Tax Map/Block/Parcel No. 74-14-155 Building Permit/Zoning Certificate No. 96-3052

Case 4159

OFFICIAL DECISION
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
CARROLL COUNTY, MARYLAND

APPLICANT:

Mr. Albert Craemer 4817 Deer Park Road

Owings Mills, Maryland 21117

REQUEST:

Enlargement of an existing beauty shop classified

as a nonconforming use

LOCATION:

2132 Liberty Road on property zoned "R-20,000"

Residence District in Election District 5

BASIS:

Article 4, Section 4.3(a)(1); Ordinance 1E (The

Carroll County Zoning Ordinance)

On October 25, 1996, the Board held a hearing on the applicant's request for enlargement of an existing beauty shop classified by the applicant as a nonconforming use. During the hearing, the applicant requested and the Board approved a modification of the request to that of a conditional use for a beauty parlor as authorized in Section 7.2(b) of Ordinance 1E. The subject property is 1.038 acres and is zoned "R-20,000".

## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

Mr. Albert Craemer, the applicant, appeared and testified on behalf of his application. Based on the testimony and the record, the Board makes the following findings of fact. The property consists of a little more than one acre and is zoned "R-20,000" Residence District. It is improved by a building which was at one time used by its resident as a beauty shop. The beauty shop use ceased operation in December of 1995. The nature or extent of the beauty shop operation is unknown as there was no testimony or evidence presented regarding the issue. The applicant's testimony is that the use abated in December of 1995, well over six months from the date of the hearing. If the use qualified as a nonconforming use, the Board finds that it no longer does. Confronted with the lack of evidence regarding the nonconforming status, the applicant petitioned the Board to modify his request to that of a conditional use for a beauty parlor as authorized in Section 7.2(b) of the zoning ordinance.

The applicant testified and the Board finds that he would like to remodel the building and provide adequate parking for the

proposed beauty parlor. The parlor would have twelve stations with twelve operators. In addition, the upstairs would continue to be used as rental property for a residence. The shop would be open six days a week between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. and two nights a week until 8:00 p.m. There would be no Sunday hours. The applicant testified that he would be the owner/operator.

The Board concludes that the degree of the operation proposed to be contrary to that which is authorized in the ordinance as a beauty parlor in Section 7.2(b). In making this conclusion, the Board is guided by several factors. The parking requirements for the proposed use would require the construction of at least 38 parking spaces.1 To construct such a large number of parking spaces on such a small area in the residential zone is contrary to the purpose of the residential zone. To make the twelve station operation viable, a large number of clients would have to visit the The number of customers which would be attracted to this facility would create a dangerous traffic problem. traffic generated by the large number of customers would be particularly onerous at this location as the site is serviced by a very heavily trafficked road with very limited access. The use as described at this location is simply not an appropriate use of the land.

The Board finds that the reduction of the number of stations would adequately address many of the Board's concerns. By reducing the number of stations authorized the traffic generated would be equally reduced. The parking requirement would equally be reduced and the adverse effects of the use upon peaceful enjoyment of people in the adjoining residences at this location would be reduced to an acceptable level.

The applicant and the Board discussed the issue of the number of stations at the hearing at great length. To be economically viable, the applicant first argued that the minimum number of stations he can have is eight, and then six. However, the Board is convinced that reducing the number of stations to six does little to ameliorate the adverse effects the use would have at this location. The Board concludes that more than four stations at this location would be unacceptable, and therefore approves the request limited to four stations. The hours of operation are also limited to the hours requested. The Board notes that by limiting the number of stations to four, it is balancing the desire of the applicant and the adverse effects the use will have on the neighborhood. The reduction of the number of stations will reduce the parking requirements, the traffic and the overall commercial nature of the venture. The Board finds that any more than four stations at this location would have a greater adverse effect than

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Three parking spaces for each station plus two parking spaces for the residence. See Article 14, Section 14.1(a)(5) and Section 14.1(a)(24).

elsewhere in the R-20,000 zone.

Subsequent to the oral decision and prior to this written decision, the Board received a request from the applicant. The request sought "reconsideration of a conditional use based upon additional information". The Board's rules do not provide a method or manner for requests for reconsideration. The rules permit for rehearings. The Board's rule (G) provides:

No request to grant a rehearing will be entertained unless new evidence is submitted, which could not reasonably be presented at the previous hearing. If the request for a rehearing is granted, the case shall be put on the calendar for a rehearing. In all cases, the request for a rehearing shall be in writing, reciting the reasons for the request, and shall be duly verified and accompanied by the necessary data and diagrams.

In the interest of administrative economy, the Board considered the request as one for a reconsideration and for a rehearing. The Board convened in open session on November 14, 1996. After reviewing the request, the Board declined to reconsider its decision and voted to deny the request for a rehearing. The applicant has not met his burden to justify a rehearing.

11/22/96

Date

Karl V. Reichlin, Chairman