IN THE MATTER OF * BEFORE THE CECIL COUNTY

THE APPLICATION OF * BOARD OF APPEALS

KEVIN URICK * CASE NO.: 3693

*

(Variance)(MH) *

OPINION

The Cecil County Board of Zoning Appeals (the "Board") is now asked to consider the application of Kevin Urick (the "Applicant"). Applicant seeks a variance from the road frontage requirements in order to subdivide up to five (5) parcels from the approximately fifty (50) acre property located at 100 Buttonwood Beach Road, Earleville, Mary land 21919, designated as Parcel 100 on Tax Map 32, in the Third Election District of Cecil County (the "Property"). The Property is in an area zoned Manufactured Home ("MH") and is owned by Elizabeth A. Pasquarello, Walter S. Barlcay, Jr., and Dorcas E. Barclay.

Under the provisions of Article XVII, Part I, Section 306, Paragraph 1, variances, as defined in Article II, may be granted by the Board of Appeals. Paragraph 2 of Section 306 requires the Board to examine all facts of the case and render a decision based upon the following criteria:

- A. The variance requested is based upon a situation where, because of special circumstances, a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would deprive the applicant of a right commonly enjoyed by other parties in the same zone under the terms of this Ordinance.
- B. Special conditions and circumstances exist that are peculiar to the land, buildings, or structures involved, and that are not applicable to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zone, such conditions and circumstances not being the result of actions by the applicant.

- C. The granting of the variance will not confer upon the applicant any special privileges that are denied by this Ordinance to other properties in the same zone.
- D. The variance request does not arise from any condition to land or building use, either permitted or non-conforming, on any neighborhood property.

Applicant appeared and testified that a variance is being sought to the road frontage requirements in order to subdivide the Property. The Property consists of approximately fifty acres and has no public road frontage. Property was originally subdivided off of a 150 acre parcel that was subdivided into three lots, resulting in a lack of road frontage for this parcel. Applicant requested the ability to subdivide up to five lots from the Parcel. This would allow the property owners to each take a lot and allow additional lots to be transferred to family members.

From the evidence presented the Board is satisfied that the criteria set forth in Section 306 has been met, and makes the following findings:

- 1. The variance request is based upon a situation where, because of special circumstances, a literal enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would deprive the applicant of a right commonly enjoyed by other parties in the same zone under the terms of this Ordinance. Although the Property is of sufficient size, the Applicant is unable to subdivide the property because of the road frontage requirements. Other properties of the size of the Parcel are able to subdivide in the manner proposed by the Applicant and without a variance Applicant will not be able to move forward with the proposed subdivision.
- 2. Special conditions and circumstances exist that are peculiar to the subject land, buildings or structures involved and that are not applicable to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zone. Due to the unique position of the Property with respect to the road map as a result of

the prior subdivision, a parcel that would be otherwise able to be subdivided is unable to be subdivided.

- 3. The granting of the variance will not confer upon the applicant special privileges that are denied by this Ordinance to other properties in the same zone. Other owners of parcels of equal size to the Property are able to subdivide their property in the manner proposed by Applicant.
- 4. There is no evidence that the variance request arises from any condition to land or building use, either permitted or non-conforming, on any neighborhood property.

For the reasons stated, by unanimous vote, the Board is satisfied that the criteria set forth in Section 306 have been met, and the application is therefore **APPROVED** for the purpose of doing a minor subdivision.

10) 28 / Join

3

BOARD OF APPEALS APPLICATION CECIL COUNTY, MARYLAND	FILE NO. 3693
THIS REQUEST IS FOR: SPECIAL EXCEPTION RENEWAL SPECIAL EXCEPTION AARIANCE APPEAL	DATE FILED: 8 20 111 AMOUNT PD: 5 200.00 ACCEPTED BY: 75 U
A. APPLICANT INFORMATION Kevin Usick, Es APPLICANT NAME - PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS ADDRESS	1kton Med 21921 CITY STATE ZIPCODE
APPLICANT SIGNATURE	4 4 3 - 8 38 - 6536 PHONE NUMBER
B. PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION PLEGSE SEE CONTINUE PROPERTY OWNER NAME - PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY	other sheet - Top signatures
ADDRESS	CITY STATE ZIP CODE
PROPERTY OWNER SIGNATURE	PHONE NUMBER
PROPERTY ADDRESS OS OS OS OS HAXMAP# BLOCK PARCEL LOT#	ELECTION DIST. ACCT. NUMBER 54.6 MH #ACRES ZONE
Please See Continuation	1 1
E. On an attached sheet, <u>PLEASE</u> submit a sketch of the property in distances from the front, side and rear property lines and the dim	idicating the proposed project. Show
F. LAND USE DESIGNATION Is property in the Critical Area? If yes, Pertinent provision of the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area P Is property in the 100 year Floodplain? Is property an Agricultural Preservation District?	
If property is located in the Critical Area, all provisions and requ XVII, Part I, II & III of the Zoning Ordinance. G. PROVISION OF ZONING ORDINANCE:	evt Schedule of Zone Rosulat
G. PROVISION OF ZONING ORDINANCE: Qual 170	Trede VII Section 17 Wer Ve
H. SPECIAL EXCEPTION RENEWAL – PREVIOUS FILE NO. &	CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL: 1/9
I. SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR A MANUFACTURED HOM	$\underline{\mathbf{E}}$ – Please fill out the following information:
Will unit be visible from the road? If yes,	distance:
Will unit be visible from adjoining properties? If yes,	
Distance to nearest manufactured home: Size/Mo	odel/Year of Unit:
Number of units on property at present time:	Revised 10-05-gd

CONTINUATION SHEET

B. PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION:

1. Elizabeth Anne Pasquarello		
Property Owner Name		
314 S. Union Street	Wilmington	DE 19805
Address Horse Kissa	City	State Zip Code 302-777-1147
Property Owner Signature Property Owner Signature	noe)	Phone Number
2. Walter Scott Barclay, Jr.		
Property Owner Name		
100 Buttonwood Beach Rd.	Earleview	MD 21919
Address	City	State Zip Code
Property Owner Signature		Phone Number
3. Dorcas Elaine Barclay		
Property Owner Name		
250 E. Main St.	Elkton	MD 21921
Address 1	City	State Zip Code 443 945 6499
Property Owner Signature		Phone Number

D. PURPOSE OF APPLICATION

The current owners of 100 Buttonwood Beach Road wish to create a minor subdivision of the property. However, the property has no public road frontage. Buttonwood Beach Road, a private road running along an easement through the property, is the only road abutting the property. The owners seek a variance to the public road frontage requirement of Article VI, Schedule of Zone Regulations, pursuant to Article VII, Section 171, Road Frontage Waivers, so that they may subdivide the property.

September 27, 1957, Elkview Shores, Inc., deeded the property to Dorcas C. Barclay. WAS book 53 page 285. June 5, 2001, Dorcas C. Barclay deeded the same property, without alteration, to herself and her three children, Elizabeth Anne Pasquarello, Walter Scott Barclay, Jr., and Dorcas Elaine Barclay. WLB book 01617 page 00060. Dorcas C. Barclay is since deceased, leaving the three siblings as joint owners with right of survivorship.

100 Buttonwood Beach Road has had no subdivision since at least 1957. Now the joint owners wish to sever the joint ownership and subdivide the property with the aim of being able to build residences and reside on their respective properties. The parameters of the minor subdivision envisioned will be established later by the surveyor who is contracted to effect the division and lay out the boundaries. Attached is a map from county records showing 100 Buttonwood Beach Road in orange (the property has two additional address of 170, a rental office for the adjacent vacation resort, and 99, which is the site of a trailer which once served as a residence). The map shows that the property, which runs from the waterfront, then for a distance inland, abuts no public roads.

The joint owners do not seek to sell the property but rather to retain ownership. By a minor subdivision they expect to make better personal use of the property.



