the Flat marked as Exhibit 9, and the testimony clearly discloses that all Miller Avenue traffic will feed into the Old Harford Hoad. Mr. Fisher, a witness for the applicant, expressed his opinion that Old Harford Road would be adequate but he adultted he had made no personal study of traffic conditions (page 9-Supplemental Transcript). The clear implication of Mr. Gavrelis' testimony is that Old Harford Road will not be adequate (page 23 - Supplemental Transcript); he did not know whether Old Harford Road was now carrying a capacity load (page 31 - Supplemental Transcript). On the other hand, testimony of the protestant shows clearly that an additional burden of traffic on Old Harford Road would lead to congestion and resulting traffic hazards. The difference in the conclusions reached by this Court and the soning authorities is that the latter assumed the existence of the "New Perring Parkway", which would be an answer to the traffic problem. This assumption is not legally justified. The owner of the subject property testified that the most appropriate use of the property is for group housing, because of accessibility to "Miller Avenue Extended, and adjoining into Perring Parkway" (page 9-Transcript). His opinion also

rusts on the precise that Miller Avenus will connect with Perring Perkemy, when the fact is that the Latter highway may move come into existence. It is a long range plan, a paper streat that maints only in the minds of the planners. Under any view of the oridence the application for resoning in premature.

The Court Further finds that the use of a 21.7 ares treet for the building of group homes is not, in itself, a change in the character of a neighborhood that would justify the reclassification of an editional 26 scree for group heating particularly when the twests are not immediately adjacent. The existence of a searly group home development morely tends to bring into play one of the fundamental principles of soning, which is to prevent the overcrooking of land and the avoidance of under concentration of population.

The education of our youth is a nature directly involving the gene at walfare of the public. Isocording to the testimony of No. Orien (page 106 - Tremencys) existing schools in the area are now overloaded by 1863 children. The conclusion is insecapable that any resoning that tends to increase population density in such an area is detrinantal to the general walfare.

For the afuregoing reasons the action of the Soard of Zoning Appeals is REVERSED.

John R. Raine, Jr. - Judge

October 9, 1957

John E. Raine

#3888

In July, 1956, Hissouri Realty, Inc. sought a reclassification A in the soming of its twenty-six agre tract of land from 1.6 (cottage or semi_datached) to R.G. (group housing). The application was granted by the soning Commissioner and affirmed by the County Board of Appeals. On appeal, the Board's action was reversed by the Circuit fourt for Baltimore County, but that action was ir turn reversed by this Court. Missouri Realty, Inc. v. Remer. 216 Md. hh?. An order affirming the action of the Board of Ameals use duly entered in accordance with the mendate of this Court. Thereafter, the County Solicitor ruled that the reclassification would become final and effective only upon approval by the County Council. The County Council, bowever, refused to act upon the merits of the reclassification, taking the position that the reclassification became final upon affirmance in judicial review, and that it was not properly subject to approval, or disapproval, by the County Council. Because of the disagreement between County officials as to the finality of the court order, the annelles was unable to sometre approva of its subdivision plat, execution of a public works agreement, or issuance of building paraics, and hence was unable to develop its land under the R.G. classification. To resolve the impasse, the appelles brought its present bill seeking a declaration that the land was remoned R.G. without any action by the County Council, or, in the alternative, a decree requiring the Council to act. After any and hearing, at which the facts were stimulated, the court decrease that the reclassification was walld without further action by the Council, and granted appropriate injunctive relief. All of the defendants, except the County Council, annual.

The appellants rely strongly upon the case of <u>Maltiners County v.</u>
Sporten Scally, 217 56, 783. That was no notion of amedama to compel the
Council to approve a realizatification said by the loning Conductionary, from
Smide no appeal has been taken. The Council decisions to approve the realizat-

fication, despite the opinion of the County Solicitor that it had no power to disapprove, but only to approve the firms, the action taken, under Code of Public Local Leave of Baltimere County (1955 ed.), sec. 532(e), and sec. 500,2 of the Zening Replations. We hald that the language of the statute, repeated in the Repulation, providing that a change in boundaries of a soning district should not "become affective and binding until it shall have been approved in writing by the County Condesioners", implied the power to disapprove, that the power to approve, that the power to approve, or disapprove, called for the exercise of judgment and discretion, and that the mandame would not lie. We did not pass upon the openion now presented, as to the powers of the Council after a decision with the Sonion Accordance and whickell review.

The provisions of sec. 532(c) of the statute and sec. 500.2 of the Regulations only apply to a situation where there has been no appeal from the granting of a reclarationation by the Zoning Commissioner. The Board of Zoning Appeals set up under sec. \$32(f) of the statute is authorised to bear appeals from any decision of the Zonine Commissioner. Sec. 532(e) provides a further appeal, by way of certicreri, to the Circuit Court, to review a decision of the Board of Zoning Appeals, and provides that upon denial of an application for reclassification, no subsequent application for reclassification of the same property shall be filed within 18 months from the final order denying the prior application. Sec. 532(h) provides for a further appeal to this Court. Nowhere in the statute is there my provision equivalent to the language above quoted, for approval by the County Commissioners after review by the Board of Zonine Appeals or by the courts. As pointed out in Murray v. Director or Planning, 217 Md. 381, 385, soming in Baltimore County has been accomplished under the local law contained in sec. 532, and not under the State Enabling Act. Art. 66 B of the Code of Public General Laws. Sec. 500.3 of the Regulations, however,

provides that if the Board of Ioning Appeals upon appeal shall order a reclassification denied by the Zoning Commissioner, the latter shall "then
forthwith smitht said reclassification to the County Commissioners-weed upon
their written approval thereof the said reclassification shall become affective
and bindingses." But there is no equivalent language in the impulations with
reference to an order of the Acard of Zoning Appeals that has been judically
reviewed. It may also be noted that see, 501.6 of the impulations provides
that appeals from the Zoning Commissioner shall be heard by the Board of Zoning
Appeals from the Zoning Commissioner shall be heard by the Board of Zoning
Appeals from the Zoning Commissioner shall be heard by the Board of Zoning
Appeals from the Zoning Commissioner shall be heard by the Board of Zoning
Appeals from the Zoning Commissioner shall be nearly before the technically
man independant decision and Judgment and not surely an affirmance. Notice ws.
States, 217 Ma. 351,355. dec. 32(d) of the statute specifically states that,
on judical review, the court shall have power to affirm the "decision of the
Board of Zoning Appeals." There is no statutory provision for review of any
action by the County Commissioners.

whatever the scope and meaning of sec. 500.) of the hegalations, to which we referred consulty in the ferrion case, sures, and in Quin v. Volle, 217 Md. 63.), 63.6, it has no application to a situation where there has been a judicial review of the Sourd's action. Upon the facts of the instant case, we find nothing in the Steinte or Angulations to indicate that approval by the Council, as moreoser to the County Connectancers, is required after judicial review. Such a construction would be at odds with the traditional doubtine of animation of administrative resedies before reserve to the courts, and the doctrine that courts review only final decisions and donot render advisory cylnious. If the Council has the power to approve, or disapprove, after judicial review, the matter might be further litigated under a claim total the settin was arbitrary. Invoking the inharment power of courts to pass upon such a question. Eresto v. Medinery, 197 Md. 139, Faller v. Bilto. County (comp. 211 Md. 162, 172. Norwerer, Medinery, 197 Md. 139, Faller v. Bilto. County (comp. 211 Md. 162, 172. Norwerer,

a legislative requirement of judicial consideration of a question when the court's doctains would be either envisory to a legislative body or subject to retrocative legislative worksion, night raise serious Constitutional questions. It is a general rule that a construction of a statute, giving rise to doubte as to its constitutionality, should be avoided if the language permiss, largett v. (large, 16) be 116, 127.

While strongly urging the construction of the local law suggested, the appellants contend that the case is even clearer under the provisions of the Home Hale Charter, and that the came is really controlled, not by sec. 532 of the local law, but by the Charter adopted November 6, 1956, under article II-a of the Maryland Constitution. Among the express powers granted by Code (1957), Art. 25 A. sec. 5 (U), was the power to create, by local law passed by the Council, a County Board of Appeals, with the power to decide among other matters: "An application for a soning variation or exception or amendment of a soning ordinance map." It provides for judicial review and closes with the sertence: "The review proceedings provided by this sub-section shall be explusive." In the Egorton case, supra, it was conceded that the pre-existing local law, rather than the Charter, was applicable, probably because, as in the instant case, the application for reclassification had been made before the effective date of the Charter, December 6, 1956. It was also conceded in the Egorton case that the Council had not rescinded or altered in any respect the powers previously conferred upon the Zoning Commissioner and the Board of Zoning Appeals.

The appelles points to sec. 500 of the Charter, providing that "All plans and maps were adopted, assended or repealed by the Office of Flanning and Zoning was shall, prior to taking offects a law, be approved by ordinance of the County Commeil." Coriously, this refers to the general, comprehensive mening. But the section further provides that "all reclassifications and all orders of

the Zening Consissionar may be appealed in the manner provided in Article VI of this Charter and not otherwise. See, 602(a) provides that the County Board of Appeals shall supplant the Board of Jening Appeals, and that VI all cases, the order of the County Board of Appeals shall be final unless on appeal be taken therefrom in the manner provided in Section 60% mem. See, 600 provides that hearings before the Board shall be 50 move. See, 600 provides for appeal to the Circuit Court, and to this Court, and combinies with the nonteness "The review proceedings provided by this section shall be exulusive." We find it unmeacessary to decide whether the provisions of the Charter or the local law are applicable, because we find in notitor, Ampeage to support a contention that, after pulsical review, the finality of an order of the Beard is contingent upon approval or disapproval by the County County!

The appellants argue that such a construction is unismable, because the sotion of the local, wisther judicially reviewed or not, is of no logal affect until confirmed by the Commoli. The argument is that reclassification is a lagislative function which cannot be delapated to an acanisaterist againty. It has a logal affect that the power is a lagislative force not prevent its delapation. See, "Lifefor, of patter, v. Strawger, 127 Me, 158, 572, and herizor, v. City of Battimore, 713 Me, 150, 215. There are causes to the contemp in other states. See Note 56 A.L.S. 20 LOS). It is argued that where there is no legislative policy laid down in advance, as in the case of special exception or variances, the rule is otherwise. But we said in the famor case, pupper (p-bir): Toming officials, when proporly entherized, here the numberty to alter note lines from time to time which constitutes and much thresholds has a reasonable relation to the sublice variance, quoting Official v. Me. and continue has a reasonable relation to the sublice variance, quoting Official v. Me. and continue pages in Me. 150, 577. Now also Parently v. Me. of Institute pages in the substance of the base of the pages of the forms of the substance of the pages of the forms of the page of the pages of the forms of the pages o

that the case involved reclassification from one residential sub-category to another, not the renoval of land from the use category in which it was placed when originally sound. The question of delegation of power was not equarely reised in that case, or the other cases cited.

It is true that in Huff v. Ed. of Loning Appeals, 21h Ed. h8,62, we sustained a reclassification from S.10 to N.R. (Namufacturing Asstricted) by analogy to a special exception, stating that "the rules which are applicable to ial exceptions would apply, not the general rules of original error or change in conditions or the character of the neighborhood; that control the progriety of resoning. This is because, as in the case of a special exception, there has been a prior legislative determination, as part of a comprehensive plan, that the use which the administrative body permits, upon application to the particular case of the specified standards, is prisa facis proper in the unvironment in which it is permitted. This prior determination and the establishment of sufficient standards effectively refute the claim of impreper delegation of legislative power even, citing Hontgomery Co. v. Herlands Club, 202 Md. 279. That was not a holding that without prior determination delegation would be improper. In Rds of Zoning Appeals v. Bailey, 216 Md. 535, SkJ, we noted that the Buff case was exceptional, and that the ordinary rules applicable to reclassification did not apply, as they were applied in the Sailey case, and more recently in White v. County Board of Appeals (No. 139, This Term), just decided.

As Judge Markell, for the Court, said in Pressnan v. D'Alesandre, 193 Md. 672, 676, the basic question "is not whether the City Council can delegate legislative power, but whether the Legislature has conferred, by the Baltimore charter or otherwase, power - of whatever nature, legislative or executive on the - to makes the choice of alternatives. There can be no question as to the power of the Legislature to make such grants of powers of local government, whether to an existing municipal corporation or agency, a specially constituted body, or an existing executive or administrative body such as county commissioners. The

constitutional requirement of separation of powers is not applicable to local government. (Giting cases.) Just how much power is granted by a particular statute is a question of statutory construction. ***not a constitutional question. See also Francian v. Barnes, 209 Hd. 5hk, 552; Givner v. Commissioner of Health, 207 Md. 18h, 191; Davis, Administrative Law Treaties (1958), \$2.15. In the instan case the power stems directly from the statute and Charter, and there was no redelegation by the County Council to the Hoard. We do not suggest that a different result would follow if there had been a redelegation authorized by basic 1

We think the power to reacce in particular cases, by changing boundaries as distinguished from the power to adopt a comprehensive zoning ordinance, which has been nowhere delegated and for which no statutory authority exists, may be. and has been, validly delegated to the County Board of Appeals. In Tyris v. Baltimore County, 215 Md. 135, 141, we indicated that in Baltimore County such soning "changes as conditions from time to time warranted could be ffected either by reclassification or by Special Exception or by both." The only difference is that in the former case the Board must find a substantial justification for its action in an original error or changed circumstances and conditions, and not merely consider the effects upon neighboring property, the traffic and school problems, and other matters appropriate to an exercise of the police power, as spelled out in sec. 532(a) of the Statute. The presence of these statutory prerequisities to the exercise of the legislative function, whether delegated or not, is, we think, a complete answer to the appellants' contention that there are no statutory standards for the guidance of the Board.

There is the further safequard that, to the extent that the action taken may be arbitrary, capricious, discriminatory, or illegal, or not fairly debatable, any action taken is subject to judicial review. Kroen v. Board of Zoning Appeals, 209 Md. 420, 421; Eckes v. Seard of Zoning Appeals, 209 Md. 432, h37. The presumptions arising from the adoption of a comprehensive plan are designed to promote stability and prevent ill-considered changes, and the statutory prohibition against reconsideration within 18 muths is alsod in the same direction This Court has recognized, in many of the cases cited, and generally in the field of administrative law, that the basic statutes should be liberally construed to permit delegation to subordinate expert bodies because of the pracitcal necessity of freeing the local legislative bodies from the pressure of the numerour and complex problems, callin; for special expetime, that plague the modern world.

Since we hold that the order for reclassification was valid without further action by the County Council, the Ascree appealed from will be affirmed.

DECRME APPLISHED, WITH COSTS.

IN THE MATTER OF PETITION FOR RECLASSIFICATION, FROM AN "R-6" Zone to an "R-0" Zone - W.S. Unnamed Road and N.S. Diehl Ave. 9th Estrict - Missouri Realty, 1 Petit.oner

BEFORE TONTHO COMPTESTORED OF BALTIMORE COUNTY No. 3886

Pursuant to the advertisement, posting of property and public hearing on the above petition, it is shown on the soning mans that the subject parcel adjoins a group house gone on one side and Ehrhardt & May's Storage Yard adjoins on another side

....

The Office of Planning agreed that since the Board of Education has acquired the group house land on the west side of the New Perring Parkway that group homes should be limited to the east side of said Parkway. The developer agreed and submitted plans as stated above which are acceptable to the Office of Planning.

It is also evident that the changes in the character of the neighborhood since the mightion of the original soning warrant the requested change, the granting of which will not be detrimental to the health, safety and the ceneral welfare of the community implyed.

It is ORDERED by the Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County, this 16 the day of November, 1956, that the above described promerty or area should be and the same is hereby reclassified, from and after the date of this Order, from an "R-6" (cottage) Zone to an "R-Q" (group house) Zone.

Baltimore County. Maryland OFFICE OF LAW Inter-Office Correspon

3888

MAP#9

RG

TO: Spiro T. Agnew, Chairman County Board Date...March.3.1259. of Appeals FIOM: Johnson Bowie

SUBJECT: Baltimore County v. Missouri Realty, Inc.

Enclosed herewith is a copy of the opinion

of the Court of Appeals in the above case.

JB:cis

County Council of Baltimore County County Office Building, Coloson 4, Margland #3888

COUNCILMEN First District

Third District

Mr. Wilsie Adams

Zoning Commissione

Chiral Baltimore County Towson 4. Maryland Faurth Distric

This will advise that at the meeting of the Council held July

JOHN E LASSANN
1, 1958, Bill No, 118 concerning Zoning Reclassification No. 3888 (Missouri

Realty Inc.) was called for vote but failed to receive the affirmative vote the majority of the Gouncil members. I return a copy of said bill and the original papers which were forwarded by your department to this office.

Very truly yours, Um F. Mrs

MAP

49

RG

NO PLAT IN THIS FOLDER