

**Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan
Open Houses
August 17 and 19, 2021
Public Comments**

Tuesday, August 17, 2021

Speaker #1 (Richard Kapowitz)

Opposed to planning boundary as shown in the vicinity of the MD 80/I-270 interchange.
Supports I-270 as boundary between the developed/developing areas (east of I-270) and a rural, undeveloped area (west of I-270).

Speaker #2 (John Carrera)

Opposed to planning boundary as shown in the vicinity of the MD 80/I-270 interchange.
Asked question about sewage treatment for Urbana.

Speaker#3 (Elizabeth Franklin)

Suburbanization/development in Urbana should not occur on Thurston Road.
Opposed to planning boundary as shown in the vicinity of the MD 80/I-270 interchange.
The history, ecology, and environment of the Sugarloaf area is important to preserve.

Speaker#4 ()

Thurston Road is already heavily used as a north/south commuter route to avoid I-270.
Thurston Road cannot support any new development.
The County needs to rethink the Sugarloaf planning boundary and future development on Thurston Road.
West side of I-270 in the Sugarloaf community is a treasured part of Frederick County.

Speaker#5 (Steve Levaux or Leveau)

Opposed to development on the west side of I-270.
Only one opportunity to maintain open space landscapes; once developed, it's gone.
Development can "leap-frog" to surrounding areas once agricultural areas are developed.
Doesn't want to see a "Concrete Maryland"

Speaker#6 (Kevin Storm)

What improvements to Thurston Road will be necessary to accommodate development?
Roads in the Sugarloaf area are inadequate for more development.
Widening roads in the Sugarloaf area would damage the community.
Opposed to planning boundary as shown in the vicinity of the MD 80/I-270 interchange.
Mentioned the existence of the northern Urbana Community Growth Area as justification to not develop the west side of I-270.

Speaker#7 (Martha Hartlaub)

Supports the Plan to protect the Sugarloaf Area.

The exclusion of the interchange lands from the planning boundary detracts from the Plan's goals and focus.

Thurston Road cannot sustain more development.

Thurston Road should be added to the list for recommended Scenic Road designation.

Speaker#8 (Tom Natelli)

County needs to balance needs for future economic development and land preservation.

Much public and private investment has occurred in the greater Urbana area.

Mentioned the Sugarloaf Stakeholders' Advisory Group meeting he attended where he commented on the MD80/I-270 interchange area and how it differs from the rest of the planning area.

Speaker#9 (Martha Hartlaub)

Asked Tom Natelli about his plans for developing his property along Thurston Road. (Mr. Natelli was no longer connected to the meeting).

Speaker#10 (Barbara Lutzinger—recorded message)

Opposed to planning boundary as shown in the vicinity of the MD 80/I-270 interchange.

Asked who was responsible for establishing a planning area boundary that excludes the interchange lands.

Natural resources on the west side of I-270 need to be preserved.

More "breaches" of growth boundaries leads to more "breaches."

Speaker#11 (Jim Mackintosh)

Complimented the Plan.

Asked questions on recommended changes in the Plan to subdivision potential, septic system upgrade mandates, agricultural preservation areas.

Stated that the MD 355/Park Mills Road intersection is in dire need of upgrade/enhancement to address increasing traffic volumes and safety concerns.

Speaker#12 (Jesse Johnson)

Sugarloaf area roads are insufficient.

Stream protections are needed.

Opposed to planning boundary as shown in the vicinity of the MD 80/I-270 interchange.

Keep agricultural areas on west side of I-270.

Speaker#13 (Matt Seubert)

Asked why planning boundary was changed from initial documents shown to the public.

Speaker#14 (Elizabeth Franklin)

It would be a mistake to add more high-speed, traffic-generating land uses on Thurston Road.

There are many buildings/houses on Thurston Road located very close to the roadway.

There's no way to widen Thurston Road without destroying character of area.

Speaker#15 (Nick Carrera)

Asked who was responsible for establishing the planning boundary near the MD 80/I-270 interchange.

Asked about Community Growth Areas in general.

Speaker#16 (Matt Seubert)

Asked for the acreage of forestland in the area of the MD 80/I-270 interchange that is outside of the planning boundary as shown on the Draft Plan.

Speaker#17 (Sandy)

Thurston Road and MD 109 intersection—many accidents.

Speeding vehicles and motorcycles on Thurston Road.

Keep beauty and serenity of landscape on the west side of I-270 & development on the east side of I-270.

Speaker#18 (Buzz Mackintosh)

The novelty airplane parked on a parcel along Park Mills Road causes traffic problems.

A rubble fill operation on LilyPons Road is on-going.

Speaker#19 (John Carrera)

Asked about Natelli's rezoning on the east side of I-270 in the office/retail corridor.

More bike trails are needed.

Roundabout at MD 80/I-270 funnels drivers to the "green" entrance to the Sugarloaf area.

Concerned about the viewshed if the interchange area is developed.

Speaker#20 (Lauren Storm)

Opposed to planning boundary as shown in the vicinity of the MD 80/I-270 interchange.

Growth expansion should occur on east side of I-270.

Speaker#21 (Nick Carrera)

Commented on technological difficulties with video meeting and need for live, in-person meetings.

Concerned about rezoning and development on west side of I-270.

Mentioned Natelli's demolition permit for removing barns and an addition plat to reconfigure the property lines of the Natelli parcels.

Speaker#22 ()

Mentioned the poor condition of Dixon Road and needed repairs.

Asked about future development at the MD 80/I-270 interchange.

Speaker#23 (Jesse Johnson)

Stream health important. Trash/litter is a problem.

Development at the MD 80/I-270 interchange benefits nobody except Natelli

Speaker#24 (Elizabeth Franklin)

Thanked Planning Staff and the County for giving the community a voice in this Plan process.

Speaker#25 (Lauren Storm)

Repairs to Urbana Lake access road undertaken by property owners; seeking assistance from the County and/or the State of Maryland.

Property owners pick up trash from I-270 that enters Bennett Creek and flows through their lands.

Speaker#26 (Nick Carrera)

Commented on technological difficulties with virtual meetings and the need for live, in-person meetings.

Speaker#27 (Martha Hartlaub)

Thanked the County for undertaking this Plan. Asked for review/adoption process to be repeated.

Speaker#28 (Buzz Mackintosh)

Asked why the County's 2020 Climate Emergency Resolution was included in the Appendix. Cited regulatory implications from a similar Climate Resolution in the western U.S.

Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan

Open Houses

August 17 and 19, 2021

Public Comments

Thursday, August 19, 2021

Speaker#29 (Susan Hansen)

Disappointed that the planning area boundary omits the MD 80/I-270 interchange lands.

Frederick County must retain its farmland and agricultural industries, plus the rural character, natural history, and beauty. The Sugarloaf Plan is a strong conservation plan for the area.

Removing interchange lands from planning area will impact rural and natural resources and lead to more "carve-outs" in future plans, and will benefit a special interest at the expense of the county and the environment.

Speaker#30 (Johanna Springston)

Questioned the origin and drawing of the planning area boundary—should follow I-270 south and north of the MD 80 interchange with I-270. Planning boundary change erodes public trust in government.

Concerned about development impacting the rural character of MD 80 if development occurs between I-270 and MD 80 (North of interchange). Once rural character is lost, more property owners will press for zoning changes. A Plan should do the least amount of harm to existing residents. Otherwise, the plan is strong. Mentioned the importance of Hope Hill and African American heritage.

Speaker#31(Matt Seubert)

Opposed to planning boundary as shown in the vicinity of the MD 80/I-270 interchange. Noted lack of transparency in the planning area boundary change. Asked if the Advisory Group was included in discussions about the planning area boundary change. The County must be sincere in preserving rural heritage, forest cover, streams, and addressing climate change. Cited examples of Jefferson Technology Park and the Urbana MXD, which were changed from primarily employment areas to residential development. Requested meeting minutes.

Speaker#32 (Thurston Road resident)

Recalls opposition to gun range and event venue proposed in the Sugarloaf area. Thurston Road currently has heavy traffic and is used as a I-270 bypass. Questions motives of planning boundary change. The County should not “move the goal post” for developers. Land use decisions impact the lives of existing residents in the area.

Speaker#33 (Sue Trainor)

Opposed to planning boundary as shown south of the MD 80/I-270 interchange. Supports I-270 as northern boundary of planning area. (north of MD 80/I-270 interchange)
Appreciates Sugarloaf Plan, but feels like development decisions for the interchange area are already made. Video meetings are not user friendly. The County should not prioritize a developer’s monetary interests over community and global environmental interests. Concerned about “closed-door” discussions regarding the Plan. The overall process should be slowed. Feels residents’ voices are not being heard or they are not even aware of the Plan.

Speaker#34 (Nick Carrera)

Questioned who exactly “imposed” the planning boundary change. Supports all comments against the planning boundary in the vicinity of the MD 80/I-270 interchange.

Speaker#35 (Matt Seubert)

Asked whether the Natelli lands are within a Community Growth Area. Mentioned the need for transparency in this process and the “nightmare behind the curtain” in terms of future development around the interchange.

Speaker#36 (Nick Carrera)

Questioned the Community Growth Boundary in Urbana and future expansion into Sugarloaf.

Speaker#37 ()

Is the exclusion of the MD80/I-270 interchange area really in the best interest of the County? A confluence of factors has resulted in community alarm about the interchange area—primarily a

lack of transparency. It's disheartening to think that development decisions for the interchange lands have already been made. Video meetings are inferior to live meetings.

Speaker#38 (Martha Hartlaub)

The Natelli parcels touch Thurston Road at multiple points. Development of these parcels would require traffic calming. Asked for clarification on additional R-1 residential zoning proposed in Plan.

Speaker#39 (Matt Moran)

Opposed to planning boundary as shown in the vicinity of the MD 80/I-270 interchange. Stated desire to have land from Baker Valley Road westward to the Monocacy River included in the Plan.

Speaker#40 (Steve Poteat)

Opposed to planning boundary as shown in the vicinity of the MD 80/I-270 interchange. Sugarloaf treasured landscape will be lost if the Natelli lands are developed. Urbana development "over-flow" into the Sugarloaf area will intrude rural area and create potential to run over the Sugarloaf area. There is a great need to preserve the entire Sugarloaf Area, including the Thurston Road corridor. Surprised by planning boundary change from prior maps that showed I-270 as the planning area boundary. Multi-modal symbol shown on the east side of I-270 at the new, future MD 75/Mott Road interchange on I-270.

Speaker#41 (Annie Farrow)

Owns lands adjacent to Natelli holdings. Mentioned demolition of farm buildings and recent surveying on Natelli lands.

Speaker#42 (Matt Seubert)

Transparency issues and concerns with Plan process that lacked early Advisory Group knowledge and input on planning boundary change. Natelli now does not have to lobby for the exclusion of his lands from the planning area boundary.

Speaker#43 (Jesse Johnson)

Doesn't agree with the County facilitating Natelli's development plans in the MD 80/I-270 interchange area.

Speaker#44 Recorded message (Meredith Yeager)

Asked about ownership and zoning of Remsburg Estates on Roderick Road.

Speaker #45 (Stan Mordensky)

Desires to see a halt to the planning process until live, in-person meetings can occur. A new interchange at I-270 and Park Mills Road will open more land for future development.

Speaker#46 Recorded message (Linda Norris-Waldt)

Asked why and how the new planning boundary was developed, compared to Sugarloaf maps that were publicly-displayed and presented with a different boundary. Asked about the Overlay District.

Speaker#47 (Nick Carrera)

The new, proposed planning boundary does not advance goals of the Sugarloaf Plan.

Speaker#48 (Kristen Morrison)

Opposed to planning boundary as shown in the vicinity of the MD 80/I-270 interchange.

The County needs to preserve and protect the serenity of the special place that is Sugarloaf.

Does not support video meetings.