

Mr. Robert G. Deitrich,  
Building Inspection Engineer

(continued)

on which it fronts, it follows inescapably, we believe, that no such structure can lawfully be erected unless it is on a lot which fronts on a street."

Sections 48(t) and 48(m) of the Baltimore City Zoning Ordinance read as follows:

"(t) FRONT OR FRONTAGE. That side of a lot abutting on a street or way and ordinarily regarded as the front of the lot, but it shall not be considered as the ordinary side line of a corner lot."

"(m) FRONT YARD. A clear, unoccupied space on the same lot with a building, extending across the entire width of the lot and situated between the front line of the building and the front line of the lot."

Also, in the Restivo v. Princeton Construction Co., case, supra, the Court of Appeals of Maryland said:

"Provisions requiring buildings to front on a public street seem not to be uncommon in zoning ordinances and generally have been upheld. 8 McQuillin, Municipal Corporations (3rd Rev. Ed. 1957), Sec. 25.143, says: 'A zoning or other ordinance, leastwise where authorized, may require that buildings on lots shall face the street that the lot faces. \* \* \* It may be required that houses or other buildings front on streets and not alleys, and the requirement cannot be evaded by subterfuge, concealment or misnaming fronts, sides or rears.'"

In support of the last quoted statement, the Court of Appeals makes reference, by footnote on page 527 of 223 Maryland, to the following cases: Rollins v. Armstrong, 251 Md. 349, 167 N.E. 466; Davis v. City of Abilene, Texas Civil Appeal, 250 S.W.2d 685; In re McInerney, 47 Wyo. 34 P.2d 35; and Dinnick v. City of Toronto, 3 D.L.R. 310, 311.

In the case of Rollins v. Armstrong, supra, the Court said:

"The front wall of a building, within the meaning of the zoning ordinance of the City of Yonkers, is the one fronting on the street and not the one designated by the builder as the front."

In the case of Davis v. City of Abilene, the Court said: