

Case 3128

OFFICIAL DECISION
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
CARROLL COUNTY, MARYLAND

APPLICANT: Thomas Underwood
1307 Lee Lane
Sykesville, Maryland 21784

ATTORNEY: Charles D. Hollman, Esq.
Beck, Hollman, Hughes & Finch
189 East Main Street
Westminster, Maryland 21157

AGENT: BPR, Incorporated
359 Manchester Road
Westminster, Maryland 21157

REQUEST: Variances reducing one minimum required side yard
of 10 feet to one foot for a proposed office and
warehouse facility, and the minimum required
width of the access driveway from 20 feet to 15
feet.

LOCATION: 1307 Lee Lane in Election District 5

BASES: Article 11, Section 11.5; Article 14, Division I,
Section 14.1(b)3; Article 15, Section 15.5;
Ordinance 1E

HEARING HELD: March 31, 1989

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

Based on the application, testimony and evidence comprising the record of this case, the Board hereby authorizes the requested variances. The pertinent findings justifying the authorization include the following facts:

The property is zoned "B-G" General Business District and is improved with a single family dwelling. The applicant, Mr. Underwood, operates an electrical contractor's business from the premises. As shown by the site development plan, identified as Applicant's Exhibit 1, the lot is approximately 69 feet in width and slightly more than 300 in depth. An existing detached garage

presently located to the rear of the dwelling will be razed, and storage trailers will be removed. The proposed building, 48 feet in width by 60 feet in length is planned to have several offices, a sales display area, and storage space. The building will be located about 80 feet to the rear of the dwelling and a little more than that from the rear property line. Parking spaces will be established between the dwelling and the proposed building, and to the rear of the building in accordance with applicable regulations. The existing driveway providing access to the proposed building and parking can not be made to comply with the minimum requirement of 20 feet in width adjacent to the dwelling, without razing at least part of the dwelling. Although concerns were expressed regarding the proposed improvements, the Board finds no probative evidence that establishment of the building and parking spaces as proposed will unduly affect the adjoining properties or public interest.

The applicant's attention is directed to the provisions of Article 10, Section 10.4(d) of Ordinance 1E regarding approval of the proposed site development plan.

April 13, 1989

Date

John Totura

John Totura, Chairman