IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND
No. 215
September Torm, 1967

GEORGE H. BROUTLIETT, et al.

EUDCWOOD SHOPPING PLAZA, INC., et al.

ME/con

of Putty

S INC

6

0.000

Horney Marbury Barnes McWilliams Singley,

Opinion by Marbury, J.

Filed: May 2, 1968

Ge - 516/68

- (4) Restdents of the area testified to other car wash facilities in the general area, pointing out a lack of need for a self-service facility in the immediate neighborhood.
- (e) The plan as presented was inadequate, particularly as to screening, lighting and the organization of parking aisles.
- (f) The impact of such a use on public utilities is 'unknown.'

0

- (g) No information was furnished as to the number and type of signs to be creeted avertising the use.
- (h) This type of car wash 'is rather a rare thing' in this portion of the county.
- (1) The Director of planning, the sole expert called by the Appelleer, was unable to state if this type of operation would or would not adversely affect the neighborhood.
- (j) Five outside light standards were proposed, but no one had any idea as to their type, height, wattage of illumination.
- (k) Business will continue throughout the night every night (Bunday included) with possibly fifteen per cent or the total husiness being done between 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m.
- (1) Despite the around-the-clock operation, no attendant will be furrished after 5:30 p.m. or before 9:00 a.m.
- (m) The busiest periods will be on weekends.
- (n) On Sunday mornings the car wash is expected to be full. It is one of the 'maximum periods.'
- (o) Unless the Appellees can operate seven days a week, 24 hours a day the use is not economically feasible."

These items of evidence taken cumulatively gave the Board legally sufficient grounds for denying the special execution.

A further reason in support of the Board's action in denying the special exception was the appellees' failure to adduce sufficient evidence that the requested use would not "be destimental to the health, safety or general welfare of the locality involved."

This case concerns a petition for a special exception filed by the appellees. Eudowood Shopping Plaza, Inc. (as legal owner) and the J. C. Corporation (as lessee contingent on zoning). to the zoning commissioner of Baltimore County. The petition requested a special exception to allow the erection and operation of a self-service car wash on a part of what is now the parking lot of the Eudowood Shopping Flaza. The deputy zoning commissioner had originally granted the special exception but the County Board of Appeals denied the appellees' request, finding that it would "be detrimental to the health, safety, and general welfare of the locality involved." An appeal was taken to the Circuit Court for Baltimore County where Judge Barrett reversed the Board, holding that its decision "was not based on substantial evidence." All of the appellants appeared as trotestants before the Board and had answered and argued the appeal to the Circuit Court. All are residents of the immediate neighborhood and a subdivision known as Fellowship

The proposed car wash is described as a building 30 feet wide, 171 feet 10 inches long and 24 feet high, to be built of cinder block with steel sidings and roof. The proposed building would be fully enclosed and the actual washing will be in ten bays which could be entered from the parking area in front of the building, which is of sufficient size to hold forty automobiles.

The building was to be situated on a 120 feet by 200 feet area near the southwest corner of the shopping center parking lot, at the intersection of Putty Hill Road and Goucher Boulevard, in

the Towson area of Baltimore County. Immediately adjacent to the shopping center are: a tract to the north and west being developed for apartments; a tract south of Putty Hill Foad and west of Goucher Boulevard known as the Fellowship Forest Apartments; Calvert Hall High School to the south; to the east are dwellings zoned as group houses and to the north of that is a parking lot, zoned industrial.

The shopping center property is new zoned Business-Local and was given this classification on the comprehensive zoning man of 1955. Under this classification a car wash is a permitted use only if it is authorized by the graning of a special exception. The proposed business would be operated on a twenty-four hour, seven day a week basis and would be unattended from 5:30 p.m. until 9:00 a.m. At the hearing before the Board there was testimony from Ira James Alligood, a witness for the appellees, who owner three similar businesses in York, Pennsylvania, that such an operation would not be feasible unless carried out on the above basis. He also testified that ten to fifteen per cent of the business was done between 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. while the operation was unattended. He further testified that "Sunday morning, from 8:00 a.m. to noon, it is full if the weather is clear * * * . So that is one of the maximum periods."

The real party in interest is the J. C. Corporation which had, at the time of the hearing, negotiated a lease for the subject property with the Eudowood Shopping Plaza, Inc., the lease to be crntingent on obtaining the special exception. The J. C. Corporation was organized for the specific purpose of operating the proposed

car wash and fifty per cent of its capital stock is owned by Mr. Chris William Courge, who operated a car rental agency and who has no experience with a car wash operation.

One of the questions presented to us is whether the Board's decision was based on substantial evidence produced before it. We believe that it was and that the evidence presented for the Board's determination a question which was fairly debatable. Consequently, the Circuit Court was in error and should have permitted the decipion of the Board to stand. The zoning authority is presumed to possess the expertise necessary for deciding the matters brought before it and if its decision is based on substantial evidence then the courts may not substitute their fragment for that of the zoning authority. As we stated in Crowther, In: v. Johnson, 225 Md. 379, 383, 170 A. 24 768:

wa. 399, 385, 170 A. 2a 76::

"... and conditions upon which a special exception may be granted are set out in the ordinance, and the board is given a first latitude of discretion in passing upon special exceptions and the resulting test is in harmony with the general purpose of the souling plan and will not adversely affect the time of the souling plan and will not adversely affect the time of the souling plan and will not adversely affect the time of the souling plan and will not adversely affect the time of the souling plan and will not adversely affect the souling of the souling o

In the present case the Board had before it the following evidence on which it could have relied to reach the result that it did:

- "(a) That the proposed use would be clearly visible to a residential area with home values of \$45,000.00 and more.
- (b) The use will be conducted by one who is unfamiliar with the business.
- (c) No studies or surveys have been made to determine the amount of business anticipated.

In a hearing for a special exception where the requested use is permitted under the existing soning classification the applicant need only show that the use is consistent with the existing classification and that it would not be adverse to the welfare of the neighborhood. In the case of Gursler v. Bd. of Zoning Appeals, 397, 402, 108 A.2d 563, 204 Md. Amere the application was for a special exception permitting a restaurant in Baltimore County, we said:

"*** in Baltimore County, where restaurants are prima facio permissible in residential zones, an applicent for a permit to conduct a restr want in a residential zone is not required to show this denial of a permit would result in Practical difficulty, or unnecessary or unreasonable hardship, 'as in the case of a variance, but must show only that the exception would be in harmony with the zoning plan and would not be detrimental to the welfare of the neighborhood."

Accord, County Commissioners v. Lucia, 249 Md. 1, 238 A. 2d 108; Montgomery Co. v. Meriands Club, supra. In the instant case the appellees did not show that the proposed use would be in conformity with the zening regulation, i.e., that it would not "be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of the locality involved." Baltimore County Zoning Regulations, Sec. 502.1 a.

Their only expert to testify on this aspect of the case, Mr. George E. Garrelle, Director o. Planning, who had studied the proposed site plan, stated in answer to a question as to the effect of the car wash on the community, that "this kind of car wash, at least in this portion of the county, is a rather rare thing, and I don't have any personal experience on which to form a judgment. I don't really know." This being the only testimony on this subject the Board was justified in finding, as it did, that the application should be denied. Under the facts of the case before us the action taken by the Board of Zoning Appeals was justified.

ORDER REVERSED AND ORDER OF BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS REINSTATED; COSTS TO BE PAID BY APPELLERS.

......

MEMORANEUM OPINION

This is an Appeal from an Order of the County Board of Appeals of Baltimore County, dated February 9, 1967, which denied the Patitioner's request for a Special Exception for the construction of a Salf-Service Car Wash on the southwest corner of the existing Eudowood Shopp'ng Center parking lot. The subject property is presently zoned Business-Local and is located within the actual confines of the Eudowood Shopping Center itself. A car-wash is a permitted use as a Special Exception in a Business-

Testimony was offered by 'an Petitioner' to the effect that the proposed structure would be built of cinder block with ateal roof and sidings, and would cover as area of approximately 176 feet by 30 feet with a heighth of 24 feet. The roof of the building, as agreed in the Petitioner's lease with Eudowood, will be in Keeping with the rest of the Shopping Center (R34). Testimony was also offered that, unlike most self operated car washes with their washing base open and axposed, this operation would be completely enclosed by an attractive steel frame structure. An artist's drawing of the proposed structure was offered in evidence before the Board, which appears

to the Court to be a reasonably attractive building and the witness, Fred Ratowsky, who is to supply the building and equipment, stated that the building is much prettier than the artist's drawing and that he does not think the exhibit does the building justice (R38). This building would house a self-service car wash in which customers drive their automobiles into a bay of the building, wash it, dry it and then exit. The operation would be on a 24 hour, 7 day a week basis and will be unstranded.

The Petitioners produced George A. Gavrelis, who is the Director of Planning in the County Office of Planning and Zoning for the purpose of showing that the granting of the Special Exception would not in any way violate Section 502.1 of the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations. At Page 6 of the record, Mr. Gavrelis testified as follows:

A. In connection with this petition, 67-12-K, on July 15 of this year. I wrote the following comments: (Reads) The planning staff of the fee of Planning and Zoning has reviewed the subject petition and offers the following comments:

We agree in principle with the notion of locating car washes on shopping renter sites. The Project Planning Division of this office will require certain additions and detail alterations in the review of the site plan. These will deal with the provision of landscaping, screening, libiting. etc."

And further at Page 7 testifieds

- O. "Does it most the requirements as set forth in the regulations with respect to car washes?"
- A. Insofar as I can determine, the site plan for the proposed car weah does meet the basic requirements set
 forth in the zoning requiations in the sense that it
 does provide the appropriate amount of stack-up space,
 based a half-hour capacity of three cars per bay, it
 does in fact have a circulation plan that in our judgment
 works, the circulation plan incidentally works off of the
 internal circulation of the shopping center itself, ather
 than creating new accessways from either Goucher
 Louisand of Putty Hill Read.

Purther, at Page 9 of the transcript record, Mr. Gavrelis testified:

"With respect to compliance with Section 502.1 of the zoning regulations, I would say that from a planning

viewpoint that the car wash 'acility located within the shopping center complex itself, with no external other scoss, world certafry not, from a planning viewpoint, tend to create congestion in the roads, streets or alleys therein.

We have no knowledge that car weakes do offer any hazard with report to fire, panle, or other dangers, with respect to overcrowding the land or causing under concentration of population, we don't see any involvement between the car west and that standard hers pointing out again that the area is zoned commercial, it is used for parking, and that the car weak is sent internal feature really of the shopping conter at large.

Cartainly we don't believe that the car wash would interfare with provisions for schools, parks, transportation, or other public requirements. We don't really know its impact on the utility cystem, but I can't recall any adverse comment by the Public Works people, water or sewer facilities, when the petition was recessed.

I don't think that the car wash ought necessarily to interfere with adequate light or air. Since it is fairly reneved from any adjoining or abutting tract on the roads adjacent to this, to start with, plus the institutional use of Calvert Hall.

A number of protestants 'estified adversely to the granting of the potition. However, a fair analysis of their testimony was to the effect that the Eudowood Shopping Plaza itself had affected the neighborhood in which they resided in an adverse menner, including its unsightliness, its effect on the values of their properties and the noise and illumination during the nightline as a detriment to the enjoyment and value of their properties. The eroction of the our wash would amount to but one additional outling in the greently certablished shougher center complex.

While there is testimony to the effect that the operation of the car wash, in the opinion of several witnesses, will increase the amount of traffic on their roads, yet the record is uncontradicted that there will be no securate entrance provided for the car wash, but all users will emanate from

the shopping center complex itself. As stated by Mr. Gevrells, this certainly would not, from a planning viewpoint, tend to create congestion in the roads, streets or alleve. 7 (6.9)

The principal and perhaps the only material complaint concerning the operation of the car wash was the effect of the possible use of the facility as a teen-age hangout due to the unattended 24 hour operation of the business. The Court cannot help but conclude that this is pure speculation on the part of these witnesses as they gave no reasons as to this conclusion other than that Ameche's, which is somewhere in the neighborhood, attracts a name of consequent in relation to its business. It also would appear that this operation would attract teon-agers no more than the general shopping area of the consequence of th

The Board, in its opinion, stated "The protestants, who mainly reside in the Fellowship Porest community, south of the subject site and ecross Goucher Soulevard, oppose the Special Exception mainly on the grounds that there was not any need for the car wash; that it would be unsightly; and that they particularly objected to the 24 hour unstiended operation, several witnesses stating that in their opinion they fear it would become a meeting place for teen-agers in the early A.M. and that lack of adequate policing would create an undesirable situation in the naishborhood."

The artist's drawing of the proposed facility would indicate that the building would not be unattractive and the opinion of the protestants that this area would become a meeting place for teen-opers is entirely speculative and based on no substantive evidence. The Board's opinion concluded: "The Board cannot find that the granting of the Special Ecception would in one way violate.

7, id 6-29-61

-5-

Section 502.1, sub-sections B through F. However, the Board does find that the <u>possible</u> unsightliness of the proposed building and the 24 hour unattended operation would be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfers of the locality impliesd."

The Court is of the opinion that the Board in refusing the granting of the Special Exception acted arbitrarily; that the testimony in this case before the Board did not present a reasonably debat, ble question; that the decision of the Board was not based on substantial evidence and that the Order of the Board should be assured.

The Order of the Board of Appeals in this case, dated February 3, 1967, is therefore reversed and this case is remanded to the Board for the granting of the Special Exception and imposition of such conditions, restrictions or regulations as may be decreed necessary or advisable for the protection of surrounding and heighboring properties in accordance with Section 502.2 of the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations.

June 27, 1967

rate & Barut

RE: PCTITION FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION:
for a Car Wash
NE CORNER Putty Hill Road and
Goucher Boulevard,
9th District
Eudowood Shopping Plazo, Inc.,
Battiener.

BEFORE
COUNTY BOARD OF APPEALS

OF

BALTIMORE COUNTY

No. 67-18-X

OPINION

The petitioner in this case scake a special exception for a self service car wash on the southwest corner of the existing Eu loward Shopping Center packing Icr. The property is zoned Business-Local and a car wish is a permitted use as a special exception in a Business-Local zone.

The petitioner proposes to creet a structure 176 feet by 30 feet, with a height of 24 feet, and proposes five light standards on poles to illuminate the building. The construction of the proposed building is cinder block with steel roof and sides, with automobile bays 16 feet by 30 feet. The petitioner proposes a self service ccin operated car wash that would be open twenty-four hours a day but would have an attendant on duty and during the daylight bours.

Before granting any special exception the Board must find that the granting of the requested special exception will not in any way violate Section. 502.1, subsections a through f. The owner testified that the proposal met all the requirements of Section 419 of the Zoning Regulations, which is the section of the Zoning Regulations that sets up special requirements for car waches in addition to those of Section 502.1. The pathioner produced restimany that, in his opinion, the use would not create traffic congestion or finding problems on the streets surrounding the shopping center.

George E. Gavrelis, Director of Planning for Baltimore County, was summaned by the petitioner, and while he did not offer any apposition to the proposed use he did state that if the special exception were granted, the petitioner should be allowed to use only the existing shopping center antrance and, further, that the plan as submitted by the petitioner did not make adequate provision for screening or parking.

The protestants, who mainly reside in the Fellowship Forest consmunity south of the subject site and across Goucher Boulevard, opposed the special exception mainly on the grounds that there wo not any need for the car wast; that it would be unsightly; and that they particularly objected to the twenty-four hour unattended operation, several witnesses stating that, in their opinion, they feared it would become a meeting place for icensages awing the early A.M. hours, and that the lack of adequate policing would create an undesirable situation within the neighborhood. They also objected for aesthetic reasons.

Eudowood Shopping Plaza, Inc. - #67-18-X

. . .

The Board cannot find that the granting of the special exception would in any way violate Section 502.1, subsections b through f. However, the Board does find that the possible unsight lines of the proposed building and the twenty-four hour unattended operation would "be detrimental to the health, safety, and general welfare of the locality involved."

- 2 -

ORDER

For the reasons set forth in the aforegoing Opinion, it is this 9th day of February, 1967 by the County Board of Appeals, ORDERED that the special exception 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 cdition.

COUNTY BOARD OF APPEALS OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

William S. Baldwin, Chairman

John A. Slowik

NOTE: Mr. Paul T. McHenry, Jr. sat at the hearing of this case, however, his term expired prior to the Board's decision and hence, Mr. McHenry did not vate on this

PETITION FOR ZONING RE-CLASSIFICATION AND/OR SPECIAL EXCEPTION

| AND/OR SPECIAL EXCERTION | |
|--|------------------|
| TO THE ZONING COMMISSIONER OF BALTIMORE COUNTY: | |
| Lear we. Tenant and legal owner of the property situate County and which is described in the description and plat attached hereto and made a hereby petition (1) that the avaing status of the herein described property be re-classif | part hereof, # 7 |
| to the Zoning Law of Baitimore County, from an | NE-98 |
| | 2/2:/6: |

| | and (2) | for a Special | Exception, | under | the | said | Zoning | Law | and | Zoning | Regulations | of | Baltim |
|---|---------|---------------|-------------|---------|------|------|--------|-----|-----|--------|-------------|----|--------|
| j | County | to use the i | herein desc | ribed p | горе | rty. | for | Car | Was | sh | | | |

Property is to be posted and advertised as prescribed by Zoning Regulations. I, or we, agree to pay expenses of above re-classification and or Special Exception advertising. posting, etc., upon filing of this petition, and further agree to and are to be bound by the zoning posting, etc., upon nang or this periton, and lander agree and the Zoning Law for Baltimore

| - | . C. CCHPORATION |
|--------|--|
| - 18.8 | point Controct purchaser |
| 9: 2 | enant / Contract purchaser |
| (S) | 215 West Fayette Etreet |
| - | ACCES 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10 |

Lagal Owner NORMAN M. KRANZDORF outhor (WC

ELDOWOOD SHOPPING PLAZA INC.

Ligare Lide!

Protestant's Attorney

No.41082

DATE 2/28/67

| | | | | himle o. | |
|-----|-----|--------|----|----------------------|--|
| | 10 | Light | st | etitioner's Attorney | |
| esi | Bal | timore | | Md. 21202 | |

use 4that the enhired matter of this petition be advertised as required by the Zoning Law of Baltimore County, in two newspapers of general circulation through-

| out Baltimore Co | unty, that | property b | e poste | d, an | i that th | e public | hearing | be h | ad before | the Zon |
|------------------|------------|------------|---------|-------|-----------|----------|----------|-------|-----------|---------|
| Commissioner of | Baltimor. | County in | Room | 106, | County | Office | Building | in | Towson, | Baltim |
| County, on the | 271 | h 10 | Jay | of | A | ıly | | ilia, | . 6 | /11,00 |

DEPUTY Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County

TELEPHONE 823-3000

BALTHORE COUNTY, MARYAND

ty dough lover

OFFICE OF FINANCE

Division of Collection and Receipts COURT HOUSE TOWSGN, MARYLAND 21204

George W. White, Jr., Esq. 10 Light Staret en. Maryland 21202

BILLED

| EPOSIT TO | ACCOUNT NO. 01,712 | \$5.00 |
|-----------|---|--------|
| | JETACH UPPER SECTION AND RETURN WITH YOUR REMITTANCE | COST |
| | Cost of certified documents - File No. 67-18-X | 5.00 |
| | Endewsed Shapping Plato, Inc. NE cor Putry Hill Road and Gouches coalewand 9th District | 5.0 |
| | Ø ₹-147 (175) + *12700 €29 | 5.0 |
| 1.5 | 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.

> CERTIFICATE OF POSTING ZONING DEPARTMENT OF BALTIMORE COUNTY Towner, Maryland

| District | Date of Posts | ing |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------|
| Posted for | | |
| Petitioner: | Orth Hill Law Ton | - Elec |
| Location of property: | J. E. E. G. Att B | |
| Location of Signs: | As Markey Africa | |
| July Car Car | <u> 184 : Francis Tha</u> | |
| Remarks: | Coll Date of return | 11-3-66 |
| Posted by | Date of return | J |

| Pursuant to the advertisen | nent, posting of preperty, and public hearing on the above p | etition ar |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------|
| it appearing that by reason of | the requirements of Section 502.1 of the Ba | altimor |
| County Zoning Regulation | ons having been met | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| the above: Reskassification about | kk des hader ude it efecthon appearing that the concentration | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | *************************************** | |
| | r washshould be | |
| | ning Commissioner of Baltimore County this | |
| day of September 1 | 196 ⁶ that::tt:exhavolandescribud::propertyxos::area::ahoul | Moberan |
| the same is thereby ree lassified; f | nomen | |
| gun and una Special Exception | for a Car wash should be and th | e same i |
| Burel of Public Service | te of this order, subject to approval of the site pins and the Office of Planning and Zoning, Luxue DEPUTYZoning Commissioner of Baltimore | 21 |
| and it appearing that by reason | ent, posting of property and public hearing on the above of | |
| | | |
| | d NOT BE HAD, and/or the Special Exception should | |
| IT IS ORDERED by the Zon | ing Commissioner of Baltimore County, this | day |
| | that the above re-classification be and the same is | |
| | cribed property or area be and the same is hereby continue | |
| | | |
| | be and the same is he eby | |
| | Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore | Count |

BALTTHORE COUNTY, MARYLAND OFFICE OF FINANCE Division of Collection and Receipts COURT HOUSE TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

No.39412 DATE 7/1/66

4 67-18.4

Wite, Mindel & Clarke To: Hesers. Bucknester, M 10 Light Street BILLED Zoning Dept. of Beltin. Co.

| | DETACH UPPER SECTION AND RETURN WITH YOUR REMITTANCE | \$50.00 |
|----------|---|-------------|
| QUANTITY | Patition for Special Exception for Euchanod Shopping Plaza, I #67-18-X | |
| | 7/13 - E. Soy - Colon M. | GOspitRooms |
| | 2166 5513 = 29412 | 5000 - |
| | 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.

> CERTIFICATE OF POSTING O DEPARTMENT OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

| 0 th | Date of Posting 7-7-66 |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| District | |
| Posted for Hadania Com | all 27-66 197 11:00 9.71 |
| Endaward She | Janes Colones and |
| Petitioner: | Porte His Ricans |
| ocation of property: 10 NE/Gov. | |
| and or project | a Punta Blod. |
| | L I al l'agressio Contr |
| location of Signs | |
| | ill are from the |
| - MT-Alle Adeleration and a second | |
| Remarks: | |
| 11 41 -2 | 01 7.74-56 |
| Posted by | Date of return: |
| Signature | |

AUSTIN W. BRIZENDINE



Petition No. 87-18-X Petition for Special Exception on N/E corner of Putty Hill and Coucher Boulevard--Eudowood Shopping Plaza, Inc.

Please enter an appeal in the above entitled matter from the decision and Order of the Deputy Zoning Commissioner passed on September 20th, 1966, on behalf of the following:

Dr. and Mrs. George H. Brouillett, 602 Lake Drive Mr. J. H. Feldmann, 607 Hillen Road Mrs. Marian Yeaple, 619 Hillen Road

Enclosed please find a check in the amount of \$70.00 payable to Baltimore County, Maryland.

Very truly yours, Late Illia Flichard C. Murray

RCH/ tw

inclosure

PETITION FOR PETAL

NETTION TO SEPTION

TO SHE SETTION

TO SHE SETION

TO SHE SETTION

TO SHE SETTION

TO SHE SETTION

TO SHE SETTION

TO SHE

ing. aing 0.5518 acres mor

Containing 0.538 acres more or less. In property of Eudo-Belging Depoyers of Eudo-Belging Plaza, line, as above on pilat plan filed with the Zonling Department. Hearing Date Weednesday, July 27, 1966 at 11:06 A.M. 27, 1967 at 11:

CC: George W. White, Jr., Esquire

RS:LEM.

ORIGINAL.

OFFICE OF THE BALTIMOR COUNTIAN

THE COMMUNITY NEWS

No. I Newburg Avenue

CATONSVILLE, MD.

July 19, 1966.

THIS IS TO CERTIFY, that the annexed advertisement of sdward D. Hardesty, Deputy Zoning Count ssioner of Bultimore County

was inserted in THE BALTIMORE COUNTIAN, a group of thras weekly newspapers published in Baltimore County, Mary land, once a week for suggestive weeks before the 19th day of July,

the same was inserted in the issues of July 7, 1966.

THE BALTIMORE COUNTIAN

By Paul I Morray Editor and Manager & M. State Registered NSPF

DAVID W. POHMER omulting Engineerin Land Surveying - Site Plannin 114 W. 25th Street B.L. M.Lauru

April 25, 1966

SEC.3. DESCRIPTION OF PART OF EUDOWOOD SHOPPING CENTER, 9th DISTRICT, WE-9

Beginning for the same at a point measured the two following 7133 coirses and distances from the 75.00-foot cucoff at the intersection of the North side of Putty Hill Road 94 Feet wide and the East side of Goucher Boulevard 110 feet wide, as shown on a Plat of Section Three Loch Raven Manor, recorded among the and seconds of Baltimore County in Plat Book G.L.B. No. 23, folio 122, down 35 Degrees 40 Minutes 50 Seconds East measured along the North side of said Putty Hill Road 94.25 feet and North 4 Degrees 19 Mantes 10 Seconds West 5.00 feet, and running thence borth 4 Legrees 19 Minutes 10 Seconds West 120.00 feet, North 85 lagrees 40 Missies 50 Seconds hast 200.00 feet, South 4 Degrees 19 Minutes 10 Seconds East 120.00 feet, and running thence parallel to and at the distance of 5.00 feet measured at right angles from the North side of Party Hill Road herein referred to South 85 Degrees 40 Minutes 50 Seconds west 200.00 feet to the place of beginning

Containing 0.5518 acres more or less.



BAIRINGUE COUNTY OFFICE OF PLAINING AND ZONING COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING TOWNS, MATLAND 21204

George W. White, Esquire 10 Light Street Baltimore, Maryland 21202

SUBJECT: Special Scomption - Car Section Research Sharpting Flace, Incade of Sharpting Flace, Incade of Section 1313 Food and Gouchay Soul, 9th District (Jen 1, June 22, 5)

The Ecning Advisory Condities has reviewed the subject petition and makes

BERNALL BOTHLE THOSE in Futty Hill Roos, seter - Adeting 70° water in Futty Hill Roos, Sever - Relating 5° sever in Gouchy toulerary, Adequacy of extetting willities to be determined by developer or his engineer. Home - All roots are existing out and gutter rouns to which Lo further improvements are necessary.

BURAU OF TRAFFIC ENGINEERING: The plan as shown appears to be satisfactory.

ZERIM ADDITIONATION DIVINION Parking data should be provided indicating the total number of parking spaces required for the entire chopping center.

The above coveres are LoS intended to indicate the appropriateness of the soning action requested, but to assure that all parties are node sours of plans or problems that may have a bearing on this case. The Pirector manifer the Deputy Circuter of the Office of Planning and Roning will substreementations on the appropriatement of the requested soning 10 days before the Foning Constantoner's hearing.

The following members had no comment to effer:

Fire Dureau Health Appartment Industrial Development Commission Hourd of Education Building Department State Rods Commission

oo: Mr. Carlyle Broam-Boreau of Engineering Mr. C. Richard Moore-Bureau of Trailin Engineering



| OFFICE | CORRESPONDENCE | #67-18 |
|--------|----------------|--------|
| | | |

| TO Mr. John G Rose, Zoning Commissioner Date July 15, | TO | Mr. John G | kose, Zoning | Commissioner | Date July 15, |
|---|----|------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
|---|----|------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|

Petition 167-18-X. Northeast corner of Putty Hill Road & Goucher Boulevard. Eudowood Shopping Plaza Inc. - Petitio

FROM George E. Gavrelis, Director of Planning

HEARING: Wednesday, July 27, 1966. (11:00 A.M.)

The planning staff of the Office of Planning and Zoning has reviewed the subject petition and offers the following comment:

We agree in principle with the notion of locating car wasles on shopping center sites. The Project Planning Division of this office will require certain additions and detail alexations in its review of the site plan. These will deal with the provision of landscaping, screening, lighting, etc.

This case concerns a petition for a special exception filed by the appelless, Endowood Shopping Plaza, Inc. (as legal owner) and the J. C. Corporation (as lessee contingent on zoning), to the zoning commissioner of Baltimore County. The petition requested a special exception to allow the erection and operation of a self-service car wash on a part of what is now the parking lot of the Eudowood Shoppt - Plana. The deputy zoning commissioner had originally granted the special exception but the County Board of Appeals denied the appellees' request, finding that it would "be detrimental to the health, safety, and general welfare of the locality involved." An appeal was taken to the Gircuit Court for Baltimore County where Judge Barrett reversed the Board, holding that its decision "was not based on substantial evidence." All of the appellants appeared as protestants before the Board and had answered and argued the appeal to the Circuit Court. All are residents of the immediate neighborhood and a subdivision known as Fellowship

The proposed car wash is described as a building 30 feet wide, 171 feet 10 inches long and 24 feet high, to be built of cinder block with steel sidings and roof. The proposed building would be fully enclosed and the actual washing will be in ten bays which could be entered from the parking area in fr at of the building, which is of sufficient size to hold forty automobiles.

The building was to be situated on a 120 feet by 200 feet area near the southwest corner of the shopping center parking lot, at the intersection of Putty Hill Road and Goucher Boulevard, in

| Exception for a C.r Wash. LOCATION: Northeast corner of Putty Bill Road and Goucher Boulevard. | |
|---|--|
| DATE & TIME West way, July 17, 1946 at 11:00 AM. PUNLIC HEARING: Room 104, County Office Building, 111 W. Chesapeake Avenue, Towson, Md. | |
| The Deputy Zoning Commissioner of Baltimere County, by suthority of the Zoning Act and Regulations of Baltimore County, will hold a public hearing. Petition for fr-ctal Exception for a Car Wash. | |
| All that parce, of land in the Ninth District of Ballimore County. Beginning for the same at point measured the two following courses and distances from the 78.00 foot cutoff at the intersection of the | |
| North side of Patty Hill Road 14 feet wide and the East side of Geocher Boulevard 116 feet wide, as shown on a Plat of Section Three Loch Raven Manor, recorded among the Land Records of Baltimove County in Fink Book G.L.B. No. 22, | |
| County in Piat Book G.L.B. No. 21, folio 112, North 45 Degrees to Minutes 50 Seconds East measured along the North side of mid Put'y Hill Road 54.25 feet and North 4 Digrees 15 Minutes 15 F-2conds West 1-00 feet, and running thence | |
| North 6 Degrees 19 Minu a 10 Seconds West 120.00 feet, North 55 Degrees 46 Minutes 10 Seconds East 200.00 feet, South 6 Degrees 19 | |

CERTIFICATE OF PUBLICATION

TOWSON WD July 7 10 66 THIS IS TO CERTIFY, that the annexed advertisement was published in THE JEFFERSONIAN is weakly nevertance printed and published in Towson, Baltimore County, Md. The Property ox 1 Time nuccessive weeks before the 27th appearing on the are day of July 10 66 THE IFFEEDSONIAN

| make and | | |
|-----------|----------------|--|
| Occase Me | White, Soquir | |
| 10 Light | Street | |
| | o, Maryland 21 | |

BALTIMORE COUNTY OFFICE OF FLANNING AND ZONING

County Office Building 111 W. Chesapeake Aven Towson, Maryland 21204

Your petition has been received and accepted for filing this 21 _ day of June

Petitioner Endowood Shooping Plana, Inc.

Petitioner's Attorney George N. White Reviewed by

the Towson area of Baltimore County. Immediately adjacent to the shopping center are: a tract to the north and west being developed for apartments; a tract south of Putty Hill Road and wert of Goucher Boulevard known as the Fellowship Porest Apartments; Calvert Hall High Sensol to the south; to the east are dwellings zoned as group housen and to the north of that is a parking let. zoned industrial.

The shopping center property is now zoned Business-Local and was given this classification on the comprehensive zoning map of 1955. Under this classification a car wash is a permitted use only if it is authorized by the granting of a special exception. The proposed business would be operated on a twenty-four hour, seven day a week basis and would be unattended from 5:30 p.m. until 9:00 a.m. At the hearing before the Board there was testimony from Ira James Alligood, a witness for the appellees, who owned three similar businesses in York, Pennsylvania, that such an operation would not be feasible unless carried out on the above basis. He also testified that ten to fifteen per cent of the business was done between 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. while the operation was unattended. He further testified that "Sunday morning, from 8:00 a.m. to noon, it is full if the weather is clear * * *. So that is one of the maximum periods.

The real party in interest is the J. C. Corporation which had, at the time of the hearing, negotiated a lease for the subject property with the Eudowood Snopping Plaza, Inc., the lease to be contingent on obtaining the special exception. The J. C. Corporation was organized for the specific purpose of operating the proposed

| TELEPHONE BAS SOOO | OFFIC Direction | E COUNTY, I CE OF FIN Islam of Collection and Re- COURT HOUSE INVSON, MARYLAND 2 | ANCE | Ma.39 |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| TC-10 Light Str. Britisars, it | 100 1100 1100 1100 1100 1100 1100 1100 | | Miles Sentent | . |
| DEPOSIT TO ACCOUNT HO. | Mades Detach upper sec | TION AND RETURN WITH YOU | UR REMITTANCE | |
| | ing and posting of | | and Supplies Place | , los. |
| | | 720- | Edwindown via | Officers House |
| | | \$-2266 7635 | • 39470 114 | 53 |
| 4 | | | | S .(|
| MAIL TO DIVISION PLEASE RETURN L | OF COLLECTION PPER SECTION O | & RECEIPTS. CO | URT HOUSE TON | VEON 4 MAE |
| MAIL TO DIVISION | OF COLLECTION O | A RECEIPTS, CO | YOUR REMITTANG | VSON 4, MAF |
| MAIL TO DIVISION PLEASE RETURN L TELEPHONE 623-3000 | BALTIMORI OFFIC | A RECEIPTS, CO OF THIS BILL WITH | MARYLAND ANCE | VEON 4 MAE |
| MAIL TO DIVISION PLEASE RETURN L TELEPHONE 623-3000 | BALTIMORI OFFIC | INVOICE E COUNTY, N E OF FIN. Sies of Collection and Rec- COURT HOUSE | MARYLAND ANCE | No. 42 |
| MAIL TO DIVISION PLEASE RETURN L TELEPHONE 623-3000 | BALTIMORI OFFICE Direction of the control of the co | I & RECEIPTS, COPF THIS BILL WITH INVOICE E COUNTY, N E OF FIN. COURT HOUSE COURT HOUSE WHON, MARYLAND 21 | MARYLAND ANCE | No. 42 |
| MAIL TO DIVISION PLEASE RETURN L TELEPHONE 823-3000 To: Riches Legal Teles DEPORT TO ACCOUNT HO. SUARTITY | BALTIMORI OFFIC Divisorio proporio del Company del Com | A RECEIPTS, CC OF THIS BILL WITH INVOICE E COUNTY, N E OF FIN, the of Collection and Rec OUNTY HOUSE MANUAL HOUSE IN AND RETURN WITH WITH IN AND RETURN WITH VIOLEN IN AND RETURN | MARYLAND ANCE OFFIce of Plan Toman, Reyle AMITTANO AMITTANO AMITTANO Tamen, Reyle | No. 4, MAI |
| MAIL TO DIVISION PLEASE RETURN L TELEPHONE 823-3000 To: Richae Legisl Teles DEPOSIT TO ACCOUNT HO. SUARTITY Cont. | BALTIMORI OFFIC Divisorio proporio del Company del Com | A RECEIPTS, CC OF THIS BILL WITH INVOICE E COUNTY, N E OF FIN, the of Collection and Rec OUNTY HOUSE MANUAL HOUSE IN AND RETURN WITH WITH IN AND RETURN WITH VIOLEN IN AND RETURN | MARYLAND ANCE OFFIce of Planting Street, Stre | Ma. 42 Ma. 42 DATE 16/ Top 21days For 21days |

car wash and firty per cent of its capital stock is owned by Mr. Chris William George, who operated a car rental agency and who has no experience with a car wash operation.

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

> One of the questions presented to us is whether the Board's Mediaton was based on substantial evidence produced before it. We believe that it was and that the evidence presented for the Board's determination a question which was fairly debatable. Consequently, the Circuit Court was in error and should have permitted the decision of the Board to stand. The zoning authority is presumed to pessess the expertise necessary for deciding the matters brought before it and if its decision is based on substantial evidence then the courts may not substitute their Judgment for that of the zoning authority. As we stated in Crowther, Inc. v. Johnson, 225 Ma. 379, 383, 170 A. 2d 763:

No. 379, 385, 170 A. 22 703:

" • • • conditions upon which a special execution may be granted are set out in the continuace, and the board is given a size lattices of absention to parallal upon special exceptions of the resolution and is in heremony with the general purpose shore resulting no large plan and will not undersoly affect the use of miss souther plan and will not undersoly affect the use of miss souther plan and will not undersoly affect the use of miss approximate and the criticanse. Durster v. Board of Contin Appeals, 20, Mal. 367, 104 A. 28 (531); Erman v. Board of Contin Appeals, supra [212 M. 293, 129 A. 21 [21]; M. Leproscy Co. v. Morlanda [212 M. 293, 129 A. 21 [21]; M. Leproscy Co. v. Morlanda [213 M. 293, 129 A. 21 [21]; M. Leproscy Co. v. Morlanda [214].

In the present case the Board had before it the following evidence on which it could have relied to reach the result that it did:

- "(a) That the proposed use would be clearly visible to a residential area with home values of \$45,000.00 and more.
- (b) The use will be conducted by one who is unfamiliar with the business.
- (c) No studies or surveys have been made to determine the amount of business anticipated.

1-174 ZONING FILE NO. 67-18-X IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYIAND No. 215 September Term, 1967 CEORGE H. BROULLETT, et al. v EUDOWOOD SHOPPING PLAZA, INC., et al. Opinion by Marbury, J. Filed: May 2, 1968

Re'd 5/6/68 9.300 40

- Residents of the area testified to other car wash facilities in the general area, pointing out a lack of neighborhood.
- The plan as presented was inadequate, particularly as to screening, lighting and the organization of parking aisles.
- (f) The impact of such a use on public utilities is 'unknown,
- (E) No information was furnished as to the number and type of signs to be creeted asvertising the use.
- (h) This type of car such 'is rather a rare thing! In this portion of the county.
- (1) The Di vector of planning, the sole expert called by the Appellees, was unable to state if this type of operation would not not never all affect the neighborhood.
- (j) Pive outside light standards were proposed, but no one had any loca as to their type, neight, wattage of illumination.
- Business will continue throughout the night every night (Sunday included) with possibly fifteen per cent of the total business being done between 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m.
- (1) Despite the around-the-eleck operation, no attendant will be furnished after 5:30 p.m. or before 9:00 a.s.
- (m) The busiest periods will be on weekends.
- (n) On Sunday mornings the cer wash is expected to be full. It is one of the 'maximum periods.'
- (o) Unless the Appelless can operate seven days a week, 24 hours a day the use is not economically feasible."

These items of syldence taken cumulatively gave the Board legally sufficient grounds for denying the special exception.

A further reason in support of the Board's action in denying the special exception was the appellees' failure to adduce sufficient evidence that the requested use would not "be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of the locality involved."

In a hearing for a special exception where the requested use is permitted under the existing zoning classification the applicant need only show that the use is consistent with the existing classification and that it would not be adverse to the welfare of the neighborhood. In the case of Oursler v. Bd. of Zoning Appeals, 397, 402, 104 A.2d 568, 204 Md. where the application was for a special exception permitting a restaurant in Baltimore County, we said:

"** * in Baltimore County, where restaurants are prima facto permissible in residential zones, an applicant for a permit to conduct a restaurant in a residential zone is not required to show that denial of a permit would result in 'practical diffliculty, or unnecessary or unreasonable hardenip,' as in the case of a variance, but must show only that the exception would be in harmony with the zoning plan and would not be detrimental to the welfare of the neighborhood."

Accord, County Commissioners v. Luria, 249 Md. 1, 238 A. 2d 108; Montgomery Co. v. Merlands Club, Supra. In the instant case the appelless did not show that the proposed use would be in conformity with the zoning regulation, i.e., that it would not "be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of the locality involved." Baltimore County Zoning Regulations, Sec. 502.1 a.

Their only expert to testify on this aspect of the case, Er. George E. Gavrelis, Director of Planning, who had studied the proposed site plan, stated in answer to a question as to the effect of the car wash on the community, that "this kind of car wash, at least in this portion of the county, is a rather rare thing, and I don't have any personal experience on which to form a judgment. I don't really know." This being the only testimony on this subject the Board was justified in finding, as it did, that the application should be denied. Under the facts of the case before us the action taken by the Board of Zoning Appeals was justified. ORDER REVERSED AND ORDER OF BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS REINSTATED; COSTS TO BE PAID BY APPELLEES.

