Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan
Stakeholders' Advisory Group Draft Plan Comments (Pre-FCPC)

Advisory Group Meeting #1 (Bar-T Ranch, 27 July 2021)

Advisory Group Attendees: Martha Hartlaub, Blanca Poteat, Steve Poteat, Joe Richardson, Russell Thompson, David Webster, John Webster

Introduction/Background
- Overall the plan is very impressive – a comprehensive document
- Planning Area boundary – the Natelli parcels should remain within the Sugarloaf planning area; interest in understanding the current development potential, and planned development potential, for these parcels and potential impacts on Thurston Road (traffic, rural character)

History & Culture
- No comments

Stronghold Incorporated and Sugarloaf Mountain
- Correct photo caption for Frank Lloyd Wright in car (not Gordon Strong)

Land Use
- Incorporate "Change Maps" to more clearly identify the proposed land use and zoning changes
- Stronghold representatives requested clarification on the development activities that would trigger a requirement for site plan submittal
- Expansion of the Carrollton Manor Rural Legacy Area should include incorporation of the Sugarloaf name to maintain the area's distinct identity
- County policies that support long-term preservation throughout the proposed expanded Rural Legacy Area are important

Transportation Network
- Concerns regarding increasing traffic volumes along Thurston Road; traffic coincides with network congestion along the I-270 corridor, but is not limited to those instances
- In terms of traffic impacts, the Sugarloaf area experiences impacts generated by growth outside of the planning area; I-270 corridor problems (and potential solutions) affect the planning area
- The future interchange at Dr. Perry Road/Mott Road and I-270 is problematic for the Sugarloaf area; the surrounding road network is deficient
- Concerns with impacts on the Sugarloaf area of any potential "outer beltway" projects

Watershed/Water Quality

- A great benefit to have this environmental data included in the plan document; this information is not collected in any other single document available to the public

Forestlands, Green Infrastructure, and Biodiversity

- A great benefit to have this environmental data included in the plan document; this information is not collected in any other single document available to the public
- Timber Harvest Permit application requirements for DNR Wildlife & Heritage Service review may be onerous for property owners who are working in the best interest of their forestlands; proposed requirements should be consistent with current harvesting practices that are not detrimental to the local environment; as proposed, the standards could result in a shorter "window" in which harvesting may occur
- Stronghold representatives wish to confer with state forestry officials prior to submitting more detailed comments regarding the proposed timber harvesting changes
- Support the tree planting initiatives included in the plan

Climate Change

- Support having a chapter specifically addressing climate change in the plan

Overlay District

- Would like to see sustainability characteristics (energy independence, renewables, water conservation) factored into the overlay district; perhaps apply sustainability standards in the criteria established for applicants seeking to exceed the maximum building size
- Strongly support "firing range" as a non-permitted use in the planning area
- Add footnotes and other explanatory text to items such as the Use Table

Additional Issues

- In addition to highlighting the need to pursue increased rural broadband access, the plan should delineate practical solutions to the deficit in rural broadband access in the Sugarloaf area (and other rural areas of the county) since this service has become necessary to thrive economically, educationally, and individually in the 21st Century; current services are either prohibitively expensive, impractical to install, or simply unavailable in this and other rural areas
- Create a summary document for the with plan highlights for the public

Advisory Group Meeting #2 (Virtual-Webex, 28 July 2021)

Advisory Group Attendees: Tina Theime Brown, Mike Kay, Ingrid Rosencrantz, David Webster, John Webster

Introduction/Background

- Sugarloaf TLMP sets a high standard for Livable Frederick area plans; very impressive document

- Noel Manalo (Miles & Stockbridge) will submit detailed written comments at a later date on behalf of Stronghold
- Seeking rationale for planning area boundaries; particularly the changes since the Plan's initial development/the release of the briefing book
- I-270 is a better boundary on the north (instead of MD 80); better reflects the neighborhood cohesiveness in that area

History & Culture
- No comments

Stronghold Incorporated and Sugarloaf Mountain
- No comments

Land Use
- How effective are the proposed regulatory changes in terms of resource protection? Would like more information and clarity regarding efficacy

Transportation Network
- Mount Ephraim and Thurston Roads – sensitive areas in terms of current and potential traffic impacts
- Want more protection for rural roadways, including historical markers or unique identification signs for the Sugarloaf area
- What effect would Rural Roadway designation have on property owners? Any costs, additional permits or reviews, access limitations to roadway?
- Residents seeking traffic suppression/management in Sugarloaf area

Watershed/Water Quality
- No comments

Forestlands, Green Infrastructure, and Biodiversity
- Chapter 7: Policy 7-2 ("Insure timber harvesting…"); good goals, but too general and open to broad interpretation; need to refine goals and establish criteria for timber permitting

Climate Change
- Are the initiatives proposed in the plan consistent with the climate change policies? Are the initiatives consistent with county's climate change policies?

Overlay District
- No comments

Additional Issues
- Logging Section E. - Page A23 Review by MD Wildlife & Heritage Service; concerns regarding review time – may take too long to be fair to applicants
- Proposed additional review by DNR Wildlife & Heritage Service may be compromised by lack of timeliness due to State personnel deficit
- Brief windows of opportunity for identification of sensitive plants and wildlife may cause significant delay in review of permits
- Perhaps use digital mapping and data layers instead of in-person assessments
- Option may be considered to allow for voluntary *wildlife and natural features inventories* prepared on behalf of (and paid for by) landowners to support on-going or future timber harvest permit applications