

IN RE: PETITION FOR ADMIN. VARIANCE	*	BEFORE THE
(8260 Streamwood Drive)		
2 nd Election District	*	OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE
2 nd Council District		
Henry D. Putty & Angela C. Davis-Putty	*	HEARINGS FOR
Petitioners		
	*	BALTIMORE COUNTY
	*	CASE NO. 2018-0085-A

* * * * *

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Office of Administrative Hearings (“OAH”) as a Petition for Administrative Variance filed by the legal owners of the property, Henry D. Putty and Angela C. Davis-Putty (“Petitioners”). The Petitioners are requesting Variance relief pursuant to § 1B02.3.C.1 of the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations (“B.C.Z.R.”), to permit a proposed addition with a side yard setback of 5 ft. and the sum of 18 ft. in lieu of the required 10 ft. and the sum of 25 ft. respectively. The subject property and requested relief is more fully depicted on the site plan that was marked and accepted into evidence as Petitioners’ Exhibit 1.

The Zoning Advisory Committee (“ZAC”) comments were received and are made part of the record of this case. A ZAC comment was received from the Bureau of Development Plans Review (“DPR”) dated October 11, 2017, indicating:

“There is an existing shed located in an existing Drainage & Utility Easement as shown on drawings. The shed shall be relocated outside of the Drainage & Utility Easement.

There is a Drainage & Utility Easement located along the property line adjacent to the proposed building addition. The proposed addition must be located outside of the Drainage & Utility Easement.”

The Petitioners having filed a Petition for Administrative Variance and the subject property having been posted on October 1, 2017, and there being no request for a public hearing, a decision

shall be rendered based upon the documentation presented.

The Petitioners have filed the supporting affidavits as required by Section 32-3-303 of the Baltimore County Code (“B.C.C.”). Based upon the information available, there is no evidence in the file to indicate that the requested variance would adversely affect the health, safety or general welfare of the public and should therefore be granted. In the opinion of the Administrative Law Judge, the information, photographs, and affidavits submitted provide sufficient facts that comply with the requirements of Section 307.1 of the B.C.Z.R. Furthermore, strict compliance with the B.C.Z.R. would result in practical difficulty and/or unreasonable hardship upon the Petitioners.

Pursuant to the posting of the property and the provisions of both the Baltimore County Code and the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations, and for the reasons given above, the requested variance should be granted.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, this 2nd day of **November, 2017**, by the Administrative Law Judge for Baltimore County, that the Petition for Variance relief from § 1B02.3.C.1 of the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations (“B.C.Z.R.”), to permit a proposed addition with a side yard setback of 5 ft. and the sum of 18 ft. in lieu of the required 10 ft. and the sum of 25 ft. respectively, be and is hereby GRANTED.

The relief granted herein shall be subject to the following:

- Petitioners may apply for their appropriate permits and be granted same upon receipt of this Order; however, Petitioners are hereby made aware that proceeding at this time is at their own risk until such time as the 30-day appellate process from this Order has expired. If, for whatever reason, this Order is reversed, Petitioners would be required to return, and be responsible for returning, said property to its original condition.
- Petitioners shall comply with the DPR ZAC comment, dated October 11, 2017; a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Any appeal of this decision must be made within thirty (30) days of the date of this Order.

Signed
JOHN E. BEVERUNGEN
Administrative Law Judge
for Baltimore County

JEB:dlw