



FROM	NAME & TITLE	CHRIS RYER, DIRECTOR 	CITY of BALTIMORE MEMO	
	AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS	DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING 8 TH FLOOR, 417 EAST FAYETTE STREET		
	SUBJECT	CITY COUNCIL BILL #21-0051 / REZONING – 4900 BOSTON STREET		

TO

The Honorable President and
Members of the City Council
City Hall, Room 400
100 North Holliday Street

DATE: April 23, 2021

At its regular meeting of April 22, 2021, the Planning Commission considered City Council Bill #21-0051, for the purpose of changing the zoning for the property known as 4900 Boston Street (Block 6820, Lot 55), as outlined in red on the accompanying plat, from the I-2 Zoning District to the IMU-2 Zoning District; and providing for a special effective date.

In its consideration of this Bill, the Planning Commission reviewed the attached staff report which recommended disapproval of City Council Bill #21-0051 and adopted the following resolution nine members being present (nine in favor):

RESOLVED, That the Planning Commission does not concur with the recommendation of its departmental staff, and instead adopts the facts submitted by the applicant, with consideration for testimony and facts presented in the meeting. The Planning Commission also took notice of the relatively small size of the subject parcel, various commercial land uses in the immediate vicinity, and a nearby Planned Unit Development (PUD) that allowed a drive-through restaurant. Therefore, the Planning Commission recommends that City Council Bill #21-0051 be passed by the City Council.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Eric Tiso, Division Chief, Land Use and Urban Design Division at 410-396-8358.

CR/ewt

attachment

cc: Ms. Natasha Mehu, Mayor's Office
Ms. Nina Themelis, Mayor's Office
The Honorable Eric Costello, Council Rep. to Planning Commission
Mr. Matthew Stegman, City Council President's Office
Ms. Nikki Thompson, City Council President's Office
Mr. Colin Tarbert, BDC
Ms. Kathleen Byrne, BMZA
Mr. Geoffrey Veale, Zoning Administration
Ms. Stephanie Murdock, DHCD
Ms. Elena DiPietro, Law Dept.
Mr. Francis Burnszynski, PABC
Mr. Liam Davis, DOT
Ms. Natawna Austin, Council Services
Mr. Dominic McAlily, Council Services
Ms. Caroline Hecker, Esq.



Brandon M. Scott
Mayor

PLANNING COMMISSION

Sean D. Davis, Chairman

STAFF REPORT



Chris Ryer
Director

April 22, 2021

REQUESTS: City Council Bill #21-0051/ Rezoning – 4900 Boston Street:

For the purpose of changing the zoning for the property known as 4900 Boston Street (Block 6820, Lot 55), as outlined in red on the accompanying plat, from the I-2 Zoning District to the IMU-2 Zoning District; and providing for a special effective date.

City Council Bill #21-0056/ Urban Renewal – Canton Industrial Area – Amendment:

For the purpose of amending the Urban Renewal Plan for the Canton Industrial Area to revise the boundary of the Plan to remove a certain property; replacing certain exhibits to reflect the change; waiving certain content and procedural requirements; making the provisions of this Ordinance severable; providing for the application of this Ordinance in conjunction with certain other ordinances; and providing for a special effective date.

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt findings and Disapprove both bills

STAFF: Matthew DeSantis, AICP

PETITIONER: Introduced by Councilman Cohen at the request of Canton Dev, LLC c/o Caroline Hecker, Esq. – Rosenberg, Martin, Greenberg, LLP

OWNER: Canton Dev, LLC

SITE/GENERAL AREA

Site Conditions: The property is approximately 0.6 acres in area and is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Boston Street and Ponca Street. It is currently improved with a small one-story building covering approximately 5% of the site, with the rest dedicated to surface parking as the property is used as a car rental facility.

General Area: The property is located within the Canton Industrial Area. It abuts I-895 to the east and fronts Baltimore City designated through truck routes on two sides (Boston and Ponca Street). In close proximity are two gas filling stations, heavy industrial uses, and auto-oriented commercial.

HISTORY

1929 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps show the northeast corner of Boston and Ponca being improved with 5 two-story rowhomes. Aerial images show that these homes, along with an industrial building on the northwest corner of the property itself, were demolished at some point in the 1970s as a part of the widening of Boston Street as it fed into the newly-constructed I-95.

The site was then apparently used as unimproved surface storage until it was paved in 2009, and then improved with the building between 2012 and 2014.

(Canton Industrial URP History):

- Ordinance #90-637, approved June 20, 1990, established the Canton Industrial Urban Renewal Plan.
- Ordinance #00-129, approved the first amendment to the Canton Industrial Urban Renewal Plan, dated October 25, 2000.
- Ordinance #01-234, approved the second amendment to the Canton Industrial Urban Renewal Plan, dated August 13, 2001.
- Ordinance #07-390, approved the third amendment to the Canton Industrial Urban Renewal Plan, dated February 15, 2007.
- Ordinance #11-548, approved the fourth amendment to the Canton Industrial Urban Renewal Plan, dated November 22, 2011.
- On May 9, 2019, the Planning Commission considered CCB#19-0373 – the fifth amendment to the Canton Industrial Urban Renewal Plan (Ordinance #19-282).

CONFORMITY TO PLANS

The proposed rezoning from I-2 to IMU-2 would not be consistent with the following Goal/Objective of the City’s Comprehensive Master Plan:

- EARN Goal 1: Strengthen Identified Growth Sectors / Objective 8: Retain and Attract Port-Related Services

The rezoning is also not consistent with the Canton Industrial Urban Renewal Plan (hence the need for the proposed companion bill seeking to amend the URP).

ZONING CODE REQUIREMENTS

Below are the approval standards under §5-508(b) of Article 32 – *Zoning* for proposed zoning map amendments:

(b) *Map amendments.*

(1) *Required findings.*

As required by the State Land Use Article, the City Council may approve the legislative authorization based on a finding that there was either:

- (i) a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood where the property is located; or
- (ii) a mistake in the existing zoning classification.

(2) *Required findings of fact.*

In making the determination required by subsection (b)(1) of this section, the City Council must also make findings of fact that address:

- (i) population changes;
- (ii) the availability of public facilities;
- (iii) present and future transportation patterns;
- (iv) compatibility with existing and proposed development for the area;
- (v) the recommendations of the City agencies and officials; and
- (vi) the proposed amendment’s consistency with the City’s Comprehensive Master Plan.

(3) *Additional standards – General*

Additional standards that must be considered for map amendments are:

- (i) existing uses of property within the general area of the property in question;
- (ii) the zoning classification of other property within the general area of the property in question;
- (iii) the suitability of the property in question for the uses permitted under its existing zoning classification; and
- (iv) the trend of development, if any, in the general area of the property in question, including changes, if any, that have taken place since the property in question was placed in its present zoning classification.

ANALYSIS

The applicant is requesting the rezoning of 4900 Boston Street in order to facilitate the future development of a fast-food restaurant with a drive-through as the current I-2 use does not permit drive-through facilities. The IMU-2 zoning district permits drive-through facilities subject to Conditional Use approval from the Board of Municipal and Zoning Appeals (BMZA). In addition to this rezoning and BMZA approval for a drive-through, a fast-food restaurant would also need to obtain a variance from the BMZA to eliminate the requirement of having a minimum of 50% of the ground-floor space dedicated to an industrial use.

In addition to the property being zoned I-2, all of the surrounding properties share this same zoning designation. Prior to the passage of Transform Baltimore’s comprehensive zoning update, the site (and surrounding properties) were zoned M-3 – a substantially similar heavy industrial zoning category.

Staff concludes that the proposed IMU-2 zoning designation is not appropriate for the site. § 11-203(a)(1) *IMU Industrial Mixed Use Districts* states that the first intent of these districts are to “encourage the reuse of older industrial buildings for light industrial use, as well as a variety of non-industrial uses.” The applicant, however, intends to demolish the existing small building in order to redevelop the site in whole.

The companion URP amendment bill to the rezoning bill seeks to remove this property from the Canton Industrial Area Urban Renewal Plan. The property is currently designated as “Heavy Industrial” by the URP, which requires that uses be limited to heavy industrial and that certain uses, including restaurants, are explicitly prohibited. In general, staff does not feel that the Canton Industrial URP, first established in 1990, is strictly necessary any longer due to the creation of the MI (Maritime Industrial) zoning district as a part of the Transform Baltimore comprehensive rezoning process. At the same time, it’s reasonable to question the overall utility and integrity of the URP if redevelopment proposals that are not permitted by the ordinance simply seek to continually amend the URP to remove themselves from it. This happened most recently in 2019 with the removal of the 1200 South Haven Street parcel from the URP in order to facilitate the Collective at Canton redevelopment (and additional rezonings and URP amendments to facilitate additional development in the area are on the horizon). While staff does not propose that the existence of the subject site being within the Canton Industrial URP is an integral factor in why the rezoning should be denied, it also is clear that this is yet another reason why the proposed rezoning is not consistent with the City’s Plan.

Below is the staff's review of the required considerations of §5-508(b)(3) of Article 32 – *Zoning*, where staff finds that this change is not in the public's interest, in that it would constitute a "spot zoning" as there has been no apparent mistake in the current zoning district applied and no substantial change in the neighborhood that would support this site-specific rezoning.

REQUIRED FINDINGS

Maryland Land Use Code – Requirements for Rezoning:

The Maryland Land Use Code requires the Planning Commission to study the proposed changes in relation to: 1. The plan; 2. The needs of Baltimore City; and 3. The needs of the particular neighborhood in the vicinity of the proposed changes (*cf.* MD Land Use Code § 10-305 (2019)). In reviewing this request, the staff finds that:

- 1. The Plan:** The proposed rezoning would not support the following aspect of the Comprehensive Plan: EARN Goal 1: Strengthen Identified Growth Sectors / Objective 8: Retain and Attract Port-Related Services as a rezoning to IMU-2 to facilitate a drive-through restaurant would remove a heavy-industrially zoned parcel from near the Port. It could also be used as a stepping stone for future rezonings that would lead to additional deterioration of property zoned I-2. It is also not consistent with the Canton Industrial URP to which it pertains.
- 2. The needs of Baltimore City:** The City should seek to preserve its heavy-industrially zoned areas, especially those in proximity of the Port and highway access. The City's industrial areas provide an important economic base and source of accessible employment. Once properties are removed from industrial use, they typically do not tend to return to industrial use.
- 3. The needs of the particular neighborhood:** The property is located in an industrial area that has no particular need for a fast-food restaurant with a drive-through facility. In fact, additional development that is entirely focused and dependent on automobile use is contrary to environmental and urban design goals that the City has established.

Similarly, the Land Use article requires the City Council to make findings of fact (MD Land Use Code § 10-304 (2019)). The findings of fact include:

- 1. Population changes;** There have been no significant population changes in the immediate area as it is industrial in nature.
- 2. The availability of public facilities;** Adequate public facilities exist at the site and should continue to exist into the future.
- 3. Present and future transportation patterns;** The site is surrounded by designated truck routes and highway access that support the existing I-2 zoning designation.
- 4. Compatibility with existing and proposed development for the area;** The IMU-2 zoning district is meant primarily for the adaptive reuse of old industrial buildings for light industrial uses, not as a backdoor way to maintain an "industrial" zoning designation but permit fast-food restaurants with drive-through facilities. Such a zoning is therefore not compatible.

5. **The recommendations of the Planning Commission and the Board of Municipal and Zoning Appeals (BMZA);** For the above reasons, the Planning Department will recommend disapproval of the rezoning request to the Planning Commission. The BMZA has not yet commented on this bill.
6. **The relation of the proposed amendment to the City's plan.** As described above, the proposed rezoning is not consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

There are additional standards under §5-508(b)(3) that must be considered for map amendments. These include:

- (i) **existing uses of property within the general area of the property in question;** The surrounding properties are used as such: to the north is heavy industrial; the west is a gasoline filling station; the southwest is heavy industrial; the south is another gasoline filling station; and to the east is I-895.
- (ii) **the zoning classification of other property within the general area of the property in question;** All of the surrounding properties are also zoned I-2 like the subject property.
- (iii) **the suitability of the property in question for the uses permitted under its existing zoning classification; and** The site is located in the middle of an industrial area, surrounded by designated truck routes and direct access to the Port and interstate highways. While the subject property itself is relatively small, it is contiguous with other I-2 zoned properties that extend north along the east side of Ponca Street, so it is conceivable that it could be combined with these parcels in the future for the expansion or establishment of heavy industrial uses.
- (iv) **the trend of development, if any, in the general area of the property in question, including changes, if any, that have taken place since the property in question was placed in its present zoning classification.** The gasoline filling station directly across Boston Street was established in 2020.

Per §5-508(b)(1) of Article 32 – *Zoning*, and as required by the State Land Use Article, the City Council may approve the legislative authorization based on a finding that there was either: (i) a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood where the property is located; or (ii) a mistake in the existing zoning classification. Staff does not find either a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood, nor mistake in the current zoning classification. As described above, this appears to be a “spot zoning” for this particular property in order to facilitate a particular development that is not permitted by the current I-2 zoning regulations.

Equity Considerations: There do not appear to be any clear equity considerations for these particular bills as there are no historically marginalized groups that would be directly impacted negatively by this legislation. The Commission might, however, evaluate as a part of their considerations how the auto dependent nature of the proposed development behind the rezoning and URP amendment has environmental equity impacts, in that fossil fuel infrastructure does have negative local impacts via air pollution and global impacts via Climate Change.

Notification: The Greater Greektown Neighborhood Association and Canton Community Association have been notified of this action, and the site has been properly posted in accordance with Planning Commission guidelines. Additionally, the Baltimore Industrial Group has been made aware of this action and proposed development.



Chris Ryer
Director



MEMORANDUM

To: Baltimore City Planning Commission
From: Caroline L. Hecker
CC: Canton Dev, LLC
Date: April 22, 2021
Re: **City Council Bill #21-0051 – Proposed Findings of Fact
Rezoning – 4900 Boston Street**

This firm represents Canton Dev, LLC (the “Applicant”), the contract purchaser of the property known as 4900 Boston St. (the “Property”). On behalf of the Applicant, counsel submits this memorandum in support of City Council Bill #21-0051, which proposes to rezone the Property from the I-2 District to the IMU-2 District. The rezoning is necessary to remedy a mistake in the 2017 Transform Baltimore Zoning Code.

1. Background

The Property is located at the intersection of Boston Street and Ponca Street and, while it is located within the Canton Industrial Urban Renewal Area, it has not had an industrial use in recent memory. The City acquired the Property in 1971 from B. H. Hubbard & Son, Inc., at which point it was zoned M-3. The City demolished the structure that had been located on the Property, and the Property remained vacant for nearly half a century. In 2009, the City Council authorized the sale of the Property as an unimproved lot that was no longer needed for public use (**Exhibit 1**), and the Property thereafter was conveyed to Omega Enterprises, LLC. Omega Enterprises had plans to construct a carry-out restaurant, for which a permit was issued in 2010 (**Exhibit 2**), but those plans never came to fruition. In 2014, the City issued a permit to use the Property as a motor vehicle rental establishment (see **Exhibit 2**), and the Property has operated as an Avis/Budget car rental business since that time. (**Exhibit 3**).

2. The Planning Commission Should Approve the Proposed Rezoning Because It Was Erroneously Zoned I-2 Under Transform Baltimore in 2017.

The City Council has the authority to change the zoning classification of a property as part of a comprehensive rezoning process or upon a finding that there was either 1) a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood where the property is located, or 2) a mistake in the existing zoning classification. MD. CODE ANN., Land Use § 10-304(b)(2); Baltimore City Code, Article 32 – Zoning § 5-508(b)(1). As detailed below, the City Council made a mistake in zoning the Property I-2 under Transform Baltimore in 2017.

2.1 A Liberal Standard is Applied to Support a Change from One Zoning Subcategory to Another.

When seeking a rezoning on the basis of a mistake, “there is a strong presumption of correctness of the original zoning and of comprehensive zoning.” *People’s Counsel v. Beachwood I Ltd. Partnership*, 107 Md. App. 627, 641 (1995). However, Maryland courts have held that “[i]n considering whether this presumption [of correctness] has been overcome a more liberal standard is applied when the property is being reclassified from one commercial subcategory to another than is applied when the reclassification involves a change from one use category to another.” *Tennison v. Shomette*, 38 Md. App. 1, 5 (1977) (citing *Chapman v. Montgomery County Council*, 259 Md. 641 (1970); *Missouri Realty, Inc. v. Ramer*, 216 Md. 442 (1958)). Here, the rezoning proposed for the Property is to reclassify it from one industrial sub-district to another industrial sub-district, so a more liberal standard should be applied to overcome the presumption of correctness in the Property’s existing I-2 zoning map designation.

2.2 The Property’s Initial I-2 Zoning Designation Was Erroneous Because it Was Premised on a Misapprehension.

An “error [or mistake] can be established by showing that at the time of the comprehensive zoning the Council failed to take into account then existing facts, or projects or trends which were reasonably foreseeable of fruition in the future, so that the Council’s action was premised initially on a misapprehension.” *Boyce v. Sembly*, 25 Md. App. 43, 51 (1975) (citations omitted). “Thus, in order to establish error based upon a failure to take existing facts or events reasonably foreseeable of fruition into account, it is necessary not only to show the facts that existed at the time of the comprehensive zoning but also which, if any, of those facts were not actually considered by the Council.” *Id.* at 52.

The Property sits on the northeast corner of the intersection of Boston Street and Ponca Street. As discussed previously, the Property’s commercial use pre-dated Transform Baltimore, as a permit was issued for use as a “motor vehicle rental establishment” on June 26, 2014, and this use remained in place throughout the Transform Baltimore comprehensive rezoning process. *See* Exhibit 2.

Moreover, the properties on two of the three other corners of the intersection where this Property is located also have commercial uses. The property known as 4901 Boston Street, at the southeast corner of Boston and Ponca, is currently used as a Wawa gas station/convenience store as approved by the BMZA in Appeal No. 2011-77, well in advance of the comprehensive rezoning. In addition, the property known as 1200 Ponca Street, at the northwest corner of Boston and Ponca, is used as a Royal Farms gas station/convenience store, which was approved by the BMZA in Appeal No. 2016-243 prior to Transform Baltimore.

The City Council failed to consider the existing commercial uses on three of the four corners of this intersection when it rezoned this entire area to the I-2 Zoning District under Transform Baltimore. As these commercial uses were of record at the time that Transform Baltimore was enacted, the industrial zoning of the Property was a mistake. Moreover, the Property is too small to be redeveloped for the types of general industrial uses that are permitted in the I-2 District, further demonstrating that it was a mistake to zone this Property I-2. Even if the City Council had wanted to preserve the industrial character of this area, then rezoning this Property and the

other properties at this intersection to a transitional zone such as the IMU District would have been more appropriate.

3. The Planning Commission Should Adopt the Following Findings Of Fact Required to Be Made In Connection With A Map Amendment.

In making the determination that there was a mistake in the existing zoning classification, both Section 5-508(b) of the Zoning Code and Section 10-304 of the State Land Use Article require the City Council to make findings of fact that address certain items. The Planning Commission is urged to adopt the findings of fact listed below:

- 3.1 Population Changes:** According to the American Community Survey data from the U.S. Census Bureau, the census tract that includes the Property (Census Tract 2606.05) is estimated to have slightly increased its population since the enactment of Transform Baltimore from 4,606 in 2017 to 4,947 in 2019. This population growth demonstrates a turn from strictly industrial uses in the area and a need for more commercial options.
- 3.2 The availability of public facilities:** The area is well-served by public utilities and services and no negative impacts are expected as a result of rezoning the Property.
- 3.3 Present and future transportation patterns:** The Property is located adjacent the I-95 corridor, providing direct access for industrial and commercial users without interfering with local travel routes.
- 3.4 Compatibility with existing and proposed development for the area:** The proposed rezoning is consistent with the existing light industrial and commercial character of the surrounding neighborhood.
- 3.5 The recommendations of the Baltimore City Planning Commission and the Board of Municipal and Zoning Appeals:** For the reasons set forth herein, the Planning Commission is requested to recommend that the Property be rezoned to the IMU-2 District. The BMZA will comment separately on the legislation.
- 3.6 The proposed amendment's consistency with the City's Comprehensive Master Plan:** The proposed rezoning will support the Comprehensive Plan by supporting its goal of retaining and attracting businesses in growth sectors by permitting the Property to be redeveloped in a manner that will create new jobs.

4. The Planning Commission Should Adopt the Following Required Considerations for Map Amendments.

Section 5-508(b)(3) of the Zoning Code also mandates that the standards listed below be considered for map amendments. A review of these considerations clearly supports a finding that a mistake was made in the 2017 comprehensive zoning that justifies the rezoning of the Property to the IMU-2 Zoning District. The Planning Commission is urged to adopt the findings listed below:

- 4.1 Existing uses of property within the general area of the property in question:** The surrounding properties have a mix of uses including both industrial and commercial. Notably, the Property itself has a commercial use that pre-dates Transform Baltimore, as do two of the other properties at the intersection—both are gas-station/convenience stores.
- 4.2 The zoning classification of other property within the general area of the property in question:** The Property is located within mere blocks of an IMU-1 Zoning District to the west and a C-4 Zoning District to the east. As stated above, the Property itself is surrounded by various industrial and non-industrial uses and thus the transitional proposed IMU-2 zoning classification is most appropriate.
- 4.3 The suitability of the property in question for the uses permitted under its existing zoning classification:** The Property, which is a mere 0.61 acres, is too small for the general industrial uses permitted in the I-2 Zoning District. In order to make best use of the lot, the Property must be rezoned to a more suitable classification.
- 4.4 The trend of development, if any, in the general area of the property in question, including changes, if any, that have taken place since the property in question was placed in its present zoning classification:** Since the 2017 comprehensive zoning, the area immediately east of the Property has continued to grow, with the expansion of commercial uses along the Boston Street corridor. The rezoning of this Property to the IMU-2 District is consistent with this shift, as it creates an appropriate transition between the commercial uses west of this site and the industrial uses to the east and south.

5. Required Items for Consideration Under the Land Use Article.

Finally, Section 10-305 of the State Land Use Article requires the Planning Commission to study the proposed changes in relation to (1) the Plan; (2) the needs of Baltimore City; and (3) the needs of the particular neighborhood in the vicinity of the proposed changes.

- 5.1 The Plan:** the proposed rezoning will support the Plan’s goal of retaining and attracting businesses in growth sectors by permitting the redevelopment of the site for commercial use.
- 5.2 The needs of Baltimore City:** Rezoning the Property to IMU-2 supports the creation of new jobs for City residents.
- 5.3 The needs of the particular neighborhood:** The Property is located in a mixed-use neighborhood with a growing residential population. The transitional IMU-2 zoning classification is necessary so that the Property can best serve its industrial, commercial, and residential community members. The Canton Community Association, Brewers Hill Neighbors, and Greater Greektown Neighborhood Alliance all support the proposed rezoning.

EXHIBIT 1

Council Bill 09-0411

MAY 24 2010

Certified as duly passed this _____ day of _____, 20__

David C. Hardy

President, Baltimore City Council

Certified as duly delivered to Her Honor, the Mayor,

this _____ day of ^{MAY 24 2010} _____, 20__

Raymond J. ...

Chief Clerk

Approved this ^{MAY 27 2010} _____ of _____, 20__

Stephen D. Blaise

Mayor, Baltimore City

Approved For Form and Legal Sufficiency

This 25 day of May 2010.

[Signature]
Assistant Solicitor

A TRUE COPY

Edward J. Gallagher
Director of Finance

EXHIBIT 2



BALTIMORE CITY DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT



Search Results

If you suspect that work is being performed without a permit or that the work is more than the scope of work indicates, please fill out a report at [311 Online](#).

Record Count : 11

(To organize your search click on the appropriate heading.)

Permit Number	Plan Number	Description	Address	District	Issued Date	Expiration Date	Neighborhood
USE2014-02166		(USE) USE PREMISES AS A MOTOR VEHICLE RENTAL ESTABLISHMENT.	4900 BOSTON ST	203	06/26/2014		CANTON INDUSTRIAL AREA
USE2011-05728		(USE)PORTION OF THE PREMISES FOR WARE HOUSE OR STORAGE OF THE STEEL PRODUCTS INSIDE THE BUILDING.	4900 BOSTON ST	203	03/07/2012		CANTON INDUSTRIAL AREA
COM2014-30121		INSTALLATION OF SECURITY SYSTEM - 5 DEVICES AS PER CODE.	4900 BOSTON ST	203	10/10/2014	04/10/2015	CANTON INDUSTRIAL AREA
COM2014-11619		INSTALL NEW WALL SIGNS & VINYL HOOKS ON DOOR (1) - 13'-10" X 2'6" ILLUMINATED WALL SIGN 34.58 SQ FT. (1) 2'-5/8" X 1'7" NON-ILLUMINATED WALL SIGN 3.28 SQ FT AS PER SKETCH & AS PER CODE.	4900 BOSTON ST	203	06/30/2014	12/30/2014	CANTON INDUSTRIAL AREA
COM2014-03968	2014-400	CONSTRUCT ONE STORY ADDITION ON SIDE OF EXISTING BUILDING AS PER PLANS AND AS PER CODE.	4900 BOSTON ST	203	04/17/2014	10/17/2014	CANTON INDUSTRIAL AREA
COM2012-02767		AMEND PERMIT#COM2010-24298 ISSUED ON 1-14-2011 W/AMENDED COMPLETION DATE OF 7-14-12 TO NAME ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR AS STATED ABOVE. Original Permit Description: (COM2010-24298) NEW CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE STORY CARRYOUT RESTAURANT. WOOD FRAMED BUILDING ON A CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE. THE SITE IS A VACANT NEWLY ASPHALT PAVED AND MASONRY FENCED SITE CONSTRUCTED FROM APPROVED CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS IN 2008-2009 AS PER PLANS AS PER CODE.	4900 BOSTON ST	203	02/08/2012	07/14/2012	CANTON INDUSTRIAL AREA

COM2012-00307		REQUEST FOR TIME EXTENSION ON PERMIT COM2010-24298, ISSUED ON 01/14/11 WITH ORIGINAL COMPLETION DATE OF 01/14/12. Original Permit Description: (COM2010-24298) NEW CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE STORY CARRYOUT RESTAURANT. WOOD FRAMED BUILDING ON A CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE. THE SITE IS A VACANT NEWLY ASPHALT PAVED AND MASONRY FENCED SITE CONSTRUCTED FROM APPROVED CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS IN 2008-2009 AS PER PLANS AS PER CODE.	4900 BOSTON ST	203	01/09/2012	07/14/2012	CANTON INDUSTRIAL AREA
COM2010-24298	2010-1462	NEW CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE STORY CARRYOUT RESTAURANT. WOOD FRAMED BUILDING ON A CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE. THE SITE IS A VACANT NEWLY ASPHALT PAVED AND MASONRY FENCED SITE CONSTRUCTED FROM APPROVED CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS IN 2008-2009 AS PER PLANS AS PER CODE.	4900 BOSTON ST	203	01/14/2011	01/14/2012	CANTON INDUSTRIAL AREA
COM2008-30938		INSTALL A TEMPORARY 200 AMP SINGLE PHASE METER AND PANEL WITH MAIN BREAKER BOX. WIRE CIRCUIT TO AUTOMATIC GATE OPERATOR. AS PER CODE.	4900 BOSTON ST	203	11/19/2008	05/19/2009	CANTON INDUSTRIAL AREA
COM2008-06197		REMOVE OF BILL BOARD & STRUCTURE 12' X 25' AS PER CODE	4900 BOSTON ST	203	03/14/2008	09/14/2008	CANTON INDUSTRIAL AREA
COM2007-32588		PROPERTY MASONRY FENCE DESIGN FOR VACANT LOT, HEIGHT OF WALL PONCA STREET SIDE 3'-6" TO CAP. HEIGHT OF WALL BOSTON STREET SIDE 6'-0" TO CAP; 3'-6" HIGH 20'-0" BACK FROM PONCA STREET. AS PER CODE.	4900 BOSTON ST	203	10/24/2007	04/24/2008	CANTON INDUSTRIAL AREA

[Permits](#) |
 [Property Registration](#) |
 [Code Enforcement](#) |
 [Community Services](#) |
 [Resident Services](#) |
 [HCVP](#) |
 [Public Housing](#) |
 [Document Central](#)

[Developers](#) |
 [Home](#) |
 [Site Map](#) |
 [Jobseekers](#) |
 [Contractors](#) |
 [Homebuyers](#) |
 [Landlords](#) |
 [Residents](#) |
 Mayor Bernard C. "Jack" Young & Michael Braverman, Acting Commissioner/Acting Executive Director

EXHIBIT 3

4900 Boston Street



Google