POER

PETITION FOR ZONING VARIANCE

The undersigned, legal owner(s) 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 for a

of the Zoning Regulations of Baltimore County, to the Zoning Law of Baltimore County; for the following reasons: (indicate hardship or practical difficulty)

TO THE ZONING COMMISSIONER OF BALTIMORE COUNTY:

1. Slope in rear

in lieu of the required rear yard.

Variance from Section 400.1 to permit an acessary structure

2. Trees are about 50' tall

Property is to be posted and advertised as prescribed by Zoning Regulations.

(14' satellite dish) to be located in the front yard

Zoning Description

County on the __11th_____ day of _December ____, 19_85_, at _10:30 o'clock

Beginning at a point on the Northwest side of Larch Road (50' wide) 200' Northeast of Ranelagh Road and known as Lot 5 and part of Lot 1, Block L as shown on Plat N. 2 of Darryl Gardens. Which is recorded on the Land Records of Baltimore County in Liber 13, Folio 150 Known as 11702 Larch Road in the 11th Election District.

I, or we, agree to pay expenses of above Variance advertising, posting, etc., upon filing of the 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.

36-246-121

Phone No.

December 12, 1985 Mr. and Mrs. Peter A. Synodinos 11702 Larch Road White Marsh, Maryland 21162

> RE: PETITION FOR VARIANCE NW/S of Larch Road, 200! NE of Ranlagh Road (11702 Larch Road) - -11th Election District Peter A. Synodinos, et ux, Petitioners * Case No. 86-246-A

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Synodinos:

The hearing date to continue the above subject Petition will be Tuesday, February 4, 1986 at 9:30 a.m. in Room 106 of the County Office Building, 111 W. Chesapeake Avenue, Towson, Maryland.

> Sincerely yours, JEAN M. H. JUNG Deputy Zoning Commissioner

County, this _____ day of February, 1986, that the herein Petition for ER RECEIVED FOR FILING Variance to permit an accessory structure (14 foot satellite dish) to be located in the front yard in lieu of the required rear yard is hereby GRANTED, from and after the date of this Order.

cc: People's Counsel

variances should be granted.

IN RE: PETITION FOR VARIANCE

rear yard.

NW/S of Larch Road, 200'

NE of Ranelagh Road

(11702 Larch Road)

11th Election District

Peter Synodinos, et ux,

Petitioners

designated location. There were no Protestants.

* * * * * * * * * *

(14 foot satellite dish) to be located in the front yard in lieu of the required

dish sales, installation and service company, indicated that the slope of the

site and adjacent property, as well as the existing 70 foot high trees,

prohibited the installation of a dish anywhere on the property except the

pearing that strict compliance with the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations

would result in practical difficulty and unreasonable hardship upon the Peti-

tioners and the granting of the variance requested would not adversely affect

the health, safety, and general welfare of the community, and, therefore, the

Therefore, IT IS ORDERED by the Deputy Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore

After due consideration of the testimony and evidence presented, and it ap-

The Petitioners herein request a variance to permit an accessory structure

Testimony by the Petitioner, confirmed by a representative of a satellite

of Baltimore County

BEFORE THE

DEPUTY ZONING COMMISSIONER

OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

Case No. 86-246-A

BALTIMORE COUNTY OFFICE OF PLANNING & ZONING TOWSON, MARYLAND 21294 494-3353 ARNOLD JABLON ZONING COMMISSIONER

JEAN M. H. JUNG DEPUTY ZONING COMMISSIONER

February 6, 1986

Mr. & Mrs. Peter A. Synodinos 11702 Larch Road White Marsh, MD 21162

> RE: PETITION FOR VARIANCE NW/S of Larch Road, 200' NE of Ranelagh Road (11702 Larch Road) -11th Election District Peter Synodinos, et ux, Petitioners Case No. 86-246-A

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Synodinos:

I have this date passed my Order in the above captioned matter in accordance with the attached.

> Very truly yours, Députy Zoning Commissioner

Attachments cc: People's Counsel

11th Election District

LOCATION: Northwest side of Larch Road, 200' Northeast of Ranelagh Road

(11702 Larch Road)

DATE AND TIME: Wednesday, December 11, 1985 at 10:30 a.m. PUBLIC HEARING:

Room 106, County Office Building, 111 West Chesapeake Avenue, Towson, Maryland

The Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County, by authority of the Zoning Act and Regulations of Baltimore County, will hold a public hearing:

Petition for Variance from Section 400.1 to permit an accessory structure (14 foot satellite dish) to be located in the front yard in lieu of the

required rear yard.

Being the property of Peter A. Synodinos, et ux the plat filed with the Zoning Office.

In the event that this Petition is granted, a building permit may be issued within the thirty (30) day appeal period. The Zoning Commissioner will, however, entertain any request for a stay of the issuance of said permit during this period for good cause shown. Such request must be received in writing by the date of the hearing set above or made at the hearing.

> BY ORDER OF ARNOLD JABLON ZONING COMMISSIONER OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

RE: PETITION FOR VARIANCE NW/S Larch Rd., 200' NE of Ranelagh Rd. (11702 Larch Rd.), 11th District

Petitioners

: BEFORE THE ZONING COMMISSIONER OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

PETER A. SYNODINOS, et ux, Case No. 86-246-A

> ::::::: ENTRY OF APPEARANCE

Please enter the appearance of the People's Counsel in the abovecaptioned matter. Notices should be sent of any hearing dates or other proceedings in this matter and of the passage of any preliminary or final

> Phyllis Cole Friedman Phyllis Cole Friedman People's Counsel for Baltimore County Peter Max Tumenan

Peter Max Zimmerman Deputy People's Counsel Rm. 223, Court House Towson, MD 21204 494-2188

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 19th day of November, 1985, a copy of the foregoing Entry of Appearance was mailed to Mr. and Mrs. Peter A. Synodinos, 11702 Larch Rd., White Marsh, MD 21162, Petitioners.

Leter Max Zumanna

BALTIMORE COUNTY
OFFICE OF PLANNING & ZONING
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204
494-3353

ARNOLD JABLON ZONING COMMISSIONER

December 5, 1985

JEAN M. H. JUNG DEPUTY ZONING COMMISSIONER

Mr. & Mrs. Peter A. Synodinos 11702 Larch Road White Marsh, Maryland 21162

RE: Petition for Variance NW/S Larch Rd., 200' NE Ranelagh Rd. (11702 Larch Road) 11th Election District Peter A. Synodinos, et ux - Petitioners Case No. 86-246-A

Dear Mr. Synodinos:

This is to advise you that \$48.99 is due for advertising and posting of the above property. This fee must be paid before an Order is issued.

THIS FEE MUST BE PAID AND THE ZONING SIGN AND POST RETURNED ON THE DAY OF THE HEARING OR THE ORDER SHALL NOT BE ISSUED.

Do not remove sign from property from the time it is placed by this office until the day of the hearing itself.

BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND OFFICE OF FINANCE - REVENUE DIVISION MISCELLANEOUS CASH RECEIPT

ing. Towson, Haryland

Peter A. Synodings Advertising and Posting __ 960365-A

BO BOTO ***** 4 50 S: 8 4 2 13 % F

VALIDATION OR SIGNATURE OF CUSHIER

County, Maryland, and remit

AMGUNT \$ 48.99

Mr. & Mrs. Peter A. Synodinos 11702 Larch Road White Marsh, Maryland 21162

> NOTICE OF HEARING Re: Petition for Variance NW/S Larch Rd., 200' NE Ranelagh Rd.

(11702 Larch Rd.) 11th Election District Peter A. Synodinos, et ux - Petitioners Case No. 86-246-A

County

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

PLACE: Room 106, County Office Building, 111 West Chesapeake Avenue, Towson, Maryland

BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND OFFICE OF FINANCE - REVENUE DIVISION No. 012312 MISCELLANEOUS CASH/RECEIFT

VALIDATION OR SIGNATURE OF CASHIER

BROWN & FINN CHARTERED

> . . . [T] he presumption of validity that traditionally attends a local government's exercise of its zoning powers carries little, if any, weight where the zoning regulation trenches on rights of expression protected under the First Amendment.

Schad v. Borough of Mt. Ephraim, supra, 452 U.S. at 77 (Blackmun concurring).

It must be remembered that home satellite antennas can receive a variety of programming that cannot be obtained from any other source. The fact that some satellite programming may be received by an alternative means, such as by subscribing to cable television systems, will not validate an unconstitutional prohibition of access through the use of dish antennas. Virginia State Board of Pharmacy v. Virginia Citizens' Consumer Council, 425 U.S. 748, 757 n.15 (1976); Metromedia, Inc. v. City of San Diego, 453 U.S. 490, 518 n.24 (1981).

Similarly, courts have held that zoning restrictions may not be justified by a desire to control or eliminate commercial competition. Cord Meyer Development Co. v. Bell Bay Drugs, Inc., 229 N.E.2d 44 (N.Y. 1967); Swain v. County of Winnebago, 250 N.E.2d 439 (III. App. 1969) ("it is not the function of the county zoning ordinances to provide economic protection for existing businesses.) Furthermore, if zoning restrictions upon dish antennas are at all motivated by a community's interest in insuring the financial success of its franchised cable operator, such restrictions may be construed as a conspiracy between the community and the cable operator to foreclose competition:

> Cable TV franchisors should exercise great caution in imposing restraints on noncable TV video vendors. Given [a community's] obvious interest in ensuring the financial success of its franchised cable TV operator to foreclose competition. Thus, for example, a zoning ban on satellite dish antennas would be highly suspect and might not be covered by state action immunity.

Opinion No. 34-009, 69 Ops. Atty. Gen (Md. Feb. 21, 1984), n.20. A finding of such a conspiracy could lead to an assessment of treble damages and attorneys' fees under the antitrust laws,

Zoning Ordinances Must Serve Legitimate Objectives

To withstand challenge under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. zoning ordinances must not be enacted or enforced arbitrarily or capriciously. Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co., 272 U.S. 365 (1926). Such ordinances must "substantially advance legitimate state interests" and must not deny a property owner the economically viable use of his or her land. Agins v. City of Tiburon, 447 U.S. 225 (1980); Penn Central Transp. Co. v. New York City, 438 U.S. 104 (1978).

Health and safety concerns, for example, have long been held sufficient to justify land use restrictions. The validity of zoning regulations adopted to promote subjective aestratic goals is less clear. The courts in many states continue to hold that zoning ordinances based solely or predominantly upon aesthetic considerations are invalid. See, e.g., Mendinger Appeal, 104 A.2d 118 (Pa. 1954); Detroit Edison Co. v. City of Wixom, 172 N.E.2d 382 (Mich. 1969); Euclid v. Fitzthum, 48 Ohio App.2d 297 (1976); Duckworth FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

News media Information 2027 254-7674 Recorded listing of releases and teats

1919 M STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

This is an unofficial announcement of Commission action. Release of the full text of a Commission order constitutes official action. See MCL v. FCC. \$15 F.2d 385 (D.C. Circ. 1975)

Report No.

ACTION IN DOCKET CASE

FCC ADOPTS LIMITED PREEMPTION OF LOCAL ZONING OR OTHER REGULATION OF SATELLITE EARTH STATIONS

The Commission has adopted limited preemption of local zoning or other regulation of satellite earth stations.

The FCC ruled that state and local zoning and other regulations which differentiate between satellite receive-only antennas and other types of antenna facilities are preempted unless such regulations:

(CC DOCKET 85-87)

-- have a reasonable and clearly defined health, safety or aesthetic

-- do not operate to impose unreasonable limitations on, or prevent, reception of satellite-delivered signals by receive-only antennas, or to impose costs on the users of such antennas that are excessive in light of the purchase and installation cost of equipment.

Regulation of satellite transmitting antennas is preempted in the same manner, except that state and local health and safety regulation is not preempted.

The Commisssion noted this action ensures that state and local reculations will not interfere unreasonably with the federal right to construct and use antennas to receive satellite-delivered signals.

Under the adopted rule, local governments may impose non-discriminatory regulations on earth stations as long as the same regulations are applied to all antennas. Thus, a community may preserve its historic character by limiting construction of all external antennas without singling out satellite facilities for different treatment.

If an ordinance or regulation differentiates in the treatment of antennas, the community must show that the ordinance or regulation has a reason-able and clearly defined health, safety or aesthetic objective. In addition, the regulation must not limit or prevent reception unreasonably, nor impose unreasonable costs on an antenna user.

LAW OFFICES BROWN & FINN

v. City of Bonney Lake, 586 P.2d 860 (Wash. 1978); Mayor and City Council of Baltimore v. Swartz, 299 A.2d 828 (Md. 1973); Peck v. Kennedy, 168 S.E.2d 117 (Va. 1969).

Zoning Ordinances May Not Discriminate Against Dish Antennas

Local officials frequently consider and enact zoning ordinances that subject dish owners and prospective dish owners to procedural and substantive requirements that are not imposed upon other persons in similar circumstances. For example, an ordinance may require a dish owner to pay a special fee; submit to a special hearing; prepare and submit special drawings, surveys or certifications; or comply with other requirements that do not apply to persons desiring to install functionally or physically similar devices such as traditional rooftop television antennas, basketball backboards or backyard swing sets. These types of ordinances are discriminatory and have been held to violate the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution. See e.g. Morgan & Brockway v. City of Coral Cables, Case Nos. 83-42793, CA 22, et al. (11th Jud. Cir. for Dade Co., Fla, June 18,

Zoning Ordinances May Not Ban Dish Antennas

Because of the constitutional considerations discussed above, it seems probable that a zoning ordinance expressly banning satellite dish antennas, even for limited periods of time (i.e. a "moratorium") would not survive challenge in the courts. Although most local officials are aware of this and have no desire to impose outright prohibitions, many are willing to consider and sometimes enact restrictions that have the same practical effect.

Dish Antennas May Not Be Banned By "Consent" Ordinances Or Referendums

In a similar vein, some communities have adopted ordinances requiring persons desiring to install satellite dish antennas to obtain the consent of all or a certain percentage of abutting or neighboring property owners. Other communities have drafted ordinances giving persons in the neighborhood the right to object to and thereby prevent or effectively prevent a satellite dish installation. These ordinances most likely violate the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Washington ex rel. Seattle Title Trust Co. v. Roberge, 278 U.S. 116 (1928); Eubank v. Richmond, 226 U.S. 137 (1912); Grendel's Den v. Goodwin, 495 F. Supp. 761 (D. Mass. 1980); aff'd sub nom. Larkin v. Grendel's Den, 459 U.S. 116 (1982).

Some communities may consider submitting the issue of satellite dish antenna installations to referendums of their voters. While this procedure is generally valid, local officials should be aware that use of the referendum process will not validate a restriction that would be invalid if the officials adopted it directly:

If the substantive result of the referendum is arbitrary and capricious, bearing no relation to the police power, then the fact that the voters . . . wish it so would not save the restriction.

City of Eastlake, et al. v. Forest City Enterprises, Inc., 426 U.S. 683 (1976).

LAW OFFICES BROWN & FINN CHARTERED SUITE SIO 1920 N STREET, N. W. WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036 (202) 887-0800

MEMORANDUM

Local Government Officials From: Brown & Finn, Chartered

Local Regulation of Satellite Dish Antennas

This firm represents SPACE, the Satellite Television Industry Association, Inc., a non-profit industry association representing the interests of manufacturers, distributors, retailers and consumers of satellite earth station reception equipment throughout the

In our capacity as counsel for SPACE, we are frequently asked to assist local officials who are contemplating the adoption of regulations governing the placement of satellite dish antennas. To fairly address the legal and political issues raised by local regulations governing home satellite antennas, one must be familiar with the technology of satellite communications. The purpose of this memorandum and accompanying materials is to provide illumination in these areas and, it is hoped, to encourage the enactment of ordinances representing reasonable attempts to accommodate community concerns with the Constitutional rights of individual dish owners.

A Word About the Technology

Most communications satellites operating today operate in the "C-Band" (3.7-4.2 billion cycles per second or 3.7-4.2 "gigaherts" (GHz)). The satellites use a very small amount of energy (about 5-8 watts, about the same amount of energy used by a citizens' band radio) to transmit signals nearly 50,000 miles from their transmission points to satellites (orbiting approximately 22,000 miles above the equator) and back to reception points on earth. Because of this, satellite signals are generally quite weak by the time they return to the earth's surface and satellite antennas, which are reflective collecting dishes, must be fairly large to collect enough signal to produce an intelligible picture. Generally, dishes between 10 and 12 feet in diameter are necessary in many parts of North America to receive usable satellite signals. Dishes which are smaller in diameter may not be able to obtain a quality picture for all the major satellites A normally installed satellite antenna with a dish diameter of 12 feet, will be at least 15 feet in height. Any variation in installation necessitated by reception difficulties could require pole-mounted installations at greater heights. At some point in the future, higher powered satellites at higher frequencies may enable use of smaller diameter dishes. However, this development will not occur for a long time. We do not anticipate any

3 86-246-A

LAW OFFICES BROWN & FINN CHARTERED

> The sovereignty of the people is itself subject to those constitutional limitations which have been duly adopted and remain unrepealed.

Hunter v. Erickson, 393 U.S. 385, 392 (1969).

Reasonable Regulation Can Be Achieved

Many communities across the nation have addressed reasonable community concerns about the installation and operation of satellite dish antennas and have enacted ordinances fairly accommodating those concerns with the constitutional and property rights of dish owners. On behalf of SPACE, we will be happy to provide you with any assistance you may need in drafting such an ordinance. To this end, enclosed with these materials is a copy of The Satellite Earth Station Zoning Book, which contains a discussion of some general legal and practical issues presented in this area. Also enclosed is an updated model ordinance that, we believe, is a reasonable attempt to accommodate community and individual concerns. Additionally, we are providing a copy of a recent Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, issued by the Federal Communications Commission (in which the F.C.C. proposed to preempt local ordinances that discriminate against satellite dish antennas); a copy of a recent Report and Order, released by the Commission, that preempts ordinances that discriminate against the installation of amateur radio towers; and copies of the Coral Gables case, the Canton Township case and the Maryland Attorney General's Opinion referred to above.

If, after reviewing these materials, you have any questions, please do not hesitate

BROWN & FINN CHARTERED

changes in technology in the predictable future that would permit the installation and operation of antennas significantly smaller in size. Overly restrictive size and height limitations imposed by a zoning ordinance could effectively prohibit the installation and operation of usable dish antennas. As discussed below, such ordinances are unconstitutional.

Location and Screening Requirements

Unlike regular radio and TV signals which can bend somewhat over the horizon, satellite signals are microwave signals which must travel in a straight line from transmitter to receiver. Because of this, a direct "line of sight" between a dish antenna and the orbiting communications satellites is required for reception. Obstruction of this line of sight by a hill, a building, or even a tree, could eliminate reception. Because of factors such as topography, foliage or building obstructions, many homeowners would be unable to install and operate a usable dish antenna if they were required to comply with a rigid location requirement (such as, for example, a requirement that dish antennas be installed only in rear yards). Similarly, overly restrictive screening and landscaping requirements (such as, for example, a requirement that dish antennas be totally screened from "public view") could likewise interfere with or prevent successful installation or reception. In this respect, a rigid screening requirement would be analogous to a requirement that solar panels be installed only in the shade.

Dish Owners Have Constitutional Rights

A homeowner's right to install and operate a usable satellite dish antenna is protected by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. F.C.C., 395 U.S. 367 (1969); Schad v. Borough of Mt. Ephraim, 452 U.S. 61 (1981). As a Michigan district court judge noted in a recent case:

Regulation of satellite dish antennas . . . involves First Amendment rights that typically are not a consideration in determining the validity of zoning ordinances. As a consequence the Court has the duty to strictly scrutinize to insure that the asserted state interest is achieved by the least restrictive means.

Because satellite dish antennas provide users with the unique ability to receive scores of programming services, some of which are not available through any other means, an ordinance severely restricting or effectively banning dish antennas would leave consumers without adequate alternative means of receiving these

People of Canton Township v. Antoinette Benner, No. 85 CT 3551 (Dist. Ct., 35th Jud. Dist., Mich., Sept. 26, 1985), Slip op. at 9-10, 11. Zoning ordinances that expressly or effectively prevent home owners from installing and operating usable satellite dish antennas infringe upon these rights. Such ordinances will not survive judicial scrutiny:

> LAW OFFICES BROWN & FINN CHARTERED SUITE 510 1920 N STREET, N. W. WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

January 22, 1986

Mr. Walt Frazier Stansbury-International 6330 Frankford Avenue Baltimore, MD 21206

Re: Synodinos Variance

Dear Walt:

I reviewed the material you forwarded concerning the Synodinos installation. It seems to me that testimony at the hearing that the Synodinos can not obtain acceptable reception except from the location and at the height installed, coupled with arguments based upon the First Amendment and the F.C.C. preemption, should entitle the Synodinos to a variance almost as a matter of law. If the County denies the variance, it is, in effect, telling the Synodinos that they cannot install or operate a usable satellite dish antenna on their property. Such an edict would run counter to the First Amendment and the F.C.C.'s rule.

the Canton Township and Coral Gables cases, and the F.C.C.'s News Release on is preemption. These materials may be of assistance to the Synodinos or their attorney in

Zoning Memorandum to Local Government Officials F.C.C. News Release Canton Township Decision

(202) 887-0800

I am enclosing a copy of our Zoning Memorandum to Local Government Officials,

Let me know if there is anything else we can do. Particularly, do you think that it would be appropriate for us to write another letter to Mr. Hutchinson?

LSH:cmm

To A

BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

Arnold Jablon

Date November 21, 1985 TO Zoning Commissione

Norman E. Gerber, AICP, Director FROM Office of Planning and Zoning

SUBJECT Zoning Petition No. 86-246-A

This office is opposed to both the size and the front yard location of the satellite dish.

NEG:JGH:slm

BALTIMORE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC ENGINEERING OWSON, MARYLAND 21204 194-3550

STEPHEN E. COLLINS DIRECTOR

November 14, 1985

Mr. Arnold Jablon Zoning Commissioner County Office Building Towson, Maryland 21204

> Item No. Property Owner: Location: Existing Zoning: Proposed Zoning:

Acres: District:

Dear Mr. Jablon:

The Department of Traffic Engineering has no comments for items numbered 121, 122, 123, 124, 125 & 126.

MSF/bld

Mr. and Mrs. Peter A. Synodinos COUNTY OFFICE BLDG. 11702 Larch Road 111 W. Chesapeake Ave. White Marsh, Maryland 21162

BALTIMORE COUNTY ZONING PLANS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

November 12, 1985

MEMBERS Bureau of

> Bureau of Fire Prevention

Industrial

Traffic Engineering

State Roads Commissio

Realth Department

Project Planning

Building Department

Board of Education

Zoning Administration

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Synodinos: Department of

Enclosures

The Zoning Plans Advisory Committee has reviewed the plans submitted with the above-referenced petition. The following comments are not intended to indicate the appropriateness of the zoning action requested, but to assure that all parties are made aware of plans or problems with regard to the development plans that may have, a bearing on this case. The Director of Planning may file a written report with the Zoning Commissioner with recommendations as to the suitability of the requested zoning.

Enclosed are all comments submitted from the members of the Committee at this time that offer or request information on your petition. If similar comments from the remaining members are received, I will forward them to you. Otherwise, any comment that is not informative will be placed in the hearing file. This petition was accepted for filing on the date of the enclosed filing certificate and a hearing scheduled accordingly.

> Very truly yours, ZAMES E. DYER Chairman Zoning Plans Advisory Committee

RE: Item No. 121 - Case No. 86-246-A

Variance Petition

Petitioners - Peter A. Synodinos, et ux

MORMAN E. GERBER

Mr. Arnold Jablon Zoning Commissioner County Office Building Towson, Maryland 21204

Dear Mr. Jablon:

NOVEMBER 15, 1985

Re: Zoning Advisory Heeting of OCTOBER 8,1985 Iten + 121
Property Owner: PETER A. SHNODINOS, etux
Location: NW/S LARCH RD. 200' NE RANGLAGH RD.

The Division of Current Planning and Development has reviewed the subject petition and offers the following comments. The items checked below are

(X)There are no site planning factors requiring comment.
(A County Review Group Meeting is required.
(A County Review Group meeting was held and the minutes will be forward by the Bureau of Public Services.
(Init site is part of a larger tract; therfore it is defined as a subdivision. The plan must show the entire tract.
(B) A record plat will be recorded orior of issuance of a building permit.
(C) The access is not satisfactory.
(C) The parking arrangement is not satisfactory. The parking arrangement is not satisfactory.

Parking calculations must be shown on the plan.)Parking calculations must be shown on the plan.

()This property contains soils which are defined as wetlands, and development on these soils is prohibited.

()Construction in or alteration of the floodplain is prohibited under the provisions of Section 22-98 of the Development Regulations.

()Development of this site may constitute a potential conflict with the Saltimore County Master Plan.

()The amended Development Plan was approved by the Planning Board on On

)Landscaping: Must comply with daltimore County Landscape Manual.

() The property is located in a deficient service area as defined by Bill 178-79. No building permit may be issued until a Reserve capacity Use Certificate has been issued. The deficient service The property is located in a traffic area controlled by a "D" level intersection as defined by Bill 179-79, and as conditions change traffic capacity may become more limited. The Basic Services areas are re-evaluated innually by the County Council.

Eugene A. Bober Chief, Current Planning and Development

BALTIMORE COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204-2586 494-4500

PAUL H. REINCKE

October 14, 1985

Mr. Arnold Jablon Zoning Commissioner Office of Planning and Zoning Baltimore County Office Building Towson, Maryland 21204

Attention: Nick Commodari, Chairman Zoning Plans Advisory Committee

RE: Property Owner: Peter A. Synodinos, et ux

NW/S Larch Road, 200' NE Ranelagh Road Zoning Agenda: Meeting of October 8, 1985

Pursuant to your request, the referenced property has been surveyed by this Bureau and the comments below marked with an "X" are applicable and required to be corrected or incorporated into the final plans for the property.

: () 1. Fire hydrants for the referenced property are required and shall be located at intervals or _____ feet along an approved road in accordance with Baltimore County Standards as published by the Department of Public Works.

() 2. A second means of vehicle access is required for the site.

() 3. The vehicle dead end condition shown at

EXCEEDS the maximum allowed by the Fire Department.

() 4. The site shall be made to comply with all applicable parts of the Fire Prevention Code prior to occupancy or beginning of operation.

() 5. The buildings and structures existing or proposed on the site shall comply with all applicable requirements of the National Fire Protection Association Standard No. 101 "Life Safety Code", 1976 edition prior 🖔 to occupancy.

() 6. Site plans are approved, as drawn.

7. The Fire Prevention Bureau has no comments at this time.

Special Inspection Tivision

Mire Prevention Bureau

BALTIMORE COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PERMITS & LICENSES
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204
494-3610

TED ZALESKI, JR. DIRECTOR

Mr. Arnold Jablon, Zoning Commissioner Comments on Item # 121 Zoning Advisory Committee Meeting are as follows: Peter A. Synodinos, et ux NW/S Larch Road, 200 NE Ranelagh Road

All structures shall conform to the Beltimore County Building Code as adopted by Council Bill #17-85, the Maryland Code for the Handicapped and Aged (A.M.S.I. #117-1 - 1980) and other applicable Codes and Standards. B A building and other miscellaneous permits shall be required before the start of any construction.

Residential: Two sets of construction drawings are required to file a permit application. The seal of a registered in Maryland Architect or Engineer is/INDEX required on plans and technical data.

D. Commercial: Three sets of construction drawings sealed and signed by a registered in Maryland Architect or Engineer shall be required to file with a permit application. Reproduced seals are not acceptable.

E. All Use Groups except R-L Single Family Detached Dwellings require a minimum of 1 hour fire rating for exterior walls closer than 6'-O to an interior lot line. R-L Use Groups require a one hour wall if closer than 3'-O to an interior lot line. Any wall built on an interior lot line shall require a fire or party wall. See Table 401, Section 1407, Section 1406.2 and Table 1402. No openings are permitted in an exterior wall within 3'-O of an interior lot line.

F. The structure does not appear to comply with Table 505 for permissable height/area. Reply to the requested variance by this office cannot be considered until the necessary data pertaining to height/area and construction type is provided. See Table 501 and 505 and have your Architect/Engineer contact this department.

G. The requested variance appears to conflict with Section(s) ______, of the Baltimore County Building Code.

H. When filing for a required Change of Use/Occupancy Permit, an alteration permit application shall also be filed along with three sets of acceptable construction plans indicating how the existing structure is to be altered in order to comply with the Code requirements for the new use. Maryland Architectural or Engineer seals are usually required. The change of Use Groups are from Use to Use or to Mixed Uses See Section 312 of the Building Code.

I. The proposed project appears to be located in a Flood Plain, Tidal/Riverine. Please see the attached copy of Section 516.0 of the Building Code as adopted by Bill #17-85. Bite plans shall show the correct elevations above see level for the lot and the finish floor levels including basement.

(J.) Communes: Plans shall show foundation and anchorage against wind overturn.

K. These abbreviated comments reflect only on the information provided by the drawings submitted to the Office

the applicant may obtain additional information by visiting Room 122 of the County Office Building at 111 W. Chesapeake Avenue, Towson, Maryland 21204.

PART FOR ZONING VARIENCE DISTRICT-H, ZONED DRZ Subdivision- Plat 2 or DARRYL GARdens

BOOK NO: 13 FOLIO 150 EXISTING WATER IN LAKEH Rd DWNER: PETER H. & ANNH L. SYNOGINOS

LYISTINS

of Planning and Zoming and are not intended to be construed as the full extent of any permit. If desired By: C. E. Burnham, Chief
Building Plans Review

200 Te Pinstrahia € NE 100'-> 7

\$ 400.2 to permit an accessory structure (14 feet satellite dich) to be located in the from yard in lien of the required

In the event that this Petition:

granted, a building permit may be so cood within the thirty (30) day appeal period. The Zening Commencement will, however, entertain my request for a stay of the issuance of said per-mit derivative management.

mit during this period for good cause above. Such request must be received

in writing by the date of the bearing

Cat she se or made at the hearing.

Being the property of Peter A. Pyno-

BALTIMORE COUNTY OFFICE OF PLANNING & ZONING

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

Your petition has been received and accepted for filing this the day of Wovember, 1985.

Petition for Variance 11th Election District
LOCATION: Northwest side 'eff
Larch Read, 200' Northeast of Rane-lagh Read (1705 Larch Read)
DATE & TIME: Wednesday, De-Middle River, Md., Not 20 1985 Maryland.

The Zoning Commissioner of Baltimere County, by authority of the Zoning Act and Regulations of Baltimere County, will hely a public hearing:

Petition for Variance from Section 400

was inserted in Oge Times, a newspaper printed and published in Baitimore County, once in each

the state of the s

86-246-A Ge Times

This is to fertify, That the annexed

Good only w/tall pole

No live of Site From Background, or side yard No live of Site From Roof

The only site possible would be funt side yard W/1017 pole out of ground.

Neighbor wants to hook up to clish in the Future this location is the only sport on the entire property and no other location will have any access to Satellite Best. 86-246-A

CERTIFICATE OF PUBLICATION

PETITION FOR VARIANCE
11th Election District

LOCATION: Northwest side of Larch Road, 200' Northeast of Ranclagh Road (11702 Larch Road) DATE AND TIME: Wednesday, December 11, 1985 at 10:30 a.m. PUBLIC HEARING: Room 106, County Office Building, 111 W. Chesspeake Avenue, Towson, Maryland

more County, by authority of the Zaning Act and Regulations of Baltimore County, will hold a public hearing: Petition for Variance from Section 400.1 to permit an accessory structure (14 foot satellite dish) to be located in the front yard in lieu of the required rear yard. Being the property of Peter A. Synodinos, et ux as shown on the plat filed with the Toming Office.

In the event that this Petition granted, a building permit may issued within the thirty (30) day app period. The Zoning Commission will, however, entertain any request a stay of the issuence of said period for good cau shown. Such request must be received in writing by the date of the hearing above or made at the hearing.

By Order Of

By Order Of ARNOLD JABLON, Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County Nov. 21 THIS IS TO CERTIFY, that the annexed advertisement was published in THE JEFFERSONIAN, a weekly newspaper printed and published in Towson, Baltimore County, Md., appearing on

THE JEFFERSONIAN;

18 Venetonle

Cost of Advertising

22.00

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

G 86-246-A

District 1/14

Posted for: Vorionce

Petitioner: Pater 1. Syn dines, et uv

Location of property: NW/S 15724 C.S. 200' NE Ranelseh RS

11702 Lorch RS

Location of Signs: Factory Lorch RS 10000, 10' Fr. You Swag

Posted by 11/22/57

Signature

Number of Signs: 11/22/57