

65-284-R 2-B WPTCH RA NW-1F SW-1F 4/2/65 REBILICH #65-284-R Opinion simultaneously herewith, the majority of the Board feels that since the two properties adjoin and since they are in the same neighborhood and very similar in all respects, and since the same contentions with regard to error or change in the character of the neighborhood apply to both properties, the cases should be decided similarly. In this case, as well as the Agneslane case, there is apparently no difficulty with utilities, it being agreed by the parties in both cases that public utilities are available to both properties in sufficient capacity to serve the proposed apartment projects. The Board also finds, as a fact, in this case, as well as the Agneslane case, that the proposed apartment projects would not unduly congest the roads and streets in the neighborhood. The petitioner's main contention in this case is that the County in adopting the comprehensive zoning map in 1962 did not make provision for sufficient rental housing on the map and that the modern trend toward apartment living is a change which the Board should consider. As stated in the Agneslane opinion, the Board has in the past, in proper cases, recognized this insufficiency of apartment units as being one of the factors that should be considered in a reclassification for apartment use. However, in the instant case, as well as the companion case, the majority does not feel that the evidence produced by the petitioner in this regard is strong enough to warrant the reclassification of the subject tracts. The petitioner also contends that the development of the Meadows Industrial Park and the expansion of the Social Security complex are changes in the neighborhood that justify the rezoning of the subject property. We cannot agree with this contention for several reasons. The Meadows Industrial One of the changes cited by the petitioner is the construction of the Baltimore County Beltway and the interchange at the Beltway and Route I-70. However, the Westview Park cottage development is built right up to the Beltway on both the east and west side of the Beltway and is, in fact, in much closer proximity to the roads referred to than either the subject tract or the Agneslane property. We will not go into great detail as to the testimony of each witness. However, in the Board's mind, there has not been sufficient evidence of error in the comprehensive zoning map nor very little, if any, change in the character of the neighborhood since 1962 to justify the reclassification sought here. George E. Gavrelis, Director of Planning for Baltimore County, testified that, in his opinion, the present R-6 zoning is correct and that,

TO THE ZONING COMMISSIONER OF BALTIMORE COUNTY:

I, or we, HENRY AND AGNES REIBLICH, legal owners, of the property situate in Baltimore County and which is described in the description and plat attached hereto and made a part hereof, hereby petition (1) that the zoning status of the herein described property be reclassified, pursuant to the Zoning Law of Baltimore County, from an R-6 zone to an R-A zone; for the following reasons:

1. Change in character of neighborhood
2. Error in original zoning.

See attached Description

and (2) for a Special Exception, under the said Zoning Law and Zoning Regulations of Baltimore County, to use the herein described property, for:

Property is to be posted and advertised as prescribed by Zoning Regulations.
I, or we, agree to pay expenses of above reclassification and/or Special Exception advertising, posting, etc., upon filing of this petition, and further agree to and are to be bound by the zoning regulations and restrictions of Baltimore County adopted pursuant to the Zoning Law for Baltimore County.

Henry H. Reiblich
Henry Reiblich
Agnes Reiblich
Legal Owners
Address 1107 Baywood Rd.
Baltimore 15, Md.
NO. 21227
Bohannon
700 W. 12th Street
Baltimore, Md. 21204
21204

Edward St. John
Contract Purchaser
Address 5246 Eastman Ave.
Baltimore 15, Md.
21204
A. Owen Hennegan, Jr.
Petitioner's Attorney
Address 306 Jefferson Building
Baltimore 15, Md.
21204

ORDERED By The Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County, this 2nd day of March, 1965, that the subject matter of this petition be advertised, as required by the Zoning Law of Baltimore County, in two newspapers of general circulation throughout Baltimore County, that property be posted, and that the public hearing be had before the Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County in Room 108, County Office Building in Towson, Baltimore County, on the 15th day of April, 1965, at 11:00 o'clock A.M.



(over)

RR: PETITION FOR RECLASSIFICATION : BEFORE
from an R-6 zone to an R-A zone : COUNTY BOARD OF APPEALS
NE corner Johnnycake Road and :
Kent Avenue : OF
1st District :
Henry Reiblich, et al, : BALTIMORE COUNTY
Petitioners : No. 65-284-R

OPINION

This case involves an application for rezoning from an R-6 classification to an R-A classification of a twenty-six (26) acre tract of ground situated on the northeast side of Johnnycake Road and Kent Avenue in the First Election District of Baltimore County.

The developer proposes to erect on the site 397 garden type apartment units with town houses on the frontage of the property along Johnnycake Road with the larger buildings to the rear of the property.

The zoning surrounding the tract on all sides is presently R-6. North of the subject tract there is a development known as Catonsville Manor. This development extends also along the southeasterly side of the property across Kent Avenue and extending westerly to Johnnycake Road. Across Johnnycake Road is a substantial R-6 cottage development known as Westview Park. A large portion of the northwesterly property line borders on the Board of Education property which is the Johnnycake Junior High School. The balance of the northwesterly side of the tract borders on property which is presently zoned R-6 and is the subject of a zoning petition to change that zoning from R-6 to R-A, this case being known as Agneslane, Inc., case No. 65-332-R.

As stated in the Agneslane opinion, which is being filed

Reiblich #65-284-R

Opinion

simultaneously herewith, the majority of the Board feels that since the two properties adjoin and since they are in the same neighborhood and very similar in all respects, and since the same contentions with regard to error or change in the character of the neighborhood apply to both properties, the cases should be decided similarly.

In this case, as well as the Agneslane case, there is apparently no difficulty with utilities, it being agreed by the parties in both cases that public utilities are available to both properties in sufficient capacity to serve the proposed apartment projects. The Board also finds, as a fact, in this case, as well as the Agneslane case, that the proposed apartment projects would not unduly congest the roads and streets in the neighborhood.

The petitioner's main contention in this case is that the County in adopting the comprehensive zoning map in 1962 did not make provision for sufficient rental housing on the map and that the modern trend toward apartment living is a change which the Board should consider. As stated in the Agneslane opinion, the Board has in the past, in proper cases, recognized this insufficiency of apartment units as being one of the factors that should be considered in a reclassification for apartment use. However, in the instant case, as well as the companion case, the majority does not feel that the evidence produced by the petitioner in this regard is strong enough to warrant the reclassification of the subject tracts. The petitioner also contends that the development of the Meadows Industrial Park and the expansion of the Social Security complex are changes in the neighborhood that justify the rezoning of the subject property. We cannot agree with this contention for several reasons. The Meadows Industrial

Reiblich #65-284-R

Opinion

Park, north of the proposed Route I-70, was zoned Manufacturing-Light prior to 1962 and the zoning was subsequently affirmed by the map and the development there that has taken place has been in accordance with its zoning. Again, the Social Security complex was well known to the County authorities at the time the adoption of the map and has only developed as was undoubtedly originally contemplated by the County Council. Even if this were otherwise the majority feels, in this case, as well as the Agneslane case, that the logical line of demarcation between the manufacturing and office uses to the north and the cottage residential uses to the south is the proposed Route I-70, and that the "neighborhood" in both instances lies south of I-70, and we see no reason to change the zoning here as it would serve no transitional function that we can ascertain and could lead to other zoning changes in this area.

One of the changes cited by the petitioner is the construction of the Baltimore County Beltway and the interchange at the Beltway and Route I-70. However, the Westview Park cottage development is built right up to the Beltway on both the east and west side of the Beltway and is, in fact, in much closer proximity to the roads referred to than either the subject tract or the Agneslane property.

We will not go into great detail as to the testimony of each witness. However, in the Board's mind, there has not been sufficient evidence of error in the comprehensive zoning map nor very little, if any, change in the character of the neighborhood since 1962 to justify the reclassification sought here. George E. Gavrelis, Director of Planning for Baltimore County, testified that, in his opinion, the present R-6 zoning is correct and that,

Reiblich #65-284-R

Concurring Opinion

denying the application although I can see that even on this question reasonable minds might differ which I do not concede on the question of change and error in this case nor in the Agneslane case.

Date: 3/28/66

W. Giles Parker
W. GILES PARKER

RR: PETITION FOR RECLASSIFICATION : BEFORE
from an R-6 zone to an R-A zone : COUNTY BOARD OF APPEALS
NE corner Johnnycake Road and :
Kent Avenue : OF
1st District :
Henry Reiblich, et al, : BALTIMORE COUNTY
Petitioners : No. 65-284-R

CONCURRING OPINION

This Board member concurs with the result of the decision in the case made by the majority of the Board but does not agree with the reasons stated for such majority decision nor with the reasoning of the majority.

The reasons for such disagreement have been stated in the Dissenting Opinion in the Agneslane case, #65-332-R, and I feel that the majority finding that there was neither error nor change sufficient to warrant rezoning is mistaken, arbitrary and capricious, and unsupported by competent, material or substantial evidence. My only reason for concurring in the within case is that I feel that although there was error and there has been change, that a reclassification at this particular spot would constitute a serious detriment to the neighborhood of Westview which has been fully developed in single family homes and which is directly across the street from the Reiblich property. On the evidences in this case, as well as that presented in the Agneslane case, I believe that the proposed construction on the Reiblich property would have a serious depreciating effect on property values on the adjoining if not the neighboring homes and this, in view of the fact that there is nothing to prevent the Reiblich property from being developed under its present classification economically and profitably, to me seems sufficient reason for

Reiblich #65-284-R

Opinion

in his opinion, the proposed route of I-70-N is a boundary "south of which apartment development should be curtailed". Further testimony indicated that the recommendation for the subject tract, as well as the adjacent Agneslane tract, was for R-6 zoning and the County Council did consider the property and saw fit to zone all of the land in the immediate area south of I-70 and east of the Baltimore County Beltway R-6, and we cannot see where they made any error in zoning the subject tract.

The majority cannot agree with the reasoning of the minority opinion filed in this case in that it does not seem logical that the Reiblich property would have a serious depreciating effect on property values in the adjoining neighborhood but the Agneslane property would not have any such depreciating effect. It seems to us that the effect, if any, on the neighborhood by the construction of apartments would be the same.

For the foregoing reasons the petition for reclassification from R-6 zone to an R-A zone will be denied.

ORDER

For the reasons set forth in the foregoing Opinion, it is this 28th day of March, 1966 by the County Board of Appeals, ORDERED that the reclassification petitioned for, be and the same is hereby DENIED.

Any appeal from this decision must be in accordance with Chapter 1100, subtitle B of Maryland Rules of Procedure, 1961 edition.

COUNTY BOARD OF APPEALS
OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

William S. Baldwin
William S. Baldwin, Chairman
John A. Slowik
John A. Slowik

HENNEGAN AND CHIPMAN
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
408 JEFFERSON BUILDING
ON WEST LOCHMOUNT AVENUE
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

April 26, 1965

Edward Deal Hardesty, Deputy Zoning Commissioner
Office of Planning and Zoning
County Office Building
Towson, Maryland - 21204

Re: Petition for Reclassification
Reiblich property
No. 65-284-R

Dear Mr. Hardesty:

Please enter an Appeal to the Board of Appeals of Baltimore County from your decision and Order of April 21, 1965, denying the reclassification in the above entitled matter.

Very truly yours,

A. Owen Hennegan, Jr.
A. Owen Hennegan, Jr.
Attorney for Petitioner

AOHJ:rmf
Encls. (\$70.00 check)



FROM THE OFFICE OF
GEORGE WILLIAM STEPHENS, JR. & ASSOCIATES, INC.
ENGINEERS
202 ALLEGHENY AVENUE, TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

#65-284R

Description of the Property of Henry W. Reiblich et ux to be rezoned from R-6 to R-A February 10, 1965

Beginning for the same at the intersection of the east side of Johnnycake Road as proposed to be widened to 55 feet, and the north side of Kent Avenue 40 feet wide, and running thence binding on the east side of said Johnnycake Road as proposed to be widened North 26° 47' West 460 feet more or less thence, leaving said road North 36° 27' East 1504 feet to the south-west outline of Plat No. 2, Catonsville Manor, as recorded among the Plat Records of Baltimore County in Plat Book 6, folio 116, and thence binding on the rear outline of Lots 2 through 16, Block 25 as shown on said plat South 35° 58' East 290.94 feet, and thence binding on the outlines of Lots 17 through 20, and including said lots, the three following courses and distances viz: first North 53° 50' East 147.9 feet to Central Avenue 50 feet wide and second binding on the West side of said Central Avenue South 36° 10' East 80 feet and third South 53° 50' West 148.3 feet to intersect the rear outline of Block 25 as shown on said plat, and thence binding on the rear of Lots 21 through 42, Block 25 as shown on said Plat, South 35° 58' East 440.00 feet to a point on the east side of Lot 50, Block 25, and thence, to include lots 50 through 57, Block 25 as shown on said plat and Lots 1 through 46, Block 1 as shown on Plat No. 1 of Catonsville Manor recorded among the Plat Records of Baltimore County in Plat Book No. 6, folio 109, the four following courses and distances viz: first North 53° 50' East 0.40 feet, second South

#65-284R

Description of the Property of Henry W. Reiblich et ux to be rezoned from R-6 to R-A February 10, 1965 Sheet 2

36° 10' East 125 feet to the north side of Kent Avenue 40 feet wide, third binding on said north side of Kent Avenue South 53° 50' West 1090 feet, fourth leaving said north side of Kent Avenue North 36° 10' West 142.35 feet to the rear line of Block 1 as shown on said Plat No. 1, Catonsville Manor, thence binding on said rear line South 54° 02' West 80 feet to the Northeast corner of Lot 51, Block 1 as shown on said plat, and thence to include said lot 51 and Lots 52 through 71 Block 1 as shown on said Plat No. 1 of Catonsville Manor, the two following courses and distances viz: first South 36° 10' East 142.66 feet, to the north side of Kent Avenue 40 feet wide, second binding on said north side of Kent Avenue South 53° 50' West 436 feet to the point of beginning.

Containing 24.90 acres of land more or less.

LAW OFFICES
A. OWEN HENNEGAN
408 JEFFERSON BUILDING
108 WEST CHESAPEAKE AVENUE
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

March 28, 1966

County Board of Appeals
County Office Building, Room 301
Towson, Maryland - 21204

Re: Petition No. 65-284-R
Reiblich, et al., Petitioners
NE corner, Johnnycake Road & Kent Avenue
First District

Gentlemen:

Please withdraw the Appeal hereinbefore entered by Petitioners on April 26, 1965 on the above captioned property.

Very truly yours,

A. Owen Hennegan
A. Owen Hennegan,
Attorney for Petitioners - Appellants

AOH:mf

cc: Samuel F. Kenney, Esq.
Thomas P. Neubecker, Esq.

RE: PETITION FOR RECLASSIFICATION :
R-6 to R-A Zone :
NE cor of Johnnycake Road :
and Kent Avenue - 1st District :
Henry Reiblich-Petitioner :
DEPUTY ZONING COMMISSIONER :
OF :
BALTIMORE COUNTY :
No. 65-284-R

The subject property, consisting of twenty five acres, is the subject of a petition for rezoning from an R-6 zone to an R-A zone. Plans call for the construction of 27 apartment units.

Without reviewing the testimony in detail, the Deputy Zoning Commissioner is of the opinion the petitioner has failed to show an error in the original zoning or such changes in the character of neighborhood to justify the rezoning sought.

For the foregoing reasons, it is ORDERED by the Deputy Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County, this 21 day of April, 1966, that the above reclassification be and the same is hereby DENIED, and that the above described property or area be and the same is hereby continued as and to remain an R-6 zone.

Edward D. Hardesty
Edward D. Hardesty
Deputy Zoning Commissioner of
Baltimore County

#65-284-R

HENRY W. REIBLICH and
AGNES REIBLICH, his wife and
EDWARD A. ST. JOHN :
vs. :
WILLIAM S. BALDWIN, et al :
and :
KENNETH G. STEDDING, et al :
Intervenors :

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT
FOR BALTIMORE COUNTY
AT LAW
Misc. 8/83/3512

OPINION

This is an appeal from the Baltimore County Board of Appeals by the owners of a twenty-six acre tract of land located at the northeasterly corner of Johnnycake Road and Kent Avenue in the First Election District. The owners sought reclassification of the tract from R-6 to R-A. The Board unanimously denied the reclassification. The comprehensive zoning map involved is that covering portions of the First, Second and Third Election Districts, and was approved by an ordinance of the County Council of Baltimore County, enacted on November 14, 1962.

The owners contend that the Board should have granted the requested reclassification, first, because of errors in the map, and secondly because of changes in the neighborhood. The alleged errors are, (2) failure to make adequate provision in the area for apartments although, allegedly, substantial need for apartments was known as of the date of the adoption of the map; (b) failure to recognize the impact on the tract of U.S. Route 1-70N and the extension of Clarke Avenue, (sometimes called Woodlawn Avenue), underway at the time of the hearing, to Security Boulevard, from its terminus in November, 1962, at Johnnycake Road. The alleged changes in the neighborhood are (a) several zoning changes; (b) the purchase by the United States Government for the use of Social Security of approximately fifteen acres of land zoned R-A; (c) the construction, under way at the time of the hearing, of U. S. Route 1-70N, including a massive interchange with the Baltimore County Beltway; (d) the

extension of Clarke Avenue, referred to above; and (e) unanticipated and increased demand for apartments in the area.

A few days before the hearing in this case the owners filed with the court a "Motion for Order of Remand." In essence, two contentions are made in such motion. First, that the decision of the Board was not based upon evidence adduced before the Board in this case, but rather either upon personal knowledge of the members of the Board, or upon the evidence in what is referred to as the "Agnes Lane Case", which involved adjoining property and which was decided by the Board at the same time as was this case. Second, that the Board failed to take into consideration the definitive rulings announced by the Court of Appeals in Finney v. Halle, 241 Md. 224 (2/2/66) and Beth Tfilah v. Blum, 242 Md. 84 (3/29/66).

In support of their first contention the owners cite Hedin v. Board of County Commissioners, 209 Md. 224, 231, 236. However, that case is clearly distinguishable from the one presented here. At the conclusion of the testimony before the Board, one of the Commissioners said, "I am rather familiar with this property. In my opinion I think it would be detrimental and would be bad zoning to grant this R-18 zoning." Upon the motion of such Commissioner, the Board immediately denied the application. In the present case it is true that the majority opinion makes a number of references to the "Agnes Lane" case. However, from the portion of the opinion found in the paragraph beginning at the bottom of Page 3 and concluding at the top of Page 4, and from the order signed by the Board, it is clear that the decision was based upon the testimony in this case. The conclusions of the Board were that the owners had failed to prove either error in the comprehensive zoning map or changes in the character of the neighborhood which would warrant reclassification.

Owners also rely on Temmink v. Board, 205 Md. 480, 487. However, it is to be noted that, although the Court said that personal knowledge either of Board members or of others cannot be considered as evidence, the Court held that "In reviewing the action of the zoning board, the court on appeal considers the

board's action, not the opinion of its members." That is exactly what this Court proposes to do. Hardesty v. Board, 211 Md. 172, 177 and Price v. Cohen, 213 Md. 457, 463, 464 are to the same effect and do not support owners' contention that the case should be remanded.

As to the second contention, the Court can only conclude that the Board did take into consideration the principles announced in Finney and Beth Tfilah. Although Beth Tfilah was decided two days after the date of the order of the Board in the present case, Finney was decided some several weeks prior to such date, and must have been published in both the advance sheets of the Maryland Reports and in the Daily Record at least several weeks prior to the date of the order. In addition to this, the case which first announced the definitive ruling (restated in Finney and Beth Tfilah) that construction of important roads adjoining properties involved in zoning applications would constitute a change in the neighborhood warranting reclassification was Jobar Corp. v. Rogers Forge, 236 Md. 106. That case was decided on July 24, 1964, approximately eighteen months prior to the date of the order in the present case. In view of the foregoing, owners' motion for remand is denied.

So far as the appeal is concerned, the Court finds that the contentions of the owners are without merit. In Board v. Farr, 242 Md. 315, the most recent decision of the Court of Appeals involving the claim that the completion of a major highway adjacent to the subject property constituted a change in the neighborhood warranting reclassification, the Board of County Commissioners for Prince Georges County had refused the reclassification. The decision of the trial court reversing the Board was in turn reversed by the Court of Appeals. Judge Oppenheimer speaking for the Court cited with approval and quoted from Chief Judge Brune's opinion in County Council for Montgomery County v. Gentleman, 227 Md. 461, 498, as follows: "Even if there were facts which would have justified the Council in rezoning the property, this would not of itself prove the denial of rezoning illegal. There is still the area of debat-

ility, and one who attacks the refusal of rezoning must meet the heavy burden of proving that the action of the legislative body in refusing it was arbitrary, capricious and illegal." In that case the appellant had conceded that there had been material changes in the area subsequent to the adoption of the comprehensive zoning map, and that the requested reclassification would not constitute spot zoning. Appellant contended, however, that there was substantial evidence before the Board to support the denial of the requested rezoning.

It is to be noted that, in Finney, and in Beth Tfilah, the Board had in each instance granted the requested reclassification. There is nothing in any of those cases which would require a reclassification in any case involving a substantial road change in the neighborhood. There may very readily be other factors in any given case which dictate that rezoning should not be granted. For example, in the present case the testimony clearly demonstrates that the tract in question is completely surrounded by R-6 land. To find land of some other classification one must go to a minimum of 1200 feet from the subject property. Thus, reclassification of the subject property would constitute spot zoning as defined by the Court of Appeals in Cassel v. City of Baltimore, 195 Md. 348, 355. See also Hedin v. Board, (supra) 232; Huff v. Board, 214 Md. 48, 57. In addition to this, although the owners contend that failure to recognize the impact of U.S. Route 1-70N on properties in the area, including the subject property, constituted either error or change, and further contend that the exact location of that highway was not known at the time of the adoption of the comprehensive zoning map (Petitioner's Exhibit No. 7) such map clearly shows 1-70N and the interchange between that highway and the Baltimore County Beltway. This certainly constituted substantial evidence before the Board introduced by the owners of what was known about U. S. Route 1-70N at the time of the adoption of such map. Finally, the interchange is more than 2500 feet from the subject

Next it is contended by owners that failure to make adequate provision in the area for apartment zones constitutes either error or change. The same contention was made in Shadynock v. Molloy, 232 Md. 265. In that case the Court of Appeals had no difficulty in finding this contention to be without merit. The Court there said, "That there may be a need for additional apartments in this immediate vicinity * * * fails to show anything more than that an R-A use would be more profitable than an R-6 use; * * *". Although there was testimony in the present case that there is a substantial demand for apartments in the area, and although there was testimony that one apartment zone (located north of Route 40 at Ingleside Avenue and Craigmont Road) is used by a church - not for apartments - and that another apartment zone had been purchased by Social Security for expansion of its facilities, there are two other apartment zones in the area, one on the easterly side of St. Agnes Lane, and the other on Ingleside Avenue and Franklin Avenue abutting on U. S. Route 1-70N. In the

In view of the foregoing, this Court cannot find that the action of the Baltimore County Board of Appeals was either arbitrary, or capricious or illegal. There was substantial evidence before the Board to support its decision; the refusal to reclassify the property is in no way illegal. For the reasons stated, the order of the Baltimore County Board of Appeals is affirmed.

- 5 -

The present R-6 zoning in the vicinity of the subject property was based on the utilization of Interstate Route 70N as a boundary south of which apartment development should be curtailed; prime apartment-dweller "generators" are located to the north of that route. We believe that the R-6 zoning was correct as adopted and that there has been no change to justify the reclassification requested.

March 15, 1964

A. Owen Hennegan, Jr., Sec.
666 Jefferson Building
Towson, Md. 21204

BALTIMORE COUNTY OFFICE OF PLANNING AND ZONING

County Office Building
111 W. Chesapeake Avenue
Towson 4, Maryland

Your petition has been received and accepted for filing this
2nd day of March, 1964.

JOHN G. ROSE
Zoning Commissioner

Owners Name: Harry Rothlieb
Reviewed by: [Signature]

JED:ylb

TELEPHONE
683-5500

INVOICE
BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND
OFFICE OF FINANCE
Division of Collection and Receipts
COURT HOUSE
TOWSON 4, MARYLAND

No. 3050
DATE 4/15/64

To: A. Dean Himmelfarb, Jr.
Jefferson Building
Towson, Md. 21284

BILLED
BY

Timing Department of Sales.

DEPOSIT TO ACCOUNT NO. 68-482

TOTAL AMOUNT
\$24.50

QUANTITY

DETACH UPPER SECTION AND RETURN WITH YOUR REMITTANCE

COPIES

Advertising and posting of property for Harry Goldfish

\$1.50

PNB - Baltimore County, Md. - Office of Finance

4-1565 3584 • 30507 HTP-

\$150

4

IMPORTANT: MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND
MAIL TO DIVISION OF COLLECTION & RECEIPTS, COURT HOUSE, TOWSON 4, MARYLAND
PLEASE RETURN UPPER SECTION OF THIS BILL WITH YOUR REMITTANCE.

CFM/bbs

TELEPHONE
883-3000

INVOICE

BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

OFFICE OF FINANCE

Division of Collection and Receipts

COURT HOUSE

TOWSON 4, MARYLAND

No. 30546

DATE 4/27/68

To: A. John Hammer, Esq.,
Jefferson Building
Towson, Maryland 21204

BILLED BY
Office of Planning & Zoning
100 County Office Bldg.,
Towson, Maryland 21204

DEPOSIT TO ACCOUNT NO. 00-001	DETAIL UPPER SECTION AND RETURN WITH YOUR REMITTANCE	TOTAL AMOUNT PAID
QUANTITY		COST
Case of appeal - Baltimore property No. 45-255-2	PAID - Baltimore Court - 100 - Office of Finance 4-2865 4255 • 30546 117-	570.00 70.00

IMPORTANT: MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

MAIL TO: DIVISION OF COLLECTION & RECEIPTS, COURT HOUSE, TOWSON 4, MARYLAND

PLEASE RETURN UPPER SECTION OF THIS BILL WITH YOUR REMITTANCE.

TELEPHONE 833-3000		BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND OFFICE OF FINANCE <i>Division of Collection and Receipts</i> COURT HOUSE TOWSON 4, MARYLAND		No. 30583 DATE 5/11/68	
TO: A. Sam Wynn, Jr., Esq. Jefferson Real Estate Towne, Maryland 21204		BILLED BY: Office of Planning & Housing 110 County Office Bldg. Towne, Maryland 21204			
REPORT TO ACCOUNT NO. 00-012		TOTAL AMOUNT			
QUANTITY		DETACH UPPER SECTION AND RETURN WITH YOUR REMITTANCE			COST
Cost of parking property for appeal hearing Harry Goldstein - No. 45-285-2 5-1542 2114 • 30583 HP-		120.00			20.00
IMPORTANT: MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND MAIL TO DIVISION OF COLLECTION & RECEIPTS, COURT HOUSE, TOWSON 4, MARYLAND PLEASE RETURN UPPER SECTION OF THIS BILL WITH YOUR REMITTANCE.					

