Tax Map/Block/Parcel No. 41-21-414

Building Permit/Zoning Certificate No. 01-2691

Case 4630

OFFICIAL DECISION BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS CARROLL COUNTY, MARYLAND

APPLICANT:

Covenant Media, Inc.

6607 Jacks Court

Mt. Airy, Maryland 21771

ATTORNEY:

N/A

REQUEST:

An appeal of the Zoning Administrator's decision and a request for a variance to the required minimum 800 ft. between off premises

signs to 545 ft. for the construction of a double-faced sign.

LOCATION:

The site is located at 422 Hanover Pike, Hampstead, MD 21074,

on property zoned "I-R" Restricted Industrial District in Election

District 8.

BASIS:

Code of Public Local Laws and Ordinances, Chapter 223-182 A

and B.

HEARING HELD:

October 30, 2001

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

On October 30, 2001, the Board of Zoning Appeals (the Board) convened to hear the appeal of the Zoning Administrator's decision denying a variance and, alternatively, a request for a variance to the required minimum space between off premise signs. Based upon the testimony and evidence presented, the Board makes the following findings and conclusions.

The subject property is located within the "I-R" Restricted Industrial zone. The regulations in the "I-R" zone require a minimum of 800 ft. between advertising signs (see Code of Public Local Laws and Ordinances, Chapter 223-139 (B) (4)). The Applicant is seeking a variance to erect a sign within 545 ft. of another sign, which also belongs to the Applicant.

Official Decision Case 4630 Page 2

A variance may be granted only where strict compliance with the terms of the Zoning Ordinance would result in practical difficulty or unreasonable hardship. In addition, a variance should not be granted unless a hardship is suffered which is peculiar to the property. Economic loss alone is not a sufficient basis for the granting of a variance. In addition, variances should not be granted where the hardship is self-inflicted.

The Board finds the economic loss alleged by the Applicant is insufficient to support a variance. In addition, the Board finds it significant that the variance is needed from another of the Applicant's signs. Any hardship in this case is self-inflicted. Accordingly, the request for a variance is denied.

11-6-01

Date

Ronald F. Hoff, Acting Chairman

H:\Zoning Administration\BZA_CASE.DOC\c4630decision.doc