

**Tax Map/Block/Parcel
No. 32-14-279**

**Building Permit/Zoning
Certificate No. 03-1746**

Case 4812

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

APPLICANT: Cranberry Meadows Farm, Inc.
C/o Donald Dell
1338 Sullivan Road
Westminster, Maryland 21157

ATTORNEY: N/A

REQUEST: An application for an appeal of a Planning and Zoning Commission decision concerning the denial of a request for a waiver to residential lot size.

LOCATION: The site is located at the end of Benedict Road, on property zoned "A" Agricultural District in Election District 6.

BASIS: Code of Public Local Laws and Ordinances, Chapter 223-186 A (1)

HEARING HELD: July 29, 2003

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

On July 29, 2003, the Board of Zoning Appeals (the Board) convened to hear the request for an appeal of a Planning and Zoning Commission decision concerning the denial of a request for a waiver to residential lot size. Based on the testimony and evidence presented, the Board makes the following findings and conclusion:

The Planning Commission considered this case on 4/15/03. The Applicant came forward with a plan seeking a waiver on the lot size requirements mandated by the County's Rural Development Guidelines Standards. The purpose of the guidelines is to maximize the amount of tillable land in the agricultural district. The Applicant is proposing to divide his 55.6 acre parcel into two (2) three (3) acre lots, one 24 acre lot and one 25 acre lot. These lot sizes are inconsistent with the Rural Development Guideline Standards, which provide for minimum lot sizes of one acre in the Agricultural District to maximize the amount of land remaining in cropland.

OFFICIAL DECISION

C4812

Page Two

Based upon the testimony and evidence presented, the Board makes the following findings and conclusions:

The Planning Commission applied long standing rural development guidelines in considering the plan at issue. The purpose of the guidelines is to preserve cropland by prescribing a scheme for development in agriculturally zoned areas. The Applicant's plan clearly falls outside these guidelines. Accordingly, we see no error on the part of the Planning Commission in this instance. Accordingly, the appeal is denied.

8/25/03

Date

Karl V. Reichlin

Karl V. Reichlin, Chairman