

Tax Map/Block/Parcel  
No. 52-21-93

Building Permit/Zoning  
Certificate No. 92-2477

Case 3785

**OFFICIAL DECISION  
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
CARROLL COUNTY, MARYLAND**

**APPLICANT:** Larry K. Blizzard, Jr.  
2111 Don Avenue  
Westminster, Maryland 21157

**REQUEST:** Variances reducing the minimum required lot area of one acre to about .82 and .84 of an acre for two proposed lots, each improved with a dwelling; the minimum required lot width of 150 feet to about 120 feet for one lot; and, one minimum required side yard of 20 feet to about 10 feet for the other lot to allow division of the existing lot into two lots

**LOCATION:** 727 Deer Park Road in Election District 4

**BASES:** Article 6, Section 6.7; Article 15, Section 15.5; Ordinance 1E (The Carroll County Zoning Ordinance)

**HEARING HELD:** September 22, 1992

**FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION**

The application, testimony and evidence comprising the record of this case are hereby included by reference in this decision. Based on the record, the Board denied the variances. The pertinent findings determining the Board's decision include the following facts:

The 1.78 acre lot is improved with a dwelling constructed prior to 1988. Construction of a second dwelling was started following issuance of Building Permit 88-1088, July 6, 1988 to Arlene B. Gesell, owner of the property. Authorization of the building permit for the dwelling was conditioned, restricting use of the dwelling to immediate family only and that it was not to be rented.

Prior to completing construction of the dwelling, the circumstances prompting construction of the dwelling changed significantly, dictating that work cease prior to completion of the dwelling. Since then, Mrs. Gesell has not been able to complete construction of the dwelling due to financial difficulties.

The applicant proposes to purchase the property and complete construction of the dwelling, subject to authorization of the

variances that are required in order to divide the lot into two lots.

The zoning ordinance specifies that variances may only be granted in cases where strict compliance with the terms of the ordinance would result in practical difficulty and unreasonable hardship. In this case, the requested variances would be merely a convenience to the applicant, with no evidence of practical difficulty and unreasonable hardship in use of the property. Therefore, it was necessary for the Board to deny the requested variances.

September 28, 1992  
Date

William Law  
William Law, Chairman

JDN/bmh/c3785dec  
September 28, 1992