

From: [Shanu Kanwal](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Builders and Sugarloaf area
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 2:17:13 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear County Council members,

With due respect I am sorry to say that it looks like, we individual owners are to be sacrificed for the interest of big builders. I do not want to give any inch of my land, which I bought with hard earned money. Please explain that to those who received a letter to take away part of their land.

Thank you,

Shannon

From: [Cherney, Ragen](#)
To: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
Cc: [Mitchell, Kathy \(Legal\)](#)
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf Alliance Comments to the Planning Commission
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 4:04:46 PM
Attachments: [SACommentatPCPublichearingV2 copy.docx](#)
[22.6.8 SA Comments to PC.docx](#)
[22.2.23 SA Comments to PC for 3.2 copy.docx](#)
[22.1.17 SA Rebuttal to January 10 comments copy.docx](#)

Ragen Cherney
Chief of Staff/Legislative Director
Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049

-----Original Message-----

From: Sue Trainor <sue.trainor.music@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 3:51 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Sugarloaf Alliance Comments to the Planning Commission

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

The Sugarloaf Alliance respectfully submits the attached documents to the County Council in order to add to the Council's public record.

These are comments formulated for the Planning Commissions discussions.

Thank you for your attention.

Sue Trainor,
for the Sugarloaf Alliance



Sugarloaf Alliance Statement at Frederick County Planning Commission Meeting 5/18/22

The Sugarloaf Alliance represents over 300 residents and stakeholders in the Sugarloaf region. The Alliance's mission is to protect the unique natural and historical aspects of the Sugarloaf Mountain area and its environment through education and initiatives in support of watersheds, streams, meadows, forests, and historic sites. Working with volunteers, civic groups, and local, state, and federal agencies, the organization's primary goal is to preserve the unique character and serenity of the area for future generations.

Thank you for this opportunity to educate the Commission on our member's views.

We support the ***open, public, and transparent development of a comprehensive plan*** for the Sugarloaf region. This plan should have the purpose of preserving the character of Sugarloaf Mountain, its surrounding area, and the precious natural resources of the region. We believe that the Sugarloaf plan should, and as drafted will, preserve the current character and use of the Sugarloaf area.

We opposed the attempted creation of additional commercial and industrial activity to the west of I-270 at Thurston Road. We commend the Planning Commission for its early decision to return the plan boundary at the I 270 / 80 interchange to its appropriate location.

We fully supported the inclusion of lands between Rt 80 and the Monocacy National Battlefield and between I 270 and the Monocacy River in the Sugarloaf planning area. Inclusion of these areas will further protect and meet the county's long-range vision for the preservation and protection of the natural resources and rural landscape of the Sugarloaf Area.

Placing the Sugarloaf boundaries in this way ***is wholly consistent with Livable Frederick*** and matches the visual depiction of the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape area in the Thematic Diagram. The Sugarloaf Alliance feels that the current, improved boundaries of the plan area will best achieve preservation of the Sugarloaf region and continue the long-standing use of I-270 as a limit for development.

We believe the proposed Sugarloaf Overlay contained in the draft plan should be applied to the entire plan area. ***Every inch of the plan area deserves to benefit*** from the protections the Overlay will afford.

These views are strongly held not only by the membership of the Sugarloaf Alliance but also by ***well over 650 people*** who live in and around the Sugarloaf region. The results of this Sugarloaf Alliance petition are already part of the public record.

Over the course of nearly two years people living and working in the Sugarloaf region have made their views about this plan known. Thank you for listening to the desires of the residents of the Sugarloaf region...and their belief that the Commission should ***adopt the current draft of the Sugarloaf plan and move the process forward to the County Council.***

With respect,

The Sugarloaf Alliance



June 8, 2022

Dear Planning Commission members:

The Sugarloaf Alliance was pleased to see such a large turnout at the May 18th public hearing for the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan. It was nice to see the residents of the Sugarloaf area take such an interest and pride in their community. It also was nice to hear so many residents comment not only on their love for their property but for the Sugarloaf area as a whole. There seemed to be great unity among the residents that this area is unique in its beauty, natural resources, and history with a desire to keep it that way. We heard most of the residents strongly affirm the Plan's purpose of preservation.

While residents appeared to be unified in their desire to preserve the Sugarloaf area, there was some disagreement in how to accomplish that goal. Some who spoke did not understand why the County is proposing to rezone parts of their properties from agricultural to resource conservation. There were concerns that they could no longer use the rezoned land for agricultural purposes. This assumption is not true. We are hopeful that the County can clear up these misunderstandings in order to help affected property owners better understand the necessity of rezoning certain sensitive areas to avoid environmental degradation.

The majority of residents spoke in favor of the Preservation Overlay Zoning District. Those who opposed it mostly seemed concerned about a reduction in their property rights. While we understand these concerns, the Sugarloaf Alliance believes that the extraordinary development pressures that currently exist in southern Frederick County merit extra protection for this small area of land. The Sugarloaf Plan area comprises less than 5% of the area of Frederick County; yet, as we write this letter, there are developers who own agricultural land within this area who are *claiming* a right to rezone and develop. Additionally, on the east side of I-270, there has been and will continue to be tremendous growth—making it more imperative than ever that the County fully protect this treasured landscape.

In the State of Maryland's comments, there are concerns stated regarding the Plan's consistency with the Livable Frederick Master Plan (LFMP). We see the Sugarloaf Plan as wholly consistent with the LFMP. With its preservation focus, the Sugarloaf Plan advances one of the LFMP's primary goals to "ensure that the places, buildings, and environments that exemplify the distinct identity of Frederick County continue to thrive as important elements of our community." Within this broad goal are supporting initiatives that emphasize maintaining our agricultural and historic identity and preserving our natural landscapes.

The State of Maryland also raises concerns about future economic development along the I-270 corridor. As Mr. Goodfellow documented, there is a long history in Frederick County that I-270 is the boundary between development to the east and preservation to the west. All development, heretofore, has been concentrated along I-270 on the east side where the infrastructure exists or will exist in the future to support it. Any development on the west side of I-270 increases the threat to the Sugarloaf Plan area's stated goals of environmental and rural character preservation.

The State of Maryland has no concrete plans to add lane capacity to I-270 nor extend transit from Montgomery County. Without these transportation improvements, any development along the I-270 corridor in Frederick County is severely limited. Currently, LFMP does designate commercial development opportunities in the Urbana Growth Area on the east side of I-270 for any developer who wishes to pursue them, but, due to a lack of commercial interest, one developer has transferred a large east-side commercial tract from employment to residential.

We agree with the State's assessment that the "Sugarloaf area is an important part of the State's tourism and outdoor recreation sectors." As such, it merits protection from development which would not only harm it's fragile environment, but would render it less attractive to visitors.

The Sugarloaf Alliance wishes to thank Planning Commission members for your careful consideration of the many aspects of this complex preservation plan. We look forward to continuing our participation in the process of adopting a Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan that will "protect and enhance the Sugarloaf area's natural resources and environmental assets" for all residents and visitors for years to come.

Sincerely,

The Sugarloaf Alliance



2/23/22

Re: Monocacy-Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan Overlay

The Sugarloaf Alliance supports the open, public, and transparent development of a comprehensive land use plan for the Sugarloaf region. Our goal is preservation: safeguarding the character of Sugarloaf Mountain, the Monocacy Battlefield National Park, the surrounding area, and the precious natural resources of the region.

In order to meet the goal of preserving the Sugarloaf region, the Monocacy-Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan Overlay should apply to the entire area within the currently defined boundary. The intent of the Overlay District is to “ensure the long-term sustainability, health and integrity of ...the landscapes that comprise the Sugarloaf Planning Area.”

The Livable Frederick Master Plan, the County’s comprehensive guide to updating area land use plans, presents a thorough analysis, suggested approach, and future vision that includes and emphasizes the County’s natural environment including the Green Infrastructure and Agricultural Infrastructure segments. The Monocacy-Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan and the Overlay District are consistent with the Master Plan’s goals.

Some recent comments to the Planning Commission have opposed any future land use and development limitations in the Monocacy-Sugarloaf region and cite “the I-270 Corridor Plan” for support. We repeat: **the County has no I-270 Corridor Plan.**

- The Frederick County Transportation Needs and Priorities Review Report through Year 2045 does not include reference to a future I-270 interchange at Park Mills Road.
- Fifty years of past planning documents for the Sugarloaf/Urbana area identify I-270 as the boundary between rural and developed areas (Mr. Goodfellow, staff presentation to the Planning Commission, 11/10/21).

Future development on the west side of I-270 must be guided by the Livable Frederick commitment that “Agricultural Infrastructure must be diligently maintained” (p. 60). **The open spaces in the Monocacy-Sugarloaf region are a natural treasure that enhance the beauty of the County; they are not merely “undeveloped” land awaiting development “opportunities.”** The Monocacy-Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan and its Overlay District will protect the region’s open spaces, farmlands, forests, waterways, communities, habitats, and historical landscapes for existing and future residents and visitors.

Sugarloaf Alliance, Inc. is a 501(c)3 organization dedicated to the preservation, protection, and restoration of watersheds, streams, meadows, and forests in cooperation with volunteers, civic groups, and local, state, and federal agencies. To that end, it strives to protect the Sugarloaf Mountain area environment.



Sugarloaf Alliance, Inc. is dedicated to the preservation, protection, and restoration of watersheds, streams, meadows, and forests in cooperation with volunteers, civic groups, and local, state, and federal agencies. To that end, it strives to protect the Sugarloaf Mountain area environment.

The Sugarloaf Alliance offers the following rebuttal to several comments in the January 10, 2022 public comments to the Planning Commission.

There is no 'I-270 Corridor Plan' in Livable Frederick Master Plan (LFMP).

A computer search of the LFMP document finds no 'I-270 Corridor Planning Area' ...no 'I-270 Highway Corridor Plan'...and no '270 Technology Corridor.' The so-called interstate corridor is, according to LFMP, subject to the availability of a bus transit system, which is going nowhere fast. It would seem that Mr. Natelli and his colleagues are trying to create corridors by repeatedly naming corridors that they aspire to develop.

LFMP was intentionally vague on the geographic specifics of development areas.

The mass transit-served corridor is described as tracking along I-270. Nowhere is it described as uniformly spreading from both sides of I-270. The Thematic Diagram "shows" the interstate corridor covering the whole of the Monocacy National Battlefield. Clearly the shaded mass transit corridor is not to be taken literally.

There is no Park Mills / I-270 Interchange planned within the lifespan of the Sugarloaf Plan.

The most recent *Frederick County Transportation Needs and Priorities Review Report*, which presents plans through 2045, doesn't mention Park Mills. This imagined interchange is not on the *Highway Needs Inventory* nor is it included in *Visualize 2045: A Long-Range Transportation Plan for the National Capital Region*.

The Sugarloaf Plan and preservation effort is EXACTLY the right place to determine the fate of agricultural and forested areas within the Sugarloaf ecosystem and view shed.

LFMP left the geographic specifics of land planning to the small area planning process. There is NO 'I-270 Corridor Plan' in LFMP. The Sugarloaf Plan should cover **all** the lands suggested in LFMP.

Preserving the profitability of speculative land investments is not the responsibility of the Sugarloaf Plan.

The area around Sugarloaf Mountain is “unique and irreplaceable.” Its value is not as a developed industrial zone but rather in its current form and use. Preserving future opportunities means preserving the current use of the land.

The Rodgers Consulting “Environmental & Water Quality Analysis”

The (unsigned) author(s) seem to suggest that increased development and industrialization is the best way to improve stream, river, and Bay health. They also seem to suggest that further harming an impaired stream is ok and that polluting streams that flow away from Sugarloaf is ok, too. We strongly disagree.

Assertions that any development on their properties wouldn’t affect Furnace Branch and Bear Branch misses the point that these two are functional parts of the entire watershed system - the holistic approach. One goal of the Sugarloaf Plan, related to the others, is protection and preservation of water quality across the entire area, including the Mountain’s immediate surroundings, the Monocacy Battlefield Park, the Monocacy River and ultimately the Potomac River.

In fact, if the Sugarloaf Plan followed the Frederick County watershed map more comprehensively, to protect all of the watershed’s streams, it would extend farther east along the Montgomery County line including the east side of I270 where development has caused intense water quality impacts despite engineered environmental “improvements.”

Development will not improve the water quality of the streams and rivers around Sugarloaf.

We think the Rodgers “analysis” is myopic. Tree cover and nitrogen levels are not the only concerns with development and engineered ecosystem “improvements.” Engineered systems don’t always inspire confidence – accidents happen. Last week, for example, approximately 3 million gallons of sewage from Urbana, Ijamsville, and Landsdale was released and ended up in the Monocacy River because of a large sewer line break near the Monocacy Battlefield National Park (Frederick News Post, January 12, 2022).

Higher quality streams are not isolated from lower quality streams (“lowest quality sub-watersheds”); all feed into the Monocacy. The Rodgers Analysis dismisses the lower quality ones and ignores the possibility of remediation. Water quality contaminants are not limited to agricultural use of nitrogen fertilizers. Commercial, industrial and residential development, including impervious paved areas, contribute gasoline, oil, antifreeze, de-icing salts, heavy metals, insecticides, herbicides, to name a few.

In addition, any interstate highway interchange, and especially construction for a new one, presents myriad water quality impacts in addition to any development it engenders.

Protection has the greatest potential for environmental preservation

“Potential” engineered solutions for water quality improvements as a rationalization for further development are not adequate substitutes for protecting existing woodlands, waterways, and open spaces which have a proven record of environmental improvement.

If the nutrient run off from Natelli’s properties is as bad as Rodgers suggests, it absolutely can be improved...starting tomorrow! These properties should be making use of the Maryland Agricultural Water Quality Cost-Share (MACS) Program, planting Riparian Forest Buffers, following Nutrient Management laws and adopting cover crop and no-till farming practices. No subdivision necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

The Sugarloaf Alliance, Inc.

Steve Black, President

Sue Trainor, Vice President

Nick Carrera, Treasurer

Mary Ann Ely, Secretary

From: [Cherney, Ragen](#)
To: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
Cc: [Mitchell, Kathy \(Legal\)](#)
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf area vote
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 3:46:28 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Ragen Cherney

Chief of Staff/Legislative Director

Frederick County Council

Winchester Hall

12 East Church Street

Frederick, Maryland 21701

301.600.1049



From: Rose Woodsmall <stonybranchfarm@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:15 PM

To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>

Subject: Sugarloaf area vote

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council Members,

Without spending a lot of time and words, I'll just say:

Please hold the line at 270.

You'll know what I mean. And years from now, those who come after us will be grateful.

Best regards,

Rose M. Woodsmall

Woodsboro

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [Cherney, Ragen](#)
To: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
Cc: [Mitchell, Kathy \(Legal\)](#)
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf Plan amendment
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 2:06:33 PM
Attachments: [Dacey amendment.msg](#)
[image001.png](#)

Sugarloaf record emails.

Ragen Cherney
Chief of Staff/Legislative Director
Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049



From: msimpson2005 bennettscreekfarm.com <msimpson2005@bennettscreekfarm.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 12:02 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan amendment
[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hello,

I have just heard about the amendment placed by Mr. Dacey to allow for development to occur west of I-270.

I am writing to ask that you please vote against this new amendment. Keep the boundary at Rt. 80 and Thurston Road.

Please do not let one developer ruin the Sugarloaf area.

Please preserve this very important area for nature, agriculture, and for future generations to enjoy.

Thank you, Margy Simpson

2149 Thurston Road

301-520-7113

From: jgehman@hughes.net
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Dacey amendment
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 11:58:12 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Council members:

Please do not accept the proposed amendment to move the boundaries of the Sugarloaf management Plan away from 270.

John Gehman
Adamstown

From: [Cherney, Ragen](#)
To: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
Cc: [Mitchell, Kathy \(Legal\)](#)
Subject: FW: Please Vote AGAINST amendment returning to the July 2021 Plan boundary
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 9:07:25 PM
Attachments: [Shame to loose progress to the corrupt.msg](#)
[image001.png](#)
[Sugarloaf Preservation.msg](#)

Sugarloaf record emails.

Ragen Cherney
Chief of Staff/Legislative Director
Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049



From: A Podonsky <apodonsky@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 7:57 PM
To: Donald, Jerry <JDonald@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Hagen, Kai <KHagen@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Keegan-Ayer, MC <MCKeegan-Ayer@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Please Vote AGAINST amendment returning to the July 2021 Plan boundary
[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Current Frederick County Council Candidates,

It's recently come to my attention the beloved landmark in our town, Sugarlof Mountain, and surrounding delicate ecosystem, is coming under attack by greedy developers. This area has been a source of peace and refuge for our community for decades.

I support the preservation from the Montgomery County line, along I-270 to the Monocacy River. The single most important thing is the boundary and the preservation goal. The July 2021 boundary (drawn at Rt. 80 and including the Thurston Road cut-out) is highly suspect and will substantially benefit the developer (whose properties are excluded).

Instead of a preservation plan, the Sugarloaf Plan becomes a development plan with a preservation footnote. This area is home to rare species and a fragile ecosystem that CANNOT HANDLE further development without being destroyed.

If the boundary moves to allow dense, commercial and possibly industrial development on the west side of I-270, suburban sprawl will creep across the area as adjacent property-owners sell out.

I will vote for candidates to who listen and respond to me and my concerns as my fiancé and I

move to Frederick and start our life together.

Please, for the sake of our community, do everything you can to protect this land for future generations, keeping developers away. Please support the preservation from the Montgomery County line, along I-270 to the Monocacy River.

Thank you for your time,

A. Podonsky

From: [Tariq Thangalvadi](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Shame to loose progress to the corrupt
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 7:31:54 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

It's a shame to loose months of progress and effort to save the Sugarloaf treasured landscape and move boundaries last minute.

>

This is shameful conflict of interest: we understand that council member Dacey has received contributions from the Nattellis to represent their interest, which is based or on preservation and quality of life but rather corporate greed and profit.

I have made prior representations before on behalf of my family, friends and I, who all live in this area. As much pleasure we have living here, it's disheartening to see concerted effort that borders on criminality to convert this beautiful space into a concrete clustered pollutant - commercial landscape that serves a handful. Instead what we all need is healthy landscape with natural beauty - preserved for us and future generations to enjoy.

I hope and pray that the good wins over evil on this one.

Regards
Tariq.

>

From: [James Gunsallus](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Cc: ["Pandora Gunsallus"](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf Preservation
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 7:05:03 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Frederick County Council Members,

Hi, my name is Pandora Gunsallus and I own about 25 acres of farmland near the corner of Route 80 on Park Mills Road. My parcel is part of a larger, 366 acre farm, known as the Rosencrantz farm, bought by my grandparents about 100 years ago.

This preservation boundary issue is of great concern to me because my farm sits across the rural road, Route 80, from farm land owned by Natelli Communities. If the historic boundary is moved, once again, back in front of our farm, it will render a profoundly negative impact on our lives. We would possibly be encircled in the protective overlay and be faced with some kind of intense development right across the road from us. Our peaceful and rural existence would be ruined. We would continue to preserve farmland in Frederick County under our Agriculture zoning, yet have to exist with heavy development at our doorstep. At that point, we would no longer want to remain in this untenable existence, and our properties would be worth much less in value. If we don't want to live in the preservation area across from noisy polluting development, no one else will either. But in this tragic scenario the developer stands to receive all the gains and the value of our land would plummet.

The bigger picture is that it's irresponsible to allow any intense development at one of the gateways to this treasured landscape, let alone two gateways to Sugarloaf Mountain. It is a horrible direction for preservation planning in Frederick County. Residents will push to have their lots rezoned to match the existing and spreading Industrial zoning that is encroaching on them, and they will subsequently choose to leave the area. As a result of opening the door on the west side of I-270 to development, the plan for preservation starts to crumble and fall like dominoes.

It seems voting to move this boundary back to Route 80 is a vote to ruin the entire Sugarloaf Preservation Plan the County has been working on for years. Why formulate a plan like this only to sabotage it in the 11th hour? So

obviously it's not only the residents on route 80 that will suffer, it's the entire philosophy of the Sugarloaf Preservation Plan concept that will be degraded immediately, as well as over time. Over time the preservation plan will be chipped away as homeowners choose to leave the area. I ask you "where are we to go"? Perhaps a developer funded reservation in Kansas or Oklahoma. Maybe a plaque depicting the history of Hopehill will be erected where the community once existed. But where will they move the cemetery for the residents of Hopehill? A cemetery that was donated by my grandmother and sits on Park Mills Road surrounded by my parcel of farmland.

Also, unfortunately the Sugarloaf plan with the developer "cut outs" mysteriously appeared in the plan with no public input. It is wrong to put forth an amendment to a version of the plan that never should have existed in the first place and in my opinion, because of no public input, is invalid.

I am thoroughly disgusted the entire Sugarloaf Preservation Plan area could be compromised by a \$3000 campaign donation. Are we as residents of Frederick County going to allow that to happen? It would be a shameful day in our long history if that would come to pass. Individuals or County Council members taking donations from developers should not be voting on preservation plans for Frederick County because clearly, they don't have the county in their best interest.

I thank the County Council and planning commissioners for all their hard work in adopting a thoughtful preservation plan for Frederick County. I urge you to continue to support maintaining the boundary from the Montgomery County line along I-270 to the Monocacy River.

Thank you,

Pandora Gunsallus, farm property @3350 Park Mills Rd., Frederick, Md. 21704

Pandora Gunsallus

241 Cynthia Dr. Canonsburg PA 15317

From: [Cherney, Ragen](#)
To: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
Cc: [Mitchell, Kathy \(Legal\)](#)
Subject: FW: SUGARLOAF - TO HOLD OR NOT TO HOLD THE LINE AT I-270
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 6:45:18 PM
Attachments: [Boundary Amendment to the Sugarloaf Plan.msg](#)
[image001.png](#)
[New voicemail for County Council from Public Input.msg](#)
[sugarloaf Plan Boundary.msg](#)
[Vote against amendment returning to the July 2021 Plan boundary \(Rt. 80 and Thurston Road\)..msg](#)
[An email to County Council from Public Input.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape.msg](#)

Sugarloaf record emails.

Ragen Cherney

Chief of Staff/Legislative Director

Frederick County Council

Winchester Hall

12 East Church Street

Frederick, Maryland 21701

301.600.1049



From: Mary Dague <mhdague@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 6:02 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: SUGARLOAF - TO HOLD OR NOT TO HOLD THE LINE AT I-270
[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

You have studied questions about Sugarloaf Treasured Management Plan for a long time. The only question before you tonight is to discuss whether or not to hold the line for ANY development at I-270, as established by nature and practice.

I beseech you all to HOLD THE LINE, to deny the exemption for two properties which would violate the line. As custodians of Frederick County, the people must be heard: 90% of the population wants the line held, habitats and trees preserved. Please do your duty; it's the right thing to do.

Mary Holmes Dague
Jefferson, MD 21755

From: [Katherine Jones](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Boundary Amendment to the Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 5:33:41 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council members:

You have heard from me before, so this will be no surprise. I am asking you to think of the future of this country, the welfare of all its citizens, young and old, and vote against Mr. Dacey's amendment to change the boundary of the Sugarloaf Plan. I have heard testimony of some parties supporting this plan. But this plan protects such valuable natural resources, primarily our water source, that the protection it provides must be your primary concern. The plan is quite narrowly tailored to carve out the slopes and watershed that should not be developed. Even where some of the original plan boundaries do not look like they impinge the rivers and creeks, watersheds are not so obvious that you can just ignore the potential impact on area that seem like they would not affect the watershed.

It's just too easy to cave when a developer took risks they could not rely on working out for them. It's too easy to feel sorry for the homeowner who bought property without realizing they could not cut through a slope to build a driveway. But these are the tough decisions you took an oath to make on your constituents' behalf. Please do the right thing, and vote against this amendment.

Katherine J. Jones

From: [Luna, Nancy](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Cc: [County Council Staff](#)
Subject: New voicemail for County Council from Public Input
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 5:30:52 PM

From: +13014611287

Message Transcription: Hi, my name is Bev Toms, T H O M S. I live in Dickerson, Maryland, and I'm calling to support the Sugarloaf treasured landscape plan with the rural heritage overlay zone, which should apply to the entire 19,710 acres. Do not change the boundary of this for a couple of developers. I can't even believe that you're thinking about doing this protect stronghold property. Keep it in the rural overlay zone. Oppose the Daisy amendment that you know helps out Tom NA Kelly, the developer. I can't even believe they're doing that either. Keep the line along two 70 with development east of two 70, as it has been planned for a really, really long time. Please, the rural conservation area is much needed by society. All of us, for many reasons, for food, for fibers, for recreation, for carbon ation, we do not need more development. We need to protect rural countryside, please, please do this. Thank you.

[Audio File](#)

You can change or disable notifications like these on the [project settings tab](#).

From: [Karla Stoner](#)
To: [Keegan-Ayer, MC](#); [Fitzwater, Jessica](#)
Cc: [Council Members](#)
Subject: sugarloaf Plan Boundary
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 5:24:49 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

To Council President Keegan-Ayer and Council member Fitzwater:

We strongly urge you to support the Sugarloaf Plan boundary as recommended by the Frederick County Planning Commission, on the east along I270 from the Montgomery County line to the Monocacy National Battlefield, and on the west to include Sugarloaf Mountain.

Further, please support the inclusion of this entire Plan area in the Rural Heritage Overlay Zoning District.

Thank you,

Karla and Bill Stoner

Peters Road

Fredrick, MD

From: [Lynn Faiola](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Vote against amendment returning to the July 2021 Plan boundary (Rt. 80 and Thurston Road).
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 5:01:01 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

I am writing to you urge you to vote against the amendment returning to the July 2021 Plan boundary (Rt. 80 and Thurston

Thank you for your time and attention.

Please support preservation from the Montgomery County line, along I-270 to the Monocacy River.

From: [Luna, Nancy](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Cc: [County Council Staff](#)
Subject: An email to County Council from Public Input
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 4:52:52 PM

From: stevenfindlay2@gmail.com
To: R43187@PublicInput.com
Subject: Sugarloaf Mountain Plan

Dear Council Members,

On behalf of the Sugarloaf Citizens Association, representing some 300 individuals and families, I urge you to vote NO tonight on the Dacey amendment. Please support the historical boundary at the Montgomery County line along I-270 to the Monocacy River.

We applaud the leaders in Frederick and Montgomery Counties who have for over 50 years protected the Mountain and its environs for future generations. Moreover, we support the legacy that Gordon Strong clearly established for the land operated by Stronghold, Inc., and do not support that property being exempted from the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay Zone.

The July 2022 draft of the plan preserves, protects and honors the natural resources that residents across the region depend on and enjoy. Every visitor to Sugarloaf Mountain looks out on Frederick County farmland, forest and rural communities, with appreciation for those who protect and defend it. The only mountain in the Maryland Piedmont region, Sugarloaf anchors the surrounding rural landscape.

The Frederick County Council should not permit developers to overturn decades of planning that focused development on the East side of I-270. Mr. Natelli's efforts to manipulate the public process should not be allowed to succeed. As we now know, he worked behind closed doors in 2021 to make a deal to have his land exempted from the Sugarloaf Area boundary. That was reversed after citizens spoke up and demanded an open and fair process. It's time again to block any efforts to undermine the Sugarloaf Management Plan.

Thank you for your consideration at this critical time.

Steven Findlay
President, Sugarloaf Citizens Association
Resident of Dickerson, MD, and owner of a 25-acre farm a few miles from the mountain

From: [Sharon OLAND](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 4:28:23 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hello:

My name is Sharon Oland and I have lived at 2409 Thurston Road for 35 years. I am writing to ask you to vote against any amendments that would allow the properties owned by Natelli to be excluded from the plan. Please vote to insure that the boundary of the plan remains the Montgomery County line, I-270 and the Monocacy River. I-270 has historically been the boundary with high density development on the east side and rural development and agriculture on the west. Don't allow that to change! You have the opportunity with this plan to do something great for generations to come. PLEASE HOLD THE LINE.

Thank you,

Sharon Oland
2409 Thurston Road
Frederick, MD 21704
240-447-1136

From: [Katie Lawhon](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Please Don't Mess with the Sugarloaf Plan - Keep the boundary at 270
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 2:22:15 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear President and Members of the Frederick County Council:

I have been participating in the planning process for the Sugarloaf plan and this is the third time I have written to you with comments. I have attended meetings as well.

Please do not approve Dacey's amendment to change the boundary of the plan. This last-minute change is clearly a gift to Natelli, the developer who owns both parcels of land and wants to maximize their commercial potential for development.

The Dacey change would allow **development right next to Hope Hill, a long-standing African-American community along Fingerboard Road** by allowing commercial development right at its doorstep. This is Frederick County history too! Please don't flush it away.

The Dacey change would also create **large, new developed areas within the viewshed of Frederick's premiere Civil War battlefield, Monocacy National Battlefield.**

These acres are treasured landscapes too. Both areas have natural resources that contribute to water quality and provide natural resilience to storms, helping protect smaller streams and larger rivers downstream. Once you lose the integrity of this important area in Frederick County you can never get it back.

Please do not support the Dacey amendment. Don't pave the way for Natelli to develop hundreds of acres that are culturally important, rural, scenic, and provide a unique sense of place within Frederick County.

Sincerely,

Catherine (Katie) Lawhon
242 Dill Avenue
Frederick MD 21701
240-409-0728

From: [Shallyn1](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: please include the rest of our property in the new boundry
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 2:46:12 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hello County Council,

It is my understanding that you are going to propose an amendment to the Sugarloaf Plan, as currently conducted the red line runs through our property and we would prefer the red line to follow Thurston Rd to Dixon Rd back to Natellis property which would exclude our entire property from this new RC zoning. Our family has been against the mandated re-zoning from the beginning and if you are leaving selected properties out of the re-zoning and especially considering the close proximity of those properties to ours, we would like ours included.

Thank you,

Greg Bryant
2613 Dixon Rd

From: [Steve Cook](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 2:13:54 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council Members,

My name is Steve Cook. I am a long time resident of Middletown. I would urge you to please keep the I 270 boundary line as part of the Sugarloaf Plan.
Thank you for your consideration.

--

Steve Cook

From: [Betsy Franklin](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: THURSTON ROAD DEVELOPMENT
Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 3:09:51 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

TO ALL THE COUNTY COUNCIL MEMBERS:

I wanted to relate to you some of my thoughts, none of them new, on the latest proposal for Development of Thurston Road (the 2 Natelli parcels).

Phil Dacey has put this forward for approval this proposal, despite our prior understanding that it is contrary to his stated views, that he supports the repair of roads and infrastructure, and I thought supported the concept of protecting the Sugarloaf area. The roads in southern Frederick County ALREADY cannot support their traffic, so how does Mr. Dacey even begin to entertain a developer adding more housing to the area, not to mention the irreparable compromise that any additional development would inflict on the sensitive environment and wildlife that inhabits it. The west side of I-270 cannot support any more houses.

As this very morning, the activity on Thurston Road too often provides us our own terrible local traffic report without the help of broadcast services...when 270 backs up, Thurston Road becomes a dangerous race strip. A road that is clearly marked for 30 mph limit suddenly sees cars traveling at 50 mph or more, I can hear the squealing of tires as they round an unanticipated turn on the country road. I have had people HONK at me and even angrily pass me as I slow down to turn into my own property. It is a wonder I have never been hit. THIS traffic phenomenon is not new, yet still has not really been addressed...and the last thing Thurston Road needs is more traffic resulting from development. Do any of you Council Members ever visit this part of the county? Don't you see what is happening??

Mr. Natelli lives in Potomac. His "residential address" in Urbana is nothing but a business front. He does not concern himself with the impact on Sugarloaf or its residents of his continued development...it is all money in HIS pocket. And sometimes I can't help but wonder if Mr. Natelli is sharing his pocket change around a bit in order to resurrect such unpopular development proposals as we are seeing tonight.

I AM AGAINST THE BOUNDARY AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY PHIL DACEY TO ALLOW DEVELOPMENT WEST OF I-270, AND I URGE YOU TO VOTE AGAINST THIS AMENDMENT THAT RETURNS US TO THE JULY 2021 BOUNDARY PLAN.

PLEASE SUPPORT PRESERVATION FROM THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY LINE, ALONG I-270 TO THE SCENIC MONOCACY RIVER!d

Thank you for your time; I hope I had your ears.

Elizabeth A. (Betsy) Franklin
2669 Thurston Road
Urbana, MD 21704

From: [Michael Scott](#)
To: [Council Members](#); [McKay, Steve](#); [Hagen, Kai](#)
Subject: Dacey-proposed amendment to the Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 3:32:30 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Frederick County Council members:

Please vote against the amendment proposing to return the Sugarloaf Plan to the July 2021 Plan boundary (Rt. 80 and Thurston Road).

Please **do** support preservation from the Montgomery County line, along I-270 to the Monocacy River.

Development in Frederick County has been supercharged for years, thanks to Blaine Young and Co. Please join the many County residents who are crying “Enough!” to the paving over of Frederick County, the traffic woes, the replacement of trees with houses and warehouses. Please stop it while there is something left to save!

Thank you.

Mike Scott
11298 Panorama Drive, New Market

From: [Cherney, Ragen](#)
To: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
Cc: [Mitchell, Kathy \(Legal\)](#)
Subject: FW: Amendment to the plan
Date: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 12:25:16 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Ragen Cherney

Chief of Staff/Legislative Director

Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049



From: Mary Carlsson <marycarlsson1950@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 11:19 AM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Amendment to the plan
[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

I Urge you to vote against the amendment and to return to the July 2021 Plan boundary (Rt. 80 and Thurston Road).

- I also urge you to support preservation from the Montgomery County line, along I-270 to the Monocacy River.

Our land borders Sugarloaf Mountain Park, and we oppose increased development.

Uno and Mary Carlsson
1803 Mt. Ephraim Rd.
Adamstown, MD 21710

From: [Cherney, Ragen](#)
To: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
Cc: [Mitchell, Kathy \(Legal\)](#)
Subject: FW: Hold the line at I270
Date: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 2:20:56 PM
Attachments: [New voicemail for County Council from Public Input.msg](#)
[image001.png](#)

Ragen Cherney
Chief of Staff/Legislative Director
Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049



From: Melissa Mullen <melissat.mullen@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 2:10 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Hold the line at I270
[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Please do not approve any development the involves the destruction of our natural landscape features, water ways, farms, and forests. There simply is no compelling reason to do so. we don't need more traffic on 270, either. Developers should be required to contribute to sustainable infrastructure rather than be allowed to profit from things that detract from our counties culture, lifestyle, and sustainability.

Preservation of farms and forests, natural landscape and waterways is part of what makes our county so wonderful to live in. I don't want to live in an area that doesn't include these things. Even if you don't care to go to local farmers markets or hike on the weekends or have access for paddling...you should realize than not having ample fresh water, food supply and forested areas as well as access to waterways is, frankly, a dangerous and unsupportable situation. Development should not lay waste.

If you agree, please send your email so stating to: councilmembers@frederickcountymd.gov and share this post.

From: [Luna, Nancy](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Cc: [County Council Staff](#)
Subject: New voicemail for County Council from Public Input
Date: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 2:12:26 PM

From: +12409976776

Message Transcription: Yes, this is William Price calling. I'm a lifelong resident of the area I've grown up, looking at Sugarloaf and still enjoy the view and been at many a function at stronghold mention. I do hope that it continues to stay as it is. I oppose the amendments to change the sugar of treasured landscape plan. I hope that not only will my children, but my grandchildren will continue to enjoy that treasured landscape. Please do not accept the amendments. Please do not develop the mountain. I thank you for your consideration. And if you enjoying the day, go out and look at Sugarloaf. Thank.

[Audio File](#)

You can change or disable notifications like these on the [project settings tab](#).

From: [Planning Commission](#)
To: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
Subject: FW: Proposed Rezoning of Potomac Garden Center needs scrutiny
Date: Thursday, September 15, 2022 7:33:49 AM
Attachments: [PGC Rezoning letter to Council August 21.odt](#)

Sharing

From: Nick Carrera <mjcarrera@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 2:20 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Cc: County Executive <CountyExecutive@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Proposed Rezoning of Potomac Garden Center needs scrutiny
Council Members,

I am Nick Carrera, 2602 scenic Thurston Road, Frederick 21704

I remind you of an issue that I fear is not getting the attention it deserves. The Potomac Garden Center property owned by David Angell is 19.6 acres, of which 6 acres are zoned "general commercial" and 13.6 acres are zoned "agricultural." The July 2022 draft of the Sugarloaf Plan would make all this property zoned "general commercial," a *gift* to Mr. Angell of 13.6 acres of general commercial zoning. It would result in 19.6 acres of prime commercial property being located right at the gateway to the Sugarloaf Plan's "treasured landscape."

I have brought to the county's attention the irregular way in which this proposed zoning was inserted into the Sugarloaf Plan. I quote from my August 22, 2022, comments to the County Council (the full August 22 comments are attached):

"The proposal appeared in the Sugarloaf Plan as *a change made by the planning staff*. There was no Planning Commission discussion and no vote. This violated the policy that the Commission and the planning staff had agreed. Important issues should have been considered, but were not because the agreed process was not followed."

Since there was no discussion and no overt decision, concerns of nearby property owners were not heard, and no consideration was given as to what use this property might be put when Mr. Angell decides to sell it or to develop it differently.

Then we have the confusing-to-me process being followed. The Council is considering the Sugarloaf Plan in its totality in one venue, while at the same time the Council (or perhaps the Zoning Board) is in another venue independently considering the Plan's proposed zoning changes. This could result in the Plan's being changed or remanded, while the proposed zoning changes in the Plan are approved! Surely this would be an improper occurrence!

The aim of the Sugarloaf Plan is preservation. The proposed zoning change for the Potomac Garden Center property is inconsistent with that aim, and it ignores the property rights of nearby residents.

Just as the Hippocratic Oath admonishes doctors to "do no harm," so the Sugarloaf Plan should not risk doing harm to the very area that it aims to preserve.

Attachment: August 22, 2022, comments to the County Council

Potomac Garden Center Rezoning Comments, August 22, 2022

As the County Council considers the proposal in the Sugarloaf Plan to extend commercial zoning over the entirety of David Angell's property, the Potomac Garden Center (PGC), these points are relevant.

1. The proposal appeared in the Sugarloaf Plan as *a change made by the planning staff*. There was no Planning Commission discussion and no vote. This violated the policy that the Commission and the planning staff had agreed. Important issues should have been considered, but were not because the agreed process was not followed..
2. Mr. Angell has described plans for large greenhouses on the back part of his property. As I understand it, he feels county changes in 2010 blocked his plans, and that now a zoning to “commercial” would allow him to proceed. His claim may be a valid argument *for seeking a waiver* from limits imposed by his present zoning. But he has said that will not be enough; he wants the increased value that would come from a zoning change.
3. Any zoning decision should consider other owners who would be affected. They have inherent “property rights” that must be respected. David and Abigail Brown moved in 2020 to the house on Parcel 109 which abuts the PGC. They acted in the knowledge that the adjoining portion of the property was zoned “agricultural.” A change now to “commercial” is unfair to them, and their rights should be considered. The same consideration should be given to other owners on that side and on the opposite side of Fingerboard Road from the PGC property.
4. Mr Angell's requested rezoning would greatly increase the value of his 19.62 acres. While he argues now for rezoning to enhance his garden center operation, sooner or later that property will pass to another owner who will have different plans. With commercial zoning, many uses are possible that would violate the goals and Vision of the Sugarloaf Plan. This is all the more likely if the Overlay does not cover the PGC property. This double threat of zoning change and Overlay exclusion should be uppermost in weighing the rezoning of this property.

From: [John Allemang](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf plan boundary ammendment
Date: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 2:24:38 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Councilmember Dacey's proposed ammendment goes against long standing preservation and border issues.

I urge you to vote against the amendment returning to the July 2021 Plan boundary (Rt. 80 and Thurston Road)

I urge you to support preservation from the Montgomery County line, along I-270 to the Monocacy River.

Sincerely,

John Allemang

6764 Balmoral Ridge, New Market, MD 21774

From: [Cherney, Ragen](#)
To: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
Cc: [Mitchell, Kathy \(Legal\)](#)
Subject: FW: Correction of Natelli Statement Concerning the Montgomery County Agricultural Reserve.
Date: Thursday, September 15, 2022 11:34:07 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Ragen Cherney

Chief of Staff/Legislative Director

Frederick County Council

Winchester Hall

12 East Church Street

Frederick, Maryland 21701

301.600.1049



From: Steve Poteat <cspoteat@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2022 11:11 AM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Correction of Natelli Statement Concerning the Montgomery County Agricultural Reserve.
[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

At the September 13 , 2022 , meeting of the County Council concerning the Sugarloaf Plan Mr. Natelli stated that Montgomery County allows intensive development at I-270 interchanges in the Agricultural Reserve and cited the Clarksburg, MD 121 interchange development as an example. A check of the Clarksburg Master Plan shows that the Clarksburg MD 121 interchange is not in the Agricultural Reserve, although there is some low density residential development near by. On the contrary, the I-270/MD 109 interchange at Hyattstown which is still in Montgomery County is in the Agricultural Reserve and there is NO intensive development planned, only Agricultural Reserve. Therefore low density development on the west side of I-270 at MD 80 in Frederick County would be consistent with the Montgomery County Agricultural Reserve. I hope this clarifies and corrects Mr. Natelli's error. Please include this information in the public hearing record for Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

ca

From: [Cherney, Ragen](#)
To: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
Cc: [Mitchell, Kathy \(Legal\)](#)
Subject: FW: FNP article on data center noise -- only part of the problem
Date: Thursday, September 15, 2022 4:05:07 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Ragen Cherney

Chief of Staff/Legislative Director

Frederick County Council

Winchester Hall

12 East Church Street

Frederick, Maryland 21701

301.600.1049



From: Nick Carrera <mjcarrera@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2022 3:27 PM

To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; County Executive
<CountyExecutive@FrederickCountyMD.gov>

Cc: Hogan, Jack <jhogan@newspost.com>; Schotz, Andy <aschotz@newspost.com>; Wilson, Geordie
<gwilson@newspost.com>

Subject: FNP article on data center noise -- only part of the problem

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Council Members and County Executive,

You will have seen the article on page A4 in yesterday's *Frederick News-Post* regarding noise from data centers in Northern Virginia. You may also find it illuminating to look at the web site of the group shown in the article, protectfauquier.com. They have pictures and information on data centers in Virginia that are truly scary. If you allow data centers on Natelli's 600 acres of agricultural property west of I-270, I can only imagine the obloquy to which you would be subjected. The low reputé of a former County Commissioner would be an Everest compared to your anthill.

It would kill the Sugarloaf Plan, of course, and it's hard to imagine the extent of damage it would do to the entire county. Considering that the Sugarloaf Plan was to be the "easy one," the bellwether for other detailed area plans under LFMP, I'd say LFMP will also end up on the trash heap. If Natelli can get his way here, what's to stop him elsewhere? And then what will have been the lasting good of our initial, hopeful experiment in a new form of county government?

Please reconsider what you are doing, and do a bit of digging on your own before falling for Natelli's and Amazon's siren song.

Nick Carrera, 2602 scenic (for now) Thurston Road, Frederick 21704

From: [Cherney, Ragen](#)
To: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
Cc: [Mitchell, Kathy \(Legal\)](#)
Subject: FW: Hopefully text of the 16 Steve Mckay admendments will be shown at a future date on the Winchester Hall screens?
Date: Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:31:45 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Ragen Cherney
Chief of Staff/Legislative Director
Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049



From: smordensky@aol.com <smordensky@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2022 11:59 AM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Hopefully text of the 16 Steve Mckay admendments will be shown at a future date on the Winchester Hall screens?

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Good morning,
I like others tried to follow the admendments discussed at Tuesday's FC Council meeting but it was very challenging.
We all have strengths in specific learning styles and my wife will be the firt to tell you, "Stan is not an auditory learner".
I shall see you next week.

Sincerely,

Stan Sr., (Retired MD World Studies & Science Teacher & Renaissance Man)
Stan Mordensky, Sr.
11401 Meadowlark DR.
ljamsville, MD 21754
Home/Office Phone: 301-831-6619
Cell Phone: 301-639-8584 (Best choice)

From: [Cherney, Ragen](#)
To: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#); [Mitchell, Kathy \(Legal\)](#)
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf Management Plan
Date: Monday, September 19, 2022 8:23:54 AM
Attachments: [Please Hold the Line!.msg](#)

Sugarloaf record.

Ragen Cherney
Chief of Staff/Legislative Director
Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049

-----Original Message-----

From: Patricia Dunn <sugarloafdunn@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2022 5:48 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Sugarloaf Management Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council Members

I am opposed to the Sugarloaf Management plan as it is currently written. Actually I am appalled. How is it even legal to make changes that will reduce property values/rights without compensation? Please reject the plan as written. A revised plan should include compensation (as in Montgomery County's TDR's when Agricultural Reserve was formed) and consider consequences of limiting growth to east side of 270.

Respectively
Patricia Dunn
18335 Comus Rd
Dickerson, MD 20842

Sent from my iPad

From: [Callie Fulmer](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Please Hold the Line!
Date: Saturday, September 17, 2022 1:25:41 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

I am a homeowner in Brunswick, and an active volunteer with the BSA. I regularly take youth to hike at Sugarloaf and at Monacacy, and am deeply concerned about open space and farming as a horse owner.

Please, hold the line on development not happening south of 270. We need rural places. We need farms. Once that land is developed, we can't get it back.

To keep horses I need local people who grow hay. I can't feed my horse worth the clippings from back yards. Hay prices are already rising significantly because of fertilizer increases. Add fuel costs top truck it in from elsewhere and it becomes unaffordable. Horse owners contribute considerable money to the economy in local, small businesses like vets, farriers, trainers, farm maintenance, fence builders, etc. As well as paying property taxes. Opening up more development pushes that economic segment farther and farther out.

I oppose developers buying land that is not zoned for development and then asking for special exceptions. I oppose special interest money in elections, too.

Stand up for the people and their quality of life. Three people who already live here.

Please, Hold the line!!!

Callie Fulmer