

BEFORE THE BOARD OF APPEALS FOR WASHINGTON COUNTY, MARYLAND

GERALD RILEY  
10812 Lynn Court  
Williamsport, Maryland 21795  
Appellant

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

Appeal No. AP2008-024

OPINION

This action is a request for a variance from the minimum 10' rear yard setback to 3' for the placement of a 21' diameter above-ground swimming pool. The subject property is located at 10812 Lynn Court, Williamsport, Maryland, is owned by the Appellant, and is zoned Residential Urban.

A public hearing was held before the Board on May 21, 2008. The Appellant offered evidence and testimony in support of the appeal. No opposition was presented to this appeal.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The following findings of fact are made by the Board, based upon the testimony given and all data and other evidence presented, and upon a study of the specific property involved, as well as the neighborhood:

1. Appellant proposes construction of a 21' diameter above-ground pool on the subject 0.23-acre property.
2. The lot's irregular shape, a sewer easement, and setback areas restrict the buildable area on the lot and necessitate this variance.
3. The pool will be placed so as to share an existing deck with the Appellant's dwelling.
4. Appellant's neighbors and his homeowners' association have approved this request, and no one testified in opposition to this appeal.

## RATIONALE

This Board has authority to grant a variance upon a showing by the Appellant of practical difficulty or undue hardship. Sections 25.2(c) and 25.56, Zoning Ordinance for Washington County, Maryland. "Practical Difficulty" may be found by the Board when: (1) strict compliance would unreasonably prevent the use of the property for a permitted purpose or render conformance unnecessarily burdensome; and (2) denying the variances would do substantial injustice to the applicant and a lesser relaxation than that applied for would not give substantial relief; and (3) granting the variance would observe the spirit of the Ordinance and secure public safety and welfare. Section 25.56(a).

Appellant's proposal is a reasonable accessory use of the subject property and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Strict compliance is unnecessarily burdensome and impractical given the size and shape of the lot and the location of existing structures thereon. No evidence was presented that the proposed use was incompatible with the neighborhood; disruptive of neighbors' quiet enjoyment of their properties; detrimental to surrounding property values; generative of excessive odors, dust, gas, smoke, fumes, vibrations, or glare; generative of traffic that would exceed the capacity of existing infrastructure; or that the proposal was an inappropriate use of land or structure. As the does not engender any opposition from Appellant's neighbors and the proposed placement of the structure is the most logical given the features of the lot, we feel that the grant of this request advances the spirit and purpose of the Ordinance.

Based upon all of the testimony and evidence presented, this Board finds that the subject request does not adversely affect the public health, safety, security, morals, or general welfare, nor does it result in dangerous traffic conditions, or jeopardize the life and property of neighborhood residents. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth herein, this appeal is hereby GRANTED this 19<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2008.

BOARD OF APPEALS

By: Bert Iseminger, Chair