

**Tax Map/Block/Parcel
No. 74-16-184**

**Building Permit/Zoning
Certificate No. 02-1684**

Case 4690

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

APPLICANT: Charles L. Bopst
239 West Old Liberty Road
Sykesville, Maryland 21784

ATTORNEY: N/A

REQUEST: An application for a conditional use for the parking of commercial vehicles and a contractor's equipment storage yard; a variance from the required lot size of 3 acres; a variance from the required 43,560 sq. ft. for storage; and variances from distance requirements as needed.

LOCATION: The site is located at 6502 Oakland Mills Road, Sykesville, MD 21784, on property zoned "B-L" Local Business District in Election District 5.

BASIS: Code of Public Local Laws and Ordinances, Chapter 223-100 A, 223-75 and 223-16

HEARING HELD: June 25, 2002

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

On June 25, 2002, the Board of Zoning Appeals (the Board) convened to hear the request for a conditional use for the parking of commercial vehicles and a contractor's equipment storage yard; a variance from the required lot size of 3 acres; a variance from the required 43,560 sq. ft. for storage; and variances from distance requirements as needed. Based on the testimony and evidence presented, the Board made the following findings and conclusion:

The site is an existing house with a yard and is zoned "B-G" Business General. The Applicant envisions building a stone parking lot on the property to facilitate the parking of up to 11 pieces of contractors' equipment and/or commercial vehicles. In addition, the Applicant wishes to store up to 20 portable sanitary toilets on the site from his septic business.

Official Decision
Case 4690
Page 2

The Board finds the proposed use, namely an offshoot of an existing septic service, will generate adverse effects here greater than elsewhere in the zone. The stored portable toilets and heavy equipment would adversely impact the neighborhood here with their attendant noise, smoke and odors. Additionally, the Board finds that the Applicant has not proven hardship necessary to support the variances requested. While the location may be convenient for the Applicant, he has not shown unnecessary hardship or unique circumstances existing with regard to this particular parcel that would justify the variance requested.

Accordingly, the request for conditional uses and variances is denied.

7/24/02

Date

Karl V. Reichlin
Karl V. Reichlin, Chairman