

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf plan
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:56:22 AM
Attachments: [Please vote for the Sugarloaf Plan.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf Plan.msg](#)
[I support the Sugarloaf Plan and the Overlay.msg](#)
[The Sugarloaf plan.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf plan.msg](#)
[Re SugarLoaf Mt. Plan Needs substantial further revisions.msg](#)
[Please keep the current language about the overlay in the Sugarloaf plan- from Trail Riders of Today.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf Plan.msg](#)
[Approve Sugarloaf Plan.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf Plan.msg](#)
[Please support preservation.msg](#)
[Support for the Sugarloaf Plan and Certain Zoning Restrictions.msg](#)
[Please vote for the Sugarloaf Plan tomorrow.msg](#)
[Our Treasured Landscape.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape---Overlay.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf Overlay.msg](#)

From: Sue Fortin <ccsfortin@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 7:14 AM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Sugarloaf plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Once again I am writing in **support** of the Sugarload Treasured Landscape Management Plan **including keeping the current language regarding the Overlay.** I have been dismayed by the lack of transparency among many of the players during this process including elected officials, developers, and Stronghold. It is our elected officials' job to hear the voices of their constituents. It is imperative that this unique and treasured area of Frederick County be protected **even if Stronghold goes through with their threat to close the mountain to the public.** Please vote **Yes** without further negotiations or modifications to the plan.

Sent from my iPad

From: [Sherman Johnson](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Please vote for the Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 12:35:34 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council members:

I am writing to express my strong support for the Sugarloaf Plan, and specifically the overlay district.

Everyone is well aware of the many solid reasons to vote for the plan, so I won't repeat them here. I would like to address the poor reasons some give to oppose the plan. They boil down to two:

1) The worn out, tribal, claims that the Sugarloaf plan is a socialistic "Government land grab" or "Government overreach." Needless to say, that is absurd. It's not as if eminent domain is being invoked and people are being forced off of their property. As has been reported in the FNP numerous times, the Plan and overlay will not prevent any of Stronghold's current activities. It is not unduly restrictive.

Some of the above claims seem to be the result of AstroTurf lobbying by Stronghold; the CoC; banks; realtors, and developers -- which is all the more reason to vote to approve the plan and overlay.

2) A negative knee-jerk reaction to the word "zoning". There are people who believe that any and all zoning is inherently bad. The only action they will ever approve is up-zoning. No conservation.

As owners of RC zoned property, my wife and I support property rights, but we also recognize that with rights come responsibilities. In addition, our neighbors have rights. Unfortunately, those rights are typically tossed aside by those who rant about "property rights." Many of them come across as being greedy, self-centered, and short-sighted -- with no concern for others.

If someone's land is actually taken, then of course they should be paid fair market value, but we cannot compensate property owners for every perceived/potential reduction in property value resulting from a zoning change.

The actions of the Stronghold board have been embarrassing -- the equivalent of a toddler throwing an epic tantrum. Their pathetic attempt at extortion must not be rewarded. They had plenty of opportunity to voice their concerns -- much more than most landowners would -- there is no excuse for their petulant behavior.

It is clear that Stronghold has plans that they do not want to divulge. Otherwise, why oppose the Plan so strenuously -- when it aligns with Mr. Strong's wishes? Their cagey behavior is reason enough to vote for the overlay.

It's doubtful that they will actually close Sugarloaf, but if they do, an upside is that it will be even better protected. There are plenty of parks people can visit. It's not as if Sugarloaf is the

only opportunity people have for outdoor recreation.

This is a very important issue for Frederick County. My wife and I will give your votes a lot of weight when filling out our ballots in the next few days.

Thank you for your hard work and your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sherman Johnson
Middletown

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Cc: [Goodfellow, Tim](#)
Subject: FW: Which holiday shall we celebrate in advance tonight?
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 1:11:53 PM
Attachments: [Sugarloaf Treasured Management Plan.msg](#)
[Pass the Current Sugarloaf Plan!.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf treasured management plan.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf Plan.msg](#)

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

From: Nick Carrera <mjcarrera@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 12:50 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Which holiday shall we celebrate in advance tonight?

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Will we pre-celebrate "Thanksgiving," with your passage of the Sugarloaf Plan? YAY!

or

will we pre-celebrate "Hallowe'en," with your failure to pass the Sugarloaf Pan? BOO!

Nick Carrera, Wellcome Farms on scenic Thurston Road

From: [Mac Lankford](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Vote for Sugarloaf Plan as currently amended and Overlay!
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 3:09:50 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Members,

Thanks for all your hard work!

It is our county's future you are voting on. This is a treasure and should be kept that way for all of us.

Vote for Sugarloaf Plan as currently amended and Overlay. It takes courage to do the right thing for the future.

Thanks,
Mac Lankford

From: [Charles MacFarland](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Cc: [Susan Trainor](#)
Subject: Support for Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 2:36:27 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Charles MacFarland

2995 Hope Mills Lane

Adamstown, MD 21710

Dear Council Members,

I write in support of your voting in favor of the Sugarloaf Plan as currently amended. I am asking also that current language about the Overlay remain in the plan.

I should like to point out that I am the current owner of the remains of the old Cutsail farm, house, barn and other outbuildings on 42 acres. It is about 3 miles west of the Urbana exit off 270.

Thank you very much for your consideration of my opinion and I hope very much that you will have the courage to vote to preserve this beautiful area for our descendants and the public at large.

I'm terribly sorry that I will not be able to attend this evens meeting in person. Please believe that I will be there in sprite and wearing green.

Yours Aye,

Charles MacFarland

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Subject: Fwd: Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:00:59 PM

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

From: Cynthia Jennings <cynthiajennings4@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 5:45 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Please vote to support the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan, including its overlay and the private park status for Stonghold/Sugarloaf Mountain.

Thank you.

Cynthia Jennings

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Subject: Fwd: Overlay and Preservation Frederick County Council Hearing Oct.18, 2022
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:07:15 PM

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

From: Pandora Gunsallus <gunsalpp@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 5:37 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Overlay and Preservation Frederick County Council Hearing Oct.18, 2022

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Corrected version.

> Dear Frederick County Council Members,
>
> Hi, my name is Pandora Gunsallus. I have farm property at 3350 Park Mills Rd.
> My parcel consists of about 12 gorgeous wooded acres, with the remainder in farmland. I see my farm as supporting Frederick County's long history of agriculture, as well as the local biodiversity, including aquatic life and healthy waterways. Unfortunately, because my farm sits near the corner of Park Mills and Fingerboard Roads it is at risk from possible encroaching development. Development disturbance in this preservation area would devastate the entire regions' delicately balanced ecosystem. Please keep the Overlay and pass it over the entire plan area, without delay, in order to provide meaningful long term protections to the Sugarloaf Preservation Plan area. Protect the Mountain, its rural roads, residents and The Monocacy National Battlefield Park from outside development interests that don't have preservation as there goal.
> I want to sincerely thank council for all their hard work on the Sugarloaf Plan as a Preservation Plan.
> Thank you,
> Pandora Gunsallus
> 241 Cynthia Drive Canonsburg, PA 15317
>
> Sent from my iPad

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Subject: Fwd: National Park Service comments on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 8:08:58 PM
Attachments: [NPS Comments to Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.pdf](#)
[Overlay and Preservation Frederick County Council Hearing Oct.18 2022.msg](#)
[image001.png](#)

From: Cherney, Ragen <RCherney@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 5:03:43 PM
To: Brandt, Kimberly G. <KGBrandt@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Mitchell, Kathy (Legal) <KMitchell2@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: FW: National Park Service comments on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan

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

From: Banasik, Andrew <Andrew_Banasik@nps.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2022 4:39 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: National Park Service comments on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached pdf document with NPS comments on the Management Plan.

Regards,
Andrew

Andrew Banasik ([he/him/his](#))
Superintendent
Monocacy National Battlefield
Cell: 301-988-0681



IN REPLY REFER TO:

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Monocacy National Battlefield
4632 Araby Church Rd.
Frederick, MD 21704



Frederick County Council
12 E. Church Street
Frederick, MD 21701

Dear Council Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan. On behalf of the National Park Service (NPS) and Monocacy National Battlefield, one of over 400 units of the national park system, I applaud Frederick County's planning efforts focusing on the preservation and conservation of natural and cultural resources. The stated vision and goals of the Plan, aimed at protecting and enhancing forestlands, natural resources, biodiversity, wildlife habitat, inspiring vistas, and historic resources, are closely aligned with NPS and park preservation mandates.

The mission of the NPS is to *"to preserve unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations."* In addition to the overall NPS mandate, Monocacy National Battlefield preserves the natural and cultural resources that make up a landscape that has changed little since the 1864 Battle of Monocacy. As stewards of our country's national treasures, the NPS also realizes that effective land and resource preservation requires engagement and collaboration with interagency partners on larger, landscape scales. The park supports including portions of the battlefield west of Interstate 270 in the Planning Area boundary as well as adjacent parcels to the southeast that are the headwaters of an important park stream.

While we support the Plan overall, however, there are two related items where the NPS has potential concerns. First, "Amendment 9 to the Proposed Zoning Changes Associated with the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan" changed the zoning district from 'Resource Conservation' back to 'Agricultural,' thereby removing important protections from lands within the study area and adjacent to the park. We are always mindful of proposed zoning and development proposals on these adjacent lands because of the potential impact to park resources and hydrology. We see provisions included in the Resource Conservation district involving sensitive area protection and limits on tree cutting as providing benefit to natural resources. This change in zoning district seems to also conflict with the preservation and conservation focus of the Plan. The NPS suggests reconsideration of this amendment.

Related to Bill 22-25 to Add the Sugarloaf Rural Heritage Overlay District to the County Zoning Code, "Amendment 4 on Bill 22-25" removed two uses, rodeos and outdoor sports recreation

facilities, from the list of prohibited uses in §1-19-7.740. We believe that allowing these two uses also seems to conflict with the stated vision and goals of the Plan. These two uses, especially outdoor sports recreation facilities, could impact large land areas and involve substantial development, increased impervious surface, introduction of night-time lighting, and other incongruous activities that could lead to erosion and impacts to park resources. The NPS also suggests reconsideration of this amendment.

The NPS appreciates the ability to provide comment and feedback and supports the Plan's focus on preservation and conservation of the area's important natural and cultural resources. As noted above, however, we suggest reconsideration of the two amendments to the Plan that could potentially impact park resources.

We value our great relationship with our County partners and look forward to working collaboratively to advance the preservation and stewardship of the area's resources. Please feel free to contact me with questions or for clarification at Andrew_Banasik@nps.gov.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Andrew Banasik", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Andrew Banasik
Superintendent
Monocacy National Battlefield

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf Plan - Let's Pass It!
Date: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 11:15:35 AM

From: Matt Seubert <matts853@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 10:52 AM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Cc: Gardner, Jan <JGardner@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Brandt, Kimberly G. <KGBrandt@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Goodfellow, Tim <TGoodfellow@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Horn, Steve <SHorn@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan - Let's Pass It!

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council Members,

While I'm disappointed that some of the preservation objectives have been pulled back, overall I'll be comfortable with the final Plan including Kai's amendment.

Of course, the question remains whether or not Stronghold will give a final blessing. If they don't, no one could reasonably fault you for doing everything you could to meet their requests. In any event, I trust you will pass the plan. I expect, and hope, for at least a 6-1 vote, if not a unanimous vote to pass it.

I want to thank you all for working hard on this. I think you made the best of a bad situation. I especially want to thank Kai for his last minute solution, and Jessica for opening it up for consideration.

Best,

Matt Seubert

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf
Date: Thursday, October 20, 2022 3:52:39 PM

From: Karen Russell <1ceramicat@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 2:33 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Sugarloaf

Councilmembers,

I still wonder what Stronghold actually wants to do with the mountain. Here's my 10/18 testimony:

Passing the Sugarloaf Overlay District shows your commitment to preserving the Sugarloaf area. Please do not kick the passage of this overlay, amended or not, over to the next county council. That group will not have had the extensive time that you have had with this plan, which could delay a vote until councilmembers come up to speed and possibly change what's in front of you now in ways that defeat the purpose of the plan, which is to preserve the natural resources and rural character of the area. The overlay minimizes or eliminates adverse impacts to water quality, forest resources, wildlife habitats and scenic and rural landscape elements. It even addresses lighting to reduce negative impacts to wildlife migration, nocturnal habitats, and circadian rhythms.

With regard to Stronghold, I'm disappointed that they have come out so strongly against the plan and I've spent some time trying to find out what they want, but no one seems to know. I listened to former Montgomery County Council member John Menke describe the secrecy surrounding the Stronghold operation, which is perfectly legal, but not conducive to public trust. He identified 76 platted properties around the mountain and asked "What happens when the trust document runs out?" It's one thing, to bend over backward to appease an operation that benefits the public, but it's another when that operation isn't clear about what it wants and threatens to hold the public hostage over— what exactly?

Gordon Strong was prescient in his preservation of Sugarloaf Mountain, but he did not foresee the environmental challenges of climate change, biodiversity loss and pollution that we face today. Land use decisions now have global impacts; however, our legal framework divides land up into private and public property and regulations make decision-making for the common good necessary at the local level. Please pass bill 22-24 and the overlay before the election.

Thank you for all you do for the County,

Ms. Karen J. Russell
510 E. Mountain Rd.
Knoxville, MD 21758
301-401-2463

Specht, Jennifer

From: Brandt, Kimberly G.
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 7:48 AM
To: Specht, Jennifer
Subject: FW: Follow up from 10/18 council workshop

From: Abigail Brown <abigail.mommybrown@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2022 12:00 AM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Follow up from 10/18 council workshop

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear County Council,

I appreciate the brief discussion of the Potomac Garden Center at the 10/18 council workshop, but after hearing this discussion, I felt it was important that I follow up. It is really hard to have a dialogue in the context of a council meeting with the community, and so I am reaching out.

This discussion took place between Steve McKay, Kimberly from the planning commission, and Kai Hagen. I am not singling them out in any way, they were just the ones that spoke. I was at the meeting during this time, but went back to watch this discussion, and included it in written, dialogue format below for you all to easily read, without having to take the time to go back and rewatch it yourselves. I added the timing of the comments, for easy reference as well, if you want to confirm any details. I also added my concerns/ comments/ questions in **bold**.

If PGC is not going to be included in the Overlay plan, I am again asking it to be removed from the discussion for rezoning consideration, and asking you to seriously consider sending the issue back to the planning commission, and allow it to go through the normal process when a property is looking to rezone. This will allow an unrushed process, and give the community the opportunity to speak to this as a single issue, and not get lost in the weeds of the Overlay as a whole. **Why is PGC and this topic of rezoning still being considered, if it is not in the proposed boundary area anyway?** In addition, rezoning PGC to complete GC does not jive with the heart of the Sugarloaf plan, and if anything, its rezoning is the complete opposite of what the Sugarloaf plan is trying to accomplish: to preserve and protect this area.

I apologize in advance for the lengthy email, but appreciate your time.

- - - - -

Discussion from 10/18 council workshop

3:12:18

Steve McKay: "I thought it would be helpful to dive in a little bit on the Potomac Garden Center change in zoning to GC... there have been questions about why and concerns with the process and notifications and I can understand those, but I just wanted to dive into this a little bit ... So the issue was, generally speaking, 20 years ago there was an approved site plan. So why does the zoning need to change. And I guess perhaps mistakenly that the changed in the interim time period and in

order to do what was proposed in order to do what was proposed 20 years ago. They need the GC zone and that wasn't quite right. My understanding... is that it was contemplated with a particular activity with that site plan, but it wasn't undertaken. And in order to do it now, short of having the GC zoning would require a pathway through the board of zoning appeals, which we know is a much more expensive and arduous process. He could still get it done, but this just allows him to do it in a more economically efficient manner..."

It is being acknowledged here that PGC can still act upon the site plan by one of two paths, go through the board of zoning appeals, because they CHOSE to not jump on it 20 years ago, or get rezoned to GC. It sounds as if both paths will accomplish the same thing for them- allow them to expand their business. The only difference that I am hearing is that it would be more economical to allow a GC zoning (for them), rather than PGC following the path through the board of zoning appeals. So with this train of thought, why is it being considered to accommodate the easier path for PGC, putting us in a tight spot as an agriculturally zoned adjacent property, just because PGC did not act sooner? That is not our fault.

"It does still seem to me to be a reasonable request."

How so?

"I understand the objections to it but also heard in the objections to what he was trying to do, but what might someone else do in the future."

This comment hit the nail on the head. One of the biggest concerns is for the future. This is exactly what I have shared a few times in my comments to the council. And this is exactly the purpose of the Sugarloaf Overlay even being proposed in the first place. Protecting the area for the future.

"I really can't act on that. I mean, personally, I don't share the same concerns of future extensive GC development. You know, if the current owner moves on and sells. I mean, there's no water and sewer there, it's always going to be a limiter. And there is no plans for the county to extend it over there, you know."

I see how someone can argue these points, however, there are many other kinds of businesses that run on well and septic. If granted a full GC rezoning, this might cause limitations, yes, for some kinds of business to come in, but it still widely opens the door to so many things that would otherwise not be considered in an agriculturally zoned area. There is a lot of development that can function just fine on well & septic, as there are many, many properties supporting that point, all across our state.

So I recognize the concerns that have shared to us about this. And again, this has been the other the number two topic it seems. And there is a history there. And when the site plans were delivered to us, and I still have it in my office. You know, is well, what is the deal with this and I asked a few questions and I got it a little wrong at first. But then I got it a little clarified and I thought it was important that we at least you know, acknowledged that. And that's why when the request to extend existing GC into the other part of the parcel, it didn't make my head hurt. And then delving into a little further, further confirmed. I thought it was helpful if we just aired it out, or at least I thought I needed to, so anyway, that's all."

3:16:09

Kai Hagen "I just wanted to ask staff, either Kimberly or Tim could respond to this. This issue has come up as Steve described as number 2, if 3 or 4 until after the boundary issue got put behind us and then it moved up the list. But anyway, I just want to ask the question, if one of you wants to come up for a second as to there's been some question as to whether or not the zoning change was necessary for any and all likely expansion of the current business versus how it affects future potential use for sale or development with or without water etc and if either of you could just speak to that, and I think it would be real helpful to clear that up..."

3:17:03

Kimberly "Alright, so this is complicated because we have two different zoning districts, and we have at least three different uses on the property. And they're uses that go together, but our zoning ordinances treats them like they are three separate uses. So we have a Whole sale nursery, which is aloud in both GC and AG so we don't have an issue there. A garden center is not aloud at all in the Agricultural zoning district. So garden centers are aloud with a site plan in GC. So there would be an issue with expanding the garden center use beyond GC use, that is not aloud. And then the third use is the landscape contractor use. That is a special exception in the agricultural zoning district. And with that special exception comes limitations with how much impervious surface you can have and also how much you can have under roof. So under roof you can have 10,000 square feet and for impervious surface, you can have. So those limitations do not apply in the GC zoning district. So you can have that use in either of those districts. But again in AG, its a special exception with those limitations and GC it is aloud with a site plan without those limitations. It does make a difference.

I would send you directly back to the site plan that I shared. There is already a path that has been seen by the planning commission for PGC to move forward with their proposal to expand upon their business with the current zoning. PGC has not presently been denied anything that I have heard about, or seen in public record, to prevent them from moving forward with their plan. So again, I propose the question, why, after so many years of having this site plan in hand, are they looking for, and "NEEDING" a rezoning to grow?

In addition, the very same day I picked up the site plans from the planning commission office, Tim Goodfellow was kind enough to print me off a copy of zoning designations in general for Frederick County, and he highlighted the three types of business that were being run on the PGC property. Yes, exceptions have been granted to PGC under current zoning, but again, all the designations seem to be able to coexist under the current split zoning. Please see photo attachments of these documents. (I'm sorry I don't have a working scanner for a crisper document)

To note, Kai, this portion of your question was not answered. "...how it affects future potential use for sale or development with or without water"

3:19:38

Kai Hagen "Can you remind us, and I forgot. What percentage of the land is which zoning right now.?"

Kimberly "so the total acreage is 19.9, and they currently have 6.3 acres GC, so the balance, 13.6 acres is AG, and what's proposed is for it to all go to GC."

Please see site plan for additional information on the division and location of my property to the west, and current Commercial zoning in the east. Currently the agriculturally zoned area is acting as a zoning buffer between residential properties zoned agriculture (my house and other residents), and the portion of PGC that is currently zoned commercial. If you look to the

far left (west side) of the site plan, my house is that small cutoff rectangle that sits just over the property line.

3:20:00ish

Steve McKay "And currently on the portion in the AG zone, there is a large utility easement. Kimberly "that's correct." Steve "and whether they are GC or AG they still would not be able to build or develop over that?" Kimberly "that's correct." Steve "ok."

So, this answer could have been elaborated on. See site plans. This easement runs on the west side of the PGC property all the way to the property line. There is no natural barrier to separate this easement from the rest of the PGC property. It is all an open field from my fence line, well into the PGC's buildable area. Additionally, according to the plans, there are 2 greenhouses proposed to be built, which would butt right up to this easement, and a parking lot and storage area planned to be developed ON the easement.

- - - - -

I want you to hear my heart behind this. I feel it necessary to keep speaking up, because we want to be good stewards of our property, while at the same time, support the overall idea of preservation in the area, and to show you that this rezoning is an unnecessary and an extreme step in order for PGC to thrive.

I leave you with something to think about, and maybe will help you understand why I am passionately speaking out against this... Imagine you were in my shoes, living on a property zoned agriculture. You live next to a property who seeks a complete commercial rezoning, and you are NOT notified by any county department for almost 2 years, in order to give you a fighting chance to contribute to the conversation when still in the early stages of discussion. Your neighbor doesn't even contact you to share the intent. Imagine the impact rezoning will have on YOUR property, no longer being next to Agriculturally zoned land. The impacts it could have on your property value, daily living with additional noise, non agricultural structures, lights, influx of people, traffic, etc.

Who among you would honestly NOT be doing exactly what I am doing and speaking up??

Thank you for you time,
Abigail Brown (and Family)
8564 Fingerboard rd

§ 1-19-5.310. USE TABLE.

(A) Permitted uses and required development review.

P Principal permitted use subject to design regulations

PS Principal permitted use subject to site development plan approval. See §§ 1-19-2.160, and 1-19-3.300 through 1-19-3.300.4

E Principal permitted use as a special exception with site development plan approval. See §§ 1-19-8.320 and following

T Permitted as temporary use as a special exception. See § 1-19-8.300

X Permitted as temporary use only. See § 1-19-8.700

SW Solid Waste Floating Zone

A blank indicates that the use is not permitted under any situation

Zoning Districts														
Uses	RC	A	RI	R3	R5	R8	RI2	RI6	VC	MX	GC	ORI	LI	G
Natural Resources Uses														
Agricultural activities	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Limited agricultural activity			E	E	E	E	E	E						
Apiary	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Agricultural value added processing	P ***	P ***												
Agritourism enterprise	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Nursery retail	PS	PS									PS		PS	PS
Nursery wholesale	P	P									P		P	P
Farm distillery	P***	P***												
Farm distillery tasting room	PS** *	PS** *												
Farm winery	P ***	P ***												
Farm winery tasting room	PS ***	PS ***												
Limited farm alcoholic beverages tasting room	P***	P***												
Farm brewery	P ***	P ***												
Farm brewery tasting room	PS ***	PS ***												

Uses	Zoning Districts													
	RC	A	R1	R3	R5	R8	R12	R16	VC	MX	GC	ORI	LI	GI
<i>Commercial Uses - Retail (Cont'd)</i>														
Radio and TV sales and service									PS	PS	PS			
Shoe store									PS	PS	PS			
Sporting goods									PS	PS	PS			
Stone monument sales									PS	PS	PS		PS	PS
Tobacco store									PS	PS	PS			
Toy store									PS	PS	PS			
Liquor store									PS	PS	PS			
<i>Commercial Business and Personal Services</i>														
Advertising agency									PS	PS	PS			
Bank or savings and loan									PS	PS	PS	PS		
Broadcasting studio									PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS
Communication towers**	E	E									PS	PS	PS	PS
Barber and beauty shops									PS	PS	PS			
Bus depot											PS		PS	PS
Carpentry, electrical, plumbing, welding, printing, upholstery									PS	PS	PS		PS	PS
Contractors, fencing, pool and siding											PS		PS	PS
Commercial school or education program										PS	PS	PS	PS	
Dance or music studio									PS	PS	PS			
Dry cleaning and laundromat ****									PS	PS	PS			
Funeral home										PS	PS			
Limited landscape contractor		PS												
Landscape contractor		E									PS		PS	PS
Medical clinic									PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS
Office business									PS	PS	PS	PS	PS	PS
Office professional					E	E	E	E	PS	PS	PS	PS		

MOTEL. Any group of rooms combined or separate which are used for the purpose of housing transient guests and each unit of which is provided with its own toilet, washroom and off-street parking facilities.

MOTOR FREIGHT TERMINAL. A structure or land where truck transported goods are transferred, or stored pending transfer, and which may include truck dispatching, parking and servicing (but no retail sales of motor fuels, oils or accessories) and temporary accommodations for truck drivers.

MOTORCYCLE HILL CLIMB. The temporary use of the property for a motorcycle hill climbing event.

MPDU PROJECT. Any residential development of 25 or more units on public water and sewer.

MULTIPLE-FAMILY DWELLING. A detached building containing 3 or more dwelling units.

MULTIPLE-FAMILY GROUP DWELLING. A group of 2 or more multiple-family dwellings, which occupy 1 lot and have a yard, court or service area in common.

MUSEUM/GALLERY. A commercial establishment for preserving and exhibiting artistic, historical, scientific, natural, or man-made objects of interest. A museum or gallery may include the sale of the objects, memorabilia, crafts or artwork.

NATURAL GAS. A mixture of hydrocarbon gases that occurs with petroleum deposits, principally methane together with varying quantities of ethane, propane, butane, and other gases, and is used as a fuel and in the manufacture of organic compounds.

NEW CONSTRUCTION. Within the Floodplain District, a structure for which the start of construction commenced on or after June 1, 1978, and includes any subsequent improvements.

NONCONFORMITY. A lot, structure, or use lawfully existing before the effective date of any regulation of this chapter, which does not conform to the current regulations of the district in which it is located.

NONGOVERNMENTAL ELECTRIC SUBSTATION. A high-voltage electric system facility used to switch generators, equipment and circuits or lines in and out of a system. It also is used to change AC voltages from one level to another, and/or change alternating current to direct current or direct current to alternating current. Including without limitation a transmission and distribution substation served by transmission lines of 500 kv or greater.

NONGOVERNMENTAL UTILITY. Any utility not owned by a governmental entity. Including a transmission and distribution substation for supplying electric service served by transmission lines of less than 500 kv, but excluding Solar Facility, Commercial.

NRCS. Natural Resources Conservation Service.

NURSERY RETAIL. The use of property for the planting, maintaining and harvesting of trees, shrubs, plants, grasses or sod for sale to other nurseries, landscape contractors, retail outlets. This use includes on-site public retail sales related to the planting, maintaining, or harvesting of trees, shrubs, plants, grasses or sod, fertilizers, soils, chemicals, or other nursery goods and related products in small quantity to consumers.

NURSERY SCHOOL. A facility operated for the purpose of providing training, guidance, education or care for 4 or more children, all of whom are under 7 years of age and separated from their parents or guardians during any part of the day. This includes kindergartens, day nurseries and day care centers.

NURSERY WHOLESALE. The use of property for the planting, maintaining and harvesting of trees, shrubs, plants, grasses or sod for sale to other nurseries, landscape contractors or retail outlets.

materials used solely for parking of vehicles, storage, or building access in an area other than a basement is not the lowest floor, as long as it is supplied with water equalizing vents.

medical
for the p
patient b

MAJOR RECREATIONAL EQUIPMENT.

Mobile apparatus specifically designed for recreational activities and including travel trailers, pickup campers, motorized dwellings, tent trailers, boat trailers, houseboats or storage containers used for transporting recreational equipment.

land laid
golf, im
and equi
golf cou
retail sal

MAJOR SUBDIVISION. Any parcel which has been or is proposed to be subdivided to create 6 or more lots.

minimum
street.

MANUFACTURED HOME OR BUILDING. A structure, transportable in 1 or more sections, which is built on a permanent chassis and is designed for use with or without a permanent foundation when connected to the required utilities. For floodplain management purposes, the term **MANUFACTURED HOME OR BUILDING** also includes park trailers, travel trailers, and other similar vehicles placed on a site for more than 180 consecutive days.

permissi
along the

has been

which is
chassis,
connected

INDUSTRIAL PARK. A tract of land which is subdivided and developed according to an overall plan for occupancy by a group of industries and is provided with streets and necessary materials, including paper, rags, scrap metal, other scrap or utilities.

INTENSIVE SWINE FARM. A facility, building, tract of land or operation used for the raising, feeding or care of 250 or more animals of the porcine species.

INTERMITTENT STREAM. A stream that has flowing water during certain times of the year, when groundwater provides water for stream flow. During dry periods, intermittent streams may not have flowing water. Runoff from precipitation is a supplemental source of water for stream flow. These streams are identified through field verification and as approved by the Department. The most recent county hydrography layer may be used as a guide for the preliminary establishment of possible watercourses.

JUNKYARD. Any land or structure which is used for the abandonment, sale, storage, keeping, collecting or baling of discarded materials, or used for the abandonment, demolition, dismantling, storage, or salvaging or sale of machinery, including 3 or more vehicles which are not in running condition.

LANDFILL RUBBLE. Landfill which is designed to accept rubble which would include only land clearing debris, demolition debris, and construction debris as permitted under state guidelines. No tires or asbestos waste will be permitted in a rubble landfill.

LANDFILL, SANITARY. A solid waste acceptance facility operated by a governmental agency or under contract with a governmental agency permitted under state sanitation regulations that is designed, installed and operated so that all types of waste generated by the general public may be accepted except waste specifically prohibited by state regulations unless a permit issued under state regulations allows the specific waste to be accepted.

LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR. A business principally engaged in the designing, installing, planting or maintaining of yards, gardens or other grounds offsite to include the following: landscape installation, care and maintenance services; lawn care services (i.e., fertilizing, mowing, seeding, sod laying, spraying); plant, shrub and tree services (i.e., bracing, planting, pruning, removal, spraying, trimming); seasonal property maintenance services (i.e., snow plowing in winter, landscaping during other seasons).

LIGHT TRESPASS. Light falling outside of the property boundary on which a light installation

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Subject: FW: It's important to reach agreement on a Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 7:49:25 AM
Attachments: [Sugarloaf Overlay - 2323 Thurston Rd.msg](#)

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

From: Cherney, Ragen <RCherney@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 7:21 AM
To: Brandt, Kimberly G. <KGBrandt@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Mitchell, Kathy (Legal) <KMitchell2@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: FW: It's important to reach agreement on a Sugarloaf Plan

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: Nick Carrera <mjcarrera@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2022 10:13 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: It's important to reach agreement on a Sugarloaf Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Circumstance and timing have reduced our options for the Sugarloaf Plan. Now, to stand pat is to lose. County government is about to change, and it may be some time before the new CE and Council again take up the Plan. With new members, prospects may be less favorable than with our present Council. Moreover, after 2 1/2 years of work on the Plan, to end up with nothing would send a bad signal and would effectively be a step backward.

Things being as they are, the compromise that's been floated, of exempting RC-zoned land from the additional restrictions that Overlay would impose at this time, seems a way forward and perhaps the only way forward. As in the old adage, "half a loaf is better than none." My own property is Ag-zoned, and I'd be pleased to have this part of the county, mostly Ag-zoned, fully protected by the Overlay.

Nick Carrera 2602 scenic Thurston Road, 21704

From: [Leslie Novotny](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf Overlay - 2323 Thurston Rd
Date: Friday, October 21, 2022 3:25:00 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

To The County Council Members:

I want to thank you again for your time and attention to the Sugarloaf Overlay & Plan. I was unable to attend the meeting this past Tuesday but I was able to watch the proceedings.

I have sent comments before but wanted to again reiterate the importance of protection of this area. As I heard from the comments from Tuesday night, this area is vulnerable to extensive development. Today, Friday just for an example. A truck overturned on 270 near the scenic overlook. There was a fuel spill. 270 is shut down past 80 and traffic is being redirected. There is a very long back up both north and south. The backup extends to Clarksburg. I live on Thurston Rd and it has been a highway since 11 am. Thousands of cars speeding up the road. This is a 30mph road. This is also the case when there is an accident or morning and afternoon traffic on 270 south or north. This is not a road for an additional 10,000 or more cars.

I am asking you to protect this area to the full extent proposed. While I hope the entire Plan will be approved I know there have been some compromises offered to Stronghold. Again, I am not sure what is behind this stance that Stronghold has taken. I mentioned in my last email to the council. My husband and I got married at the mansion on Sugarloaf. Sugarloaf Mountain is near and dear to my heart. I hiked the mountain numerous times as a young girl. My dream was to live up here in this area. Both my husband and I are from Montgomery County but have lived in our house for almost 30 years. We wanted a quiet place to raise our family.

I don't understand how one landowner (Stronghold) could have this much veto power over the County land use policy. Stronghold right now is a non profit organization. If they refuse to compromise on what you have proposed I urge the Council to pass the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay as currently amended. Again, not sure what is behind this stance that they are taking. **What also concerns me is...**when the lawyer for Sugarloaf came in Phil Dacey went over to them, shook hands and both were slapping each other on the back at the break. I know things go on behind closed doors but this did not leave me with a good feeling. What is going on there?

Natelli property - As I have mentioned this area cannot support more houses. Natelli lives in Potomac. He wants to develop the west side of 270. He probably has no clue on the traffic here today due to this accident. It has been a stream of cars heading north. Cars passing on a double yellow to get up the road faster. Thurston Road was not built for this kind of traffic. It is curvy and dangerous.

M.C. Keegan-Ayer - one of your platforms is to stop overcrowding in the schools. These schools in the Urbana area have been overcrowded for 15 years ever since Natelli started building in this area. My youngest has been in portable after portable year after year with 45-

50 kids in his classes. By allowing more development you are adding to this problem. There are 2 elementary schools right next to each other. Unfortunately, the 2nd elementary school didn't open until 2 years ago. These kids have suffered from overcrowding for too long.

I am asking you again to please support the Overlay & Plan. If Stronghold does not agree to the compromises you have made then approve the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay as currently amended.

Thank you for your time.

Leslie Novotny
2323 Thurston Rd.
Frederick, MD 21704
301-351-7281

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Cc: [Goodfellow, Tim](#)
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf amendment
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 8:16:15 AM

From: Redmond, Lee <LRedmond@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 8:06 AM
To: Cherney, Ragen <RCherney@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf amendment

FYI

From: STEVE MCKAY <stevemckay@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2022 2:13 PM
To: Manalo, Noel <NManalo@mcneeslaw.com>
Cc: Disclosures <Disclosures@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Redmond, Lee <LRedmond@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Mitchell, Kathy (Legal) <KMitchell2@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Keller, Catherine <CKeller@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: RE: Sugarloaf amendment

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Noel

Amendment 17 describes the overlay, and the mountain - as zoned - is not in the Overlay. I can't say that any clearer. The mountain will remain outside the Overlay for as long as it remains RC. If in the future your client requests a change in zoning from RC - which would likely only be possible as part of a future comprehensive planning action (like this one) - then the Overlay "might" apply, depending on whether any changes to the Overlay were also enacted during that future comprehensive planning action.

So the bottom line is that your clients' property is not part of the Overlay. The only thing that will ever change that are contingent on zoning change requests and comprehensive planning activities that are far in the future and not - as you acknowledged - part of your client's intent.

As for the zoning ordinance - that hasn't been written. Staff will await Council instruction on Tuesday about the 40-50 individual property rezonings, and there will also be discussion about what happens to land that changes from RC zoning. I believe what you drafted is a reasonable representation of what that language will be, but perhaps Cate can chime in.

I understand that you're trying to be clear but keep in mind that Amendment 17 stands on it's own, and the result of it will be that your client's RC-zoned land will not be in

the Overlay. Anything that changes this situation will only occur - (1) at your client's initiation and (2) during another comprehensive planning activity, much like this last one, during which we can hash it all out again.

Regards, Steve

On 10/21/2022 1:54 PM Manalo, Noel <nmanalo@mcneeslaw.com> wrote:

Council Member McKay - interesting, so we don't have all of the info yet, necessarily.

Is the Mountain in the Overlay or is it not?

Amendment 17 appears to show the latter. But your explanation appears to indicate the former. And I am not trying to be obtuse or anything - I'm trying to be in a position to (A) clearly explain to Webster's what is going on and (B) not misrepresent to you Stronghold's position.

Not trying to do Kai's/County Legal's work here, but basically what you are saying is that "Ordinance" language that no one has seen yet will, after Tuesday, come back to the County Council that says *"any property shown in the Sugarloaf Study Area that changes zoning from RC to any other zoning will by operation of law/this Ordinance automatically also be zoned as within the Rural Heritage Overlay District"*.

Something along those lines? If so, I am quite confused, as that is quite different from what I understood of Amendment 17; in which case the only representation I can make at the moment is what I've made in the email below as to Amendment 17 - not to any as-yet drafted Ordinance language.

I wouldn't even know what to discuss with the Websters, at this point, unless you have draft Ordinance language for me to review. Again, not trying to be obtuse, just trying to understand so that I can communicate clearly.

Noel Manalo



McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC

8490 Progress Drive, Suite 225 | Frederick, MD 21701

Tel: 301.241.2014

From: STEVE MCKAY <stevemckay@comcast.net>

Sent: Friday, October 21, 2022 1:41 PM

To: Manalo, Noel <NManalo@mcneeslaw.com>

Cc: disclosures@frederickcountymd.gov; Redmond, Lee
<LRedmond@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; kmitchell2@frederickcountymd.gov;
ckeller@frederickcountymd.gov

Subject: RE: Sugarloaf amendment

[EXTERNAL]

Hi Noel

Thank you for your note. I appreciate your response and confirmation of your September 8 letter.

As you've noted, the intent and express implication of the amendment - which is now posted to our Tuesday agenda - is that the Overlay will not apply to RC zoned land. Thus, it will not apply to any of your client's land.

However, I do need to clarify/correct the point about zoning change. Kai's statement about what happens if land is rezoned from RC to something else was correct. While not expressed in the amendment, it will be part of the zoning ordinance instructions - assuming this passes, which I believe it will. If land within the planning area that is currently zoned RC is rezoned to something else, then the Overlay will apply to that land. I am glad that your client has no plans for doing this, so I would hope that this won't be an issue.

More importantly, as you're aware, zoning doesn't just get changed. Changing your client's parcels from RC to something else could realistically only be accomplished by a future comprehensive planning action. Neither "significant change" nor "zoning error" would seem to present a viable path for a change in euclidian zoning. Also, neither MXD or PUD can be applied to RC, so that's not really an option outside of a future comprehensive planning activity that first changes the underlying zoning.

So the scenario that may impact your clients - a change in zoning from RC, that they currently have no plan for - would have to be part of a future comprehensive planning action. In that case, I would imagine that the overlay issues could be addressed at that time. In the meantime, your client's requirements have been met.

Regards, Steve

On 10/21/2022 12:44 AM Manalo, Noel <nmanalo@mcneeslaw.com>
wrote:

Steve, thanks for the heads up. Yes, you were correct Tuesday as to Stronghold's position being that stated in the Sept. 8, 2022 letter sent to Council (copy attached).

Also, you are correct, the proposed Amendment 17 does fulfill Stronghold's request # (2) ("removes Stronghold's holdings from the

Sugarloaf Overlay rezoning").

[In fact, Amendment 17 is even more squarely responsive than what Council Member Hagen discussed Tuesday - he said while the Overlay would not apply to RC, if the zoning changed from RC to something else, the Overlay would then apply. This led me to believe the Overlay boundary would still be the same under what he was proposing. However, Amendment 17 does not have anything along those lines - it simply takes RC out. Period. Thus, based on my read of Amendment 17, if RC ground in the Sugarloaf Study Area were to somehow ultimately get rezoned to PUD, MXD, whatever, etc. - it's still not subject to the clearly mapped Rural Heritage Overlay District and the attendant regulations (i.e., if Amendment 17 passes, the Rural Heritage Overlay District becomes distinct from, and no longer coterminous with, the Sugarloaf Study Area). (Should go without saying, but Stronghold of course has no plans to ask for/consider any type of rezoning to any of its RC property)].

If my read as stated above tracks, then as stated in the 9/8/22 letter, my client would not oppose the Plan, and they would consider the County regulatory regime governing it as status quo and therefore no elevated risk/cost to operations.

=====

Totally out of curiosity, and just asking on my own behalf and not on behalf of Stronghold, but:

1. Isn't this what you said earlier you could not really see happening - i.e., a Sugarloaf Plan without the Mountain? Does Kai even get your vote on this - let alone 4 total votes?
2. How does this address the concerns about ability for special exception uses in RC that I thought were the main citizen concerns all along - gun range, houses of worship, etc.?
3. How does Amendment 17 go to a vote without a public hearing, based on the Council's handling of previous Amendments? This Amendment 17 is substantially a mapped/graphic version of Council Member Dacey's 9/13/22 Amendment 15, for which his was the lone positive vote.

I don't need you to answer these in a response email or anything - just curious, and maybe when we next catch up it will be more clear to me.

Noel Manalo



McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC

8490 Progress Drive, Suite 225 | Frederick, MD 21701

Tel: 301.241.2014

From: STEVE MCKAY <stevemckay@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 3:00 PM
To: Manalo, Noel <NManalo@mcneeslaw.com>
Cc: disclosures@frederickcountymd.gov; Redmond, Lee
<LRedmond@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Sugarloaf amendment

[EXTERNAL]

Hi Noel

In case you haven't seen it yet, this is the amendment we will discuss on Tuesday. This amendment will result in the Overlay not being applied to RC-zoned land. Your clients asked to be removed from the Overlay, and this amendment accomplishes that. The question for your client is - if this amendment passes, along with the other amendments that were accomplished on their behalf, does this address their concerns with the Plan such that they'll remove their objections. That's my conclusion from their prior letter, but we would like confirmation.

Steve

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

From: Kai Hagen <kai@catoctinmountain.com>
To: Steve McKay <stevemckay@comcast.net>
Date: 10/20/2022 12:55 PM
Subject: Sugarloaf amendment

FYI (linked and attached as screenshot):

<https://frederickcountymd.gov/DocumentCenter/View/340794/102522--Amendment-KH>

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Subject: FW: Please vote YES on the compromise Plan/Overlay
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 11:40:31 AM
Attachments: [Sugarloaf Plan.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf Mountain Plan.msg](#)
[image002.png](#)

From: Cherney, Ragen <RCherney@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 11:12 AM
To: Brandt, Kimberly G. <KGBrandt@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Mitchell, Kathy (Legal) <KMitchell2@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: FW: Please vote YES on the compromise Plan/Overlay

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: Monday, October 24, 2022 10:52 AM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Please vote YES on the compromise Plan/Overlay

Hello,

I am hoping that you, the members of the County Council, will take into account the efforts put into creating a plan/overlay that will meet the needs of all, if not the wants of all.

A compromise is defined as a plan that you can live with, even if you did not get everything you want.

Please do not punt this down the road to the next council. You have all worked too hard on this to let it slide.

Please vote YES on this plan, to include the overlay.

Thank you very much, Margy Simpson
2149 Thurston Road 21704
301-520-7113

From: [Giampietro, Michael](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 10:46:27 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

I support the current Sugarloaf plan.

Mike Giampietro
1329 Thurston Rd
Dickerson, MD 20842
301 639-3968

This email may contain privileged and/or confidential information that is intended solely for the use of the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient or entity, you are strictly prohibited from disclosing, copying, distributing or using any of the information contained in the transmission. If you received this communication in error, please contact the sender immediately and destroy the material in its entirety, whether electronic or hard copy. This communication may contain nonpublic personal information about consumers subject to the restrictions of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act and the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. You may not directly or indirectly reuse or disclose such information for any purpose other than to provide the services for which you are receiving the information. There are risks associated with the use of electronic transmission. The sender of this information does not control the method of transmittal or service providers and assumes no duty or obligation for the security, receipt, or third party interception of this transmission.

From: [Mary Carlsson](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf Mountain Plan
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 10:28:56 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Please vote to pass a good-even-if-compromised plan and overlay district for the Sugarloaf Mountain. I am hopeful that are at least four council members who will do this.

Our property adjoins Sugarloaf Mountain Park and we want to preserve this beautiful natural area and the lands that surround it.

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

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Subject: FW: RC Compromise Petition Results
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 9:54:06 AM
Attachments: [petition text.docx](#)
[Comments to RC Petition.docx](#)
[Signatures.docx](#)

From: Susan Trainor <sue.trainor.music@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 9:45 AM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: RC Compromise Petition Results

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]



10/25/22

Dear Council Members

Following last week's County Council meeting, the Sugarloaf Alliance posted on [change.org](https://www.change.org) a new petition in support of the proposed compromise to the Sugarloaf Plan. We are attaching the text of the petition, the signatures, and the comments received.

We would note that within hours of posting the petition, we had dozens of Frederick County signers.

Thank you for your consideration of the compromise introduced by Council Member Hagen. We appreciate Council Member Fitzwater's proposal to delay the Plan vote in order to consider the compromise.

It seems clear that full accommodation has been made for Stronghold's objections. We urge you to accept the compromise and vote for the Sugarloaf Plan and the Overlay. No further resistance can be justified, and no landowner should have a veto over County land use policy.

Sincerely, Sue Trainor, Vice President

Sugarloaf Alliance, Inc.

www.Sugarloaf-Alliance.org

The Sugarloaf Alliance represents over 400 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. Sugarloaf Alliance is a 501(c)(3) organization.



Petition:

PRESERVE the SUGARLOAF PLAN and OVERLAY
to PRESERVE OUR TREASURED LANDSCAPE

We, the undersigned, support the concept of the compromise to the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay that would exclude Resource Conservation (RC) zoning from the Overlay zoning requirements in the Sugarloaf Overlay District, with the caveat that Stronghold, Inc. also accepts this compromise and keeps Sugarloaf Mountain open to the public.

While our hope was that the entire Plan area would be protected to the full extent proposed by the Frederick County Planning Commission, we would prefer the compromise of excluding RC zoning to the option of a no-vote or a vote to remand the Overlay back to the Planning Commission.

In the event that Stronghold refuses to compromise and continues to insist they will close Sugarloaf Mountain if they are included in the Plan or the Overlay District, we urge the Frederick County Council to pass the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay as currently amended. **One landowner should not have veto power over County land use policy.**

Comments on the 10/20/22 Petition re the RC Zone Compromise

Steve Black				10/20/22	"No one private corporation should have a veto right over County Government!!!"
Ingrid Rosencrantz	Frederick	MD	21704	10/20/22	"one land owner should not have veto power over a land use plan that many, many residents, the County Executive, the Planning staff, the Planning Commission, and the County Council spent so much time and effort developing."
Heidi Rosencrantz	Frederick	MD	21704	10/20/22	"I was born here and have lived on the family farm all of my life. The rules were set for subdividing since 1986 I believe. Then we have some frilly billionaire buy up several farms in the area and he wants to change the farms to a sub division or data center (Amazon). Did I mention we have had rules in place about the land use before he came along. Now he is crying and you are entertaining the possibility of utter chaos and devastation to a semi rural area. So many people will be impacted if you do not vote to keep the sugarloaf plan with overlay. The congestion will be catastrophic and it will change the whole demeanor of the neighborhood, my neighborhood. Stop catering to wealth. Keep my neighborhood as a breadths of fresh air. Count the amount of people who want and are for a comprehensive plan with overlay against the few that stand to benefit ie. Mr. Natelli and his real estate cronies or Amazon. If you do not vote to keep and enact the Sugarloaf plan with overlay.....We all lose!!!!!"
Sue Trainor	Frederick	MD	21704	10/20/22	"The Sugarloaf Plan and overlay are critical to keep dense development on the east side of 270 and to protect the area's environment, historical sites, and rural character. If this this compromise is what it takes to get most of the protections, so be it. If Stronghold resists, retract the compromise and pass the Plan and the Overlay!!"
Marney Bruce	Chevy Chase	MD	20815	10/20/22	"I love to visit one of Frederick's pristine natural areas."

Comments on the 10/20/22 Petition re the RC Zone Compromise

Audrey Morris	potomac	MD	20854	10/20/22	"Preserving natural resources in the midst of heavily developed suburban areas is critical."
Sherman Johnson	Middletown	MD	21769	10/20/22	<p>"This is not a "compromise". It gives the Stronghold board everything they wanted -- 6 of their 6 demands. They certainly have no further reason to object to the plan.I am reluctantly signing because unfortunately, this appears to be the only way to get at least four (4) council members to vote for the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay.It is extremely discouraging that there were not at least 5 or 6 votes for the original plan (including the 160+ AG > RC changes) and a fully applicable overlay. It was eminently reasonable.One primary reason given for the string of capitulations is Stronghold's threat to "close the mountain." That is almost certainly bluff and bluster. Here's one reason why:As posted today on the FNP comment section for the article "Frederick County Council postpones final vote on Sugarloaf plan": "...their {Stronghold's} qualification as a non-profit is because they offer their land for public use and benefit. If they stop doing that, they are no more</p> <p>than a landowner (or land holder) like the"</p>
Karlene Rice	Frederick	MD	21704	10/20/22	"This has been my home for over 50 years and it is truly beautiful. Please vote for the compromise. A data center would be so harmful to so many things."
Mary Holmes Dague	Jefferson	MD	17055	10/20/22	"This seems like a fair compromise for the present. Stronghold is the owner of the mountain and I hope wants to continue to be a good neighbor."

Comments on the 10/20/22 Petition re the RC Zone Compromise

Eric Tapp	Urbana	MD	21710	10/20/22	"I hope to be able to raise my family in the setting that I purchased my home in. In an area where they can appreciate the nature, wildlife and clean air this area offers us and all who visit it."
caroline taylor	poolesville	MD	20837	10/21/22	"Protecting this biodiverse and productive area will be key to our regional resilience."
kaela g	Pasadena	MD	21122	10/21/22	"TREES ARE FRIENDS"
M E Menke	Barnesville	MD	20838	10/23/22	"We want the land use plan to pass. Today we give a bow to the Stronghold Foundation for all their past generosity to the public. Thank you Mr. Strong. Yet the current Board of the Foundation seems not to know how to proceed in keeping their honored place of high regard in the area. Sugarloaf Mountain is "property", we know that; but even more importantly, it is environment, history, it is a unique site of love and honor and treasure that all of us feel some responsibility for keeping as a communal treasure."
Cynthia Simon	Bethesda	MD	20814	10/23/22	"This issue is larger than any of us and any single property owner. The unique ecological and recreational value of the asset demands public access. How much has Stronghold received in public tax benefits since creation of the trust, by the way?"
Karen Cannon	Frederick	MD	21701	10/24/22	"The Sugarloaf area of Frederick County is a biodiversity treasure that must be protected from development."
Ann Andrex	Union Bridge	MD	21791	10/24/22	"This is the time to demonstrate the power of collaboration and compromise. Pass this now or be doomed to getting nowhere and letting big money (Natelli) WIN. That is not acceptable."
Mary Mitchell	Frederick	MD	21703	10/24/22	"I prefer this option to a no vote, or to shutting down the beautiful mountain to the public. I want to ensure this area stays open and is available to the public. One person should not make this decision."

Comments on the 10/20/22 Petition re the RC Zone Compromise

Catherine Lawhon	Frederick	MD	21701	10/24/22	"Preservation is important for Frederick county's economic health. Keep our rural areas scenic and tourism helps build a better economy for all."
					"The compromise on the Sugarloaf Management Plan, the Overlay, and the private park designation is reasonable. It is entirely necessary at this point in time to prevent irreversible development of the Sugarloaf area into wall to wall strip malls, housing tracts, and industrial scale development. All of Stronghold Corporation's demands have been met. It is essential for the Frederick County Council to pass this compromise to protect for future generations the natural, environmental, historical, and cultural values of the greater Sugarloaf area that is so treasured by the public. An overwhelming majority of Frederick County citizens support this compromise Sugarloaf management plan and Overlay. We citizens of Frederick County will watch how the County Council votes, and we will vote in November accordingly!"
David Reeves	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/24/22
					"I support the compromise plan and I strongly urge our County Council to vote to approve it. So much hard work has brought us to this point. Let's get it done!"
Anne Garrett	Frederick	MD	21702	US	10/24/22
					"Sugarloaf is a regional treasure. The elected officials of Frederick have a duty to protect it!"
Dolores milmoe	poolesville	MD	20837	US	10/24/22
Diana Conway	Alexandria	MD	71302	US	"Once it's gone, it's gone. Let's not blow this."

Comments on the 10/20/22 Petition re the RC Zone Compromise

10/24/22

"I respect the good, thoughtful work of the Planning Commission and the compromises that council members McKay and Hagan have articulated so well. This is the right thing to do."

Susan Lyons Frederick MD 21704 US

10/24/22

"I support the compromise. Please protect the Sugarloaf Mt treasured landscape management plan. Frederick, MD"

Karen Lynch Vergennes VT 5491 US

10/25/22

Signatures to the 10/20/22 Petition re the RC Zone Compromise

Courtney Carnell	Walkersville	MD	21793	US	10/21/22
Pam Burke	Walkersville	MD	21793	US	10/24/22
Ann Andrex	Union Bridge	MD	21791	US	10/24/22
Betsy Smith	Frederick	MD	21774	US	10/24/22
Virginia Fisher	New Market	MD	21774	US	10/24/22
Sherman Johnson	Middletown	MD	21769	US	10/20/22
Stephen Cook	Middletown	MD	21769	US	10/20/22
Elizabeth Bauer	Middletown	MD	21769	US	10/23/22
Ann Payne	Middletown	MD	21769	US	10/24/22
Karen Russell	Knoxville	MD	21758	US	10/20/22
Carol Ahlum	Jefferson	MD	21755	US	10/21/22
Elizabeth Orr	Burkittsville	MD	21718	US	10/24/22
Steve Black	ADAMSTOWN	MD	21710	US	10/20/22
Eric Tapp	Urbana	MD	21710	US	10/20/22
Jennifer Rinehart	ADAMSTOWN	MD	21710	US	10/24/22
Sugarloaf Alliance	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
Nicholas Carrera	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
Maureen Heavner	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
David Reeves	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
Gary and Patti					
Thuro	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
Ingrid Rosencrantz	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
Mary Perry	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
Jaden Morgan	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
Heidi Rosencrantz	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
Karla Stoner	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
Gretchen					
Rosencrantz	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
Scot Madill	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
Sue Trainor	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
barbara luchsinger	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
Leslie Novotny	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
Karlene Rice	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/20/22
Christina Tapp	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/21/22
Tracy Ochs	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/21/22
Johanna Springston	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/21/22
Carol waldmann	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/21/22
Margy Simpson	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/21/22
Faith Humerick	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/21/22
Craig Shaffer	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/21/22

Signatures to the 10/20/22 Petition re the RC Zone Compromise

Ed Rudisill	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/22/22
Melissa Shaffer	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/23/22
Alexandra Carrera	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/24/22
john Lyons	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/24/22
Jill Reeves	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/24/22
Kevin Davey	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/24/22
Susan Lyons	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/24/22
Gracie Lee	Frederick	MD	21704	US	10/25/22
Elizabeth Law	Frederick	MD	21703	US	10/24/22
Will Bureau	Frederick	MD	21703	US	10/24/22
Mary Mitchell	Frederick	MD	21703	US	10/24/22
Robert Hanson	Frederick	MD	21703	US	10/25/22
Kirsten Agrella	Frederick	MD	21702	US	10/21/22
edwin Grayzeck	Frederick	MD	21702	US	10/23/22
Anne Garrett	Frederick	MD	21702	US	10/24/22
Maureen Grayzeck	Frederick	MD	21702	US	10/24/22
Kevin Tapp	Frederick	MD	21701	US	10/20/22
Darlene Bucciero	Frederick	MD	21701	US	10/21/22
Kate Wilson	Frederick	MD	21701	US	10/24/22
Karen Cannon	Frederick	MD	21701	US	10/24/22
Jan Knox	Frederick	MD	21701	US	10/24/22
Catherine Lawhon	Frederick	MD	21701	US	10/24/22
Katherine Jones	Frederick	MD	21701	US	10/24/22
Mary Waldhorn	Frederick	MD	21701	US	10/24/22
Mike Lynch	Frederick	MD	21701	US	10/25/22
Jose Maldonado	Annapolis	MD	21404	US	10/21/22
James Long	Westminster	MD	21157	US	10/20/22
Michael Tapp	Severn	MD	21144	US	10/21/22
Pam Tapp	Severn	MD	21144	US	10/22/22
kaela g	Pasadena	MD	21122	US	10/21/22
Darien Field	Silver Spring		20902	US	10/24/22
Jason Godfroy	Gaithersburg	MD	20882	US	10/20/22
Marcia Nass	Gaithersburg	MD	20879	US	10/24/22
Andy Benson	Germantown		20876	US	10/21/22
Neeka Maghboul	Clarksburg		20876	US	10/24/22
Robert Goldberg	Germantown	MD	20874	US	10/21/22
Audrey Morris	potomac	MD	20854	US	10/20/22
Ali Bill	Potomac	MD	20854	US	10/24/22
Diana Conway	Potomac	MD	20854	US	10/24/22
Beverly Thoms	Dickerson	MD	20842	US	10/20/22

Signatures to the 10/20/22 Petition re the RC Zone Compromise

Penelope McCrea	Dickerson	MD	20842	US	10/24/22
Laura Van Etten	Dickerson	MD	20842	US	10/24/22
M E Menke	Barnesville	MD	20838	US	10/23/22
Lauren Neisser	Barnesville	MD	20838	US	10/24/22
caroline taylor	poolesville	MD	20837	US	10/21/22
Dolores milmo	poolesville	MD	20837	US	10/24/22
Julie Halstead	Poolesville	MD	20837	US	10/24/22
Kathy Bassett	Poolesville	MD	20837	US	10/24/22
Alicia Thomas	Poolesville	MD	20837	US	10/25/22
Marney Bruce	Chevy Chase	MD	20815	US	10/20/22
Patrick Rowse	Bethesda	MD	20814	US	10/20/22
Cynthia Simon	Bethesda	MD	20814	US	10/23/22
	Riverdale				
Kyle Rosencrantz	Park	MD	20737	US	10/21/22
Pandora Gunsallus	Canonsburg	PA	15317	US	10/21/22
James Gunsallus	Canonsburg	PA	15317	US	10/21/22
Ivora Rosencrantz	Ijamsville	MD	11754	US	10/20/22
Gaby Dzin	Forest Hills		11375	US	10/20/22
Lydia Smyth	Brooklyn		11226	US	10/24/22
Monise Jules	Brooklyn		11206	US	10/24/22
Alison Mandel	Port Washington		11050	US	10/24/22
Brian Tehrani	Binghamton		11021	US	10/24/22
Christopher Tom	Pleasantville		10570	US	10/24/22
Atousa Yazdani	New York		10118	US	10/20/22
Shirin Khomand	New York		10118	US	10/20/22
اخوان اخوان	New York		10118	US	10/20/22
Melika Del	New York		10118	US	10/20/22
Elizabeth Pollack	New York		10032	US	10/24/22
Abby Schwartz	New york		10016	US	10/24/22
Bahar Nemati	New York		10013	US	10/24/22
محسن سخنوری	New York		10011	US	10/24/22
Kelly Klein	New York		10011	US	10/24/22
Vali Fasaie	New York		10011	US	10/24/22
rezvan rezaee	New York		10004	US	10/20/22
Ashley Rodriguez	New York		10003	US	10/24/22
Shahrazad Sale	Cedar Knolls		7927	US	10/20/22
M Mohamadi	Matawan		7747	US	10/24/22
Susan Menaker	Westfield	NJ	7090	US	10/24/22
Siavash Karimpour	North Bergen		7047	US	10/24/22
Samara Holley	Waterford		6385	US	10/24/22

Signatures to the 10/20/22 Petition re the RC Zone Compromise

Alyson Pliska	Farmington		6032	US	10/24/22
Ali Khavi	Vermont		5819	US	10/20/22
Karen Lynch	Vergennes	VT	5491	US	10/25/22
Don Donaldson	Brisbane		4000	US	10/24/22
Julia Cardoza	East Taunton		2718	US	10/24/22
hol iday	triple city		2314	US	10/24/22
Joshua Curphey	Peterborough		PE7	US	10/20/22
			10036-		
Ezra Cohen	New York		3041	US	10/20/22
Drew Ronning	Olympia		98502	US	10/20/22
Ellie Rose	Seattle	WA	98103	US	10/25/22
Eric Bowles	Covington		98042	US	10/24/22
Elahe Abtahi	Beaverton		97007	US	10/20/22
Victor Young	Honolulu		96817	US	10/24/22
Kendal Warren	APO		96555	US	10/20/22
Linda Freeman	Yuba City		95991	US	10/20/22
Hessam Tiri	Fremont		94539	US	10/20/22
Siavash Motlagh	Concord		94521	US	10/20/22
Anika Korpenfelt	Brentwood		94513	US	10/20/22
Ahoura Kaviani	San Francisco		94124	US	10/20/22
Ariana Genato	Pacifica		94044	US	10/24/22
Cindy Perez	Bakersfield		93307	US	10/20/22
Guadalupe Garcia	Riverside		92505	US	10/24/22
mounirh shahbazi	San Diego		92129	US	10/20/22
Nazila Sorkh	San Diego		92128	US	10/20/22
Sam Janami	Carlsbad		92011	US	10/24/22
rosemary torossian	Sherman Oaks		91423	US	10/24/22
Ghazal Bahrami Asl	Los Angeles		91356	US	10/20/22
baharak behrad	Long Beach		90802	US	10/24/22
Brian Dijker	Malibu	CA	90265	US	10/24/22
Mahshad Inanlou	Los Angeles		90017	US	10/20/22
Parastesh Hoseini	Los Angeles		90017	US	10/24/22
Mohammad					
Hosseini	Los Angeles		90007	US	10/20/22
Shannon Hughes	Tucson		85719	US	10/24/22
Yolanda Stanback	Glendale		85308	US	10/24/22
Andrew Briggs	Salt Lake City		84123	US	10/20/22
Tycen Squire	Roosevelt		84066	US	10/20/22
hayden johnsen	Rathdrum		83858	US	10/24/22
Colton Meikle	Boise		83704	US	10/20/22

Signatures to the 10/20/22 Petition re the RC Zone Compromise

Darian Martin	Colorado Springs	80918	US	10/24/22
Abena Kyeremeh	Aurora	80013	US	10/24/22
Jayden Nguyen	Leander	78641	US	10/20/22
Ricardo Maldonado	San Antonio	78254	US	10/24/22
Daniel Cruz	San Antonio	78240	US	10/20/22
Jennifer Ramirez	San Antonio	78230	US	10/20/22
Adam Kaluba	Burleson	76028	US	10/24/22
hannah chinn	Arlington	76006	US	10/24/22
Kim Gh	Dallas	75270	US	10/20/22
fatem M	Dallas	75270	US	10/20/22
Hosseini Boyrati	Dallas	75247	US	10/20/22
Jada Samuels	Dallas	75243	US	10/24/22
chain Stein	Dallas	75233	US	10/20/22
ima Myers	Dallas	75206	US	10/20/22
Fatemeh Borji	Dallas	75201	US	10/20/22
Massa Alsabbagh	Garland	75040	US	10/20/22
Jaiden Johnson	Little Rock	72210	US	10/24/22
Yvonne Deloney	Little Rock	72204	US	10/20/22
Hudson Williams	Grand Island	68803	US	10/20/22
Eli Albin	Saint Joseph	64505	US	10/20/22
Laya Lale	Chicago	60616	US	10/20/22
Moslem Hajavi	Chicago	60616	US	10/24/22
Zoya Tamar	Chicago	60616	US	10/24/22
Ami B	Chicago	60602	US	10/24/22
Halle Berliant	Deerfield	60015	US	10/24/22
pedi S	Elk Grove Village	60007	US	10/20/22
OmidNemo OM	Sioux Falls	57104	US	10/24/22
Angelyna Jurado	Cologne	55322	US	10/24/22
Koro Sensei	Coopersville	49404	US	10/20/22
Rose Davis	Royal Oak	48073	US	10/20/22
Savannah Darden	Evansville	47722	US	10/20/22
Diana beth	griffith	46319	US	10/20/22
kasey meadows	Fishers	46038	US	10/24/22
Michael Samons	Wapakoneta	45895	US	10/24/22
Wesley Slone	Wheelersburg	45694	US	10/24/22
Margaret Black	Mansfield	44906	US	10/20/22
John Drevon	East Canton	44730	US	10/24/22
Hannah Mick	Kent	44243	US	10/24/22
Suzanne Schramm	Bluff City	37618	US	10/20/22
Autumn Cox	Decatur	37322	US	10/20/22

Signatures to the 10/20/22 Petition re the RC Zone Compromise

Rmesh Karimi					
Nassab	Tuscaloosa		35401	US	10/20/22
hi hi	Sarasota		34233	US	10/20/22
Sayna Movahedi	Tampa		33637	US	10/20/22
Jordan Bryan	Riverview		33578	US	10/24/22
shawn masur	davie		33328	US	10/24/22
	Pompano				
Carlos Soares	Beach	FL	33064	US	10/24/22
Sebastian Salas	Orlando		32824	US	10/24/22
Lorenzo Campos	Orlando		32801	US	10/24/22
Devon Robison	Altamonte Springs		32714	US	10/24/22
Donya Mehri	Atlanta		30318	US	10/24/22
Alireza Haidarzadeh	Atlanta		30303	US	10/20/22
سيد حسين عاشق	Atlanta	GA	30301	US	10/20/22
Samane Taheri	Atlanta		30301	US	10/20/22
Pedro Valencia	Riverdale		30274	US	10/24/22
m.reza صالحی	Duluth		30097	US	10/24/22
the one	Alpharetta		30005	US	10/24/22
Heather Sargent	Myrtle Beach		29588	US	10/20/22
Rob Tapp	Hampstead	NC	28443	US	10/20/22
Teresa Tapp	Hampstead	NC	28443	US	10/20/22
Eric Adamson	Greensboro	NC	27408	US	10/24/22
Paul Anderson	Graham		27253	US	10/24/22
Azita					
Mohammadvali	Richmond		23282	US	10/20/22

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Subject: Fwd: Sugarloaf Alliance Position on Compromise
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 11:28:11 AM
Attachments: [FCCLetteronCompromise102522.pdf](#)

From: Steve Black <steveblack2313@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 10:03:13 AM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Sugarloaf Alliance Position on Compromise

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Please see the attached Statement from the Sugarloaf Alliance concerning the proposed compromise and final vote on the Sugarloaf Plan.

Thank you,

Steve Black
President
Sugarloaf Alliance



October 25, 2022

To Frederick County Council Members:

The Council's Compromise and the Final Plan Votes

The Sugarloaf Alliance would like to thank the Council Members for supporting the I-270 boundary. We also appreciate the many thoughtful amendments made to the plan during the Council's review. Removing the egregious language on page 54 of the Planning Commission draft was an important step.

We note that proponents of the Plan's goals have already compromised significantly with elimination of the rezoning of steep slopes from AG to RC.

While our hope was that the entire Plan area would be protected to the full extent proposed, ***we recognize the need for the compromise*** of excluding RC zoned parcels from the Overlay.

The suggestion that either the Plan or Overlay bill could be rolled to the next Council or remanded to the Planning Commission is wholly unacceptable. Such a course of action flies in the face of the Livable Frederick process, the almost three years of staff work, the efforts of the Planning Commission and the expressed desires of thousands of citizens.

In the event that Stronghold refuses to compromise and continues to insist it will close Sugarloaf Mountain to the public, we urge the Council to pass the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay as currently amended. ***One landowner should not have veto power over County land use policy.***

Sincerely,

Sugarloaf Alliance

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Subject: FW: Voicemail for County Council from Public Input
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 9:59:07 AM
Attachments: [Please support the compromise to the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf Plan.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf Vote Yea.msg](#)
[Save our rural legacy.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf Mt Treasured Landscape Plan and Zoning Overlay.msg](#)
[Vote YES to support the Compromise Sugarloaf Mountain Plan Overlay and Private Park Designation.msg](#)
[Please vote to pass the compromise Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay Bill.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf plan.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf and Wildlife Corridors.msg](#)
[Treasured Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay.msg](#)
[Please Compromise and Pass the Plan and Overlay for Sugarloaf.msg](#)
[Please Compromise and Pass the Plan and Overlay for Sugarloaf.msg](#)

From: Luna, Nancy <NLuna@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 8:23 AM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Cc: County Council Staff <CountyCouncilStaff@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Voicemail for County Council from Public Input

From: +13014556315

Message Transcription: Yes. Thank you for being open to comments. This is Ellen Gordon. I feel that a Sugarloaf Mountain has been such a press resource all of my life and my children's life, and when my parents were here, we took them there and I, I hope very much that you will act to protect public access to Sugarloaf Mountain. It's, it's just, it's so precious and, and I hope you can do all you can to, to maintain this, this magnificent resource. Thank you very much for taking comments. Thank.

[Audio File](#)

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

From: [Lisa Orr](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Please support the compromise to the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 6:13:23 PM
Importance: High

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council Members,

First I want to thank you for supporting the I-270 boundary and for removing the page 54 invitation to reopen the plan.

Second, I am writing to urge you to **support the compromise to the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay that would exclude Resource Conservation (RC) zoning from the Overlay zoning requirements in the Sugarloaf Overlay District**, with the caveat that Stronghold, Inc. also accepts this compromise and keeps Sugarloaf Mountain open to the public. The Plan's proponents already compromised significantly when the Council eliminated the rezoning of steep slopes from Ag to RC. While my hope was that the entire Plan area would be protected to the full extent proposed, I prefer the compromise of excluding RC zoning to the option of a no-vote or a vote to remand the Overlay back to the Planning Commission. In the event that Stronghold refuses to compromise and continues to insist they will close Sugarloaf Mountain, I urge the Council to pass the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay as currently amended.

Thank you for all the hard work and time you have put into this important planning issue.
Lisa Orr

Lisa Orr

Burkittsville, MD 21718
240.529.3177
edeckerorr@comcast.net

From: lveamazon@aol.com
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 5:48:28 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Councilmembers:

I live just south of Sugarloaf Mountain on Mouth of Monocacy Road in Montgomery County. I go to Frederick County all the time for all my shopping and banking, as I am closer to you than to Germantown or other Montgomery County locations.

In the event that Stronghold refuses to compromise and continues to insist they will close Sugarloaf Mountain if they are included in the Plan or the Overlay District, I urge the Frederick County Council to pass the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay as currently amended. One landowner should not have veto power over County land use policy.

I hope the entire Plan area will be protected to the full extent proposed by the Frederick County Planning Commission, however, I would prefer the compromise of excluding RC zoning to the option of a no-vote or a vote to remand the Overlay back to the Planning Commission.

Sincerely,

Laura Van Etten
19735 Mouth of Monocacy Road
Dickerson, MD 20842

From: [Mary Dague](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf Vote Yea
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 5:36:13 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

October 19, 2022 is a night you will never forget as you vote on the fate of Sugarloaf. Almost two years of discussion have informed you of all the facts you need to consider. Perhaps we don't know Strong's intentions, but let's let them know ours.

Have you thought about the citizens who have memories they cherish of hikes, fishing, including trout fishing in pristine water, weddings at Strong mansion? If a referendum were taken, saving Sugarloaf would win overwhelmingly.

Some of you will be on the ballot Election Day. A frequently heard expression of the public is that "Council never listens to us." The allegation may be unfair, but the sentiment prevails. Please listen this time: The present proposal includes many changes you have voted to try to preserve the area. Thank you for your flexibility. One more night to tap into that forward thinking for your constituents. Please vote for the people; vote yea for Sugarloaf Mountain.

From: [margaret](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Save our rural legacy
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 4:49:19 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council members,

Please have the courage to save the land around Sugarloaf Mountain from the threat of development. Once lost to development, the natural beauty of this land will be gone forever. Voting for preservation is simply the right thing to do because nature is sacred. If we do not respect and preserve the natural world, we forfeit meeting the spiritual needs of people now and the people in generations to come.

Do you want to meet the needs of developers or do you want to meet the needs of the community at large now and in the future?

Consider carefully,
Margaret Kelley

Sent from my iPad

From: [Elizabeth Law](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf Mt Treasured Landscape Plan and Zoning Overlay
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 3:38:16 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

President MC Keegan-Ayer and County Council Members,

Thank you for persevering through this frustrating process to preserve the Sugarloaf Mt area for generations to come.

Thank you for supporting the I-270 boundary and for removing the page 54 invitation to reopen the Plan.

Thank you, Council Member McKay, for all your work to bring the parties together to preserve this land. I hope your patience and negotiating skills will be rewarded.

Thank you to Council Member Fitzwater for making the motion to consider a further amendment to save the Plan and to Council Member Hagen for seconding the motion.

Thank you, Council Member Hagen, for proposing a compromise amendment that may yet save the overall Plan.

In addition to the significant compromise of rezoning steep slopes from Ag to RC, I hope the compromise of excluding RC zoning will result in the Council voting to approve the Sugarloaf Mt. Treasured Landscape Plan and the Overlay Zoning today.

No one outside of the family can know the true intentions of the Stronghold heirs. Being a family, they may have their own internal conflicts.

In any case, this Treasured Landscape Plan with the addition of the Hagen Amendment and the Zoning Overlay will ensure crucial elements of the Plan are preserved.

You've heard what I said about stormwater management, let's consider the importance of preserving agriculture. The west is going through a 22-year draught. The midwest corn belt is having increasingly frequent droughts, including destroying this year's corn crops. The Mississippi River may drop so low that navigation is halted indefinitely.

Frederick County is blessed by being in a sweet spot for climate. With each of these agricultural catastrophes elsewhere, our agricultural land is ever more precious – not for housing but to produce food to feed us.

Please work together to preserve this valuable asset.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Law,

1758 Wheyfield Drive

Frederick, MD 21701

From: [David Reeves](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Vote YES to support the Compromise Sugarloaf Mountain Plan, Overlay, and Private Park Designation
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 2:38:23 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

The compromise on the Sugarloaf Management Plan, the Overlay, and the private park designation is reasonable. It is entirely necessary at this point in time to prevent irreversible development of the Sugarloaf area into wall-to-wall strip malls, housing tracts, and industrial scale development. All of Stronghold Corporation's demands have been met. It is essential for the Frederick County Council to pass this compromise to protect for future generations the natural, environmental, historical, and cultural values of the greater Sugarloaf area that is so treasured by the public. An overwhelming majority of Frederick County citizens support this compromise Sugarloaf management plan, Overlay, and Private Park Designation. We citizens of Frederick County will watch how the County Council votes, and we will vote in November accordingly!

Sincerely,
Dave Reeves
9265 Starlight Mews N
Frederick, MD 21704

From: [Sherry Stephenson](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Please vote to pass the compromise Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay Bill
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 1:56:14 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Frederick County Council Members;

Following upon my message to each of you individually last week, **I am writing before the vote tomorrow to urge you to please act positively to pass the compromise Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay Bill.** This is the last opportunity to act on this important piece of legislation before your term will end.

Please act as responsible stewards for the preservation of our beautiful region, to better protect the nearly 20,000 acres of forests and streams, farms and rural communities of this special part of Frederick County, which includes the landmark Sugarloaf Mountain area.

It is the right thing to do for the present, and for the future, to act to protect and preserve the beautiful gift that nature has bestowed on this region before it is irretrievably lost.

PLEASE VOTE TO APPROVE THE SUGARLOAF TREASURED LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND THE CONSERVATION-ORIENTED OVERLAY DISTRICT.

Sherry Stephenson
1320 Linthicum Road
Dickerson, Maryland 20842

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2022/10/24/sugarloaf-mountain-frederick-council-vote/>

Everyone loves Sugarloaf Mountain. The fight for its future is still ugly.


By [Kyle Swenson](#)
October 24, 2022

TEXT: After more than two years of planning, late-night meetings and public squabbles, the future of one of Maryland's most unusual natural landscapes hangs in the balance ahead of a public meeting this week.

But both land conservation groups and local public officials say the latest iteration of a plan for Sugarloaf Mountain that will land Tuesday before the Frederick County Council is less the product of back-and-forth than the result of threats hurled by park ownership.

Stronghold, Inc., the nonprofit entity that owns the popular hiking and birdwatching destination about 30 miles from the District, has long opposed aspects of a county conservation plan for the region. That opposition boiled over in recent months into threats from Stronghold's lawyers to end public access to the park.

Late last week, legislation was submitted to the council that largely bends to the owner's wishes. For some local activists, the new developments are a capitulation to the owner's "extortion."

"We will not view it as a total loss at all," said Steve Findlay, president of the Sugarloaf Citizens' Association, a community group deep in the trenches of the public debate. "But we cannot support it."

The latest version of the plan will be the council's last shot before the November election could push a new group of people onto the council.

"The bottom line was that even after a number of compromises that we made to some of Stronghold's concerns, they were still threatening to close the mountain," said Kai Hagen, an at-large member of the council.

The Sugarloaf debate also hints at troubling signs for future development across the Washington area, as more exurban grasslands and forests fall in the crosshairs of developers who want to build residential and shopping areas.

Sugarloaf's future is being fought out by groups who all acknowledge the environmental importance of the region. But they have different ideas of how that legacy is best protected, whether by government oversight or private stewardship.

A representative for Stronghold did not reply to multiple requests for comment.

Sugarloaf Mountain is unique in that it is private land for public use. The area's original owner was Gordon Strong, a wealthy patent attorney. He purchased the area to open to the public for hiking, birdwatching and other outdoor activities. Following his 1954 death, his will created Stronghold to maintain the area for the public at no cost to visitors. The area today includes more than 500 species of plants, high-quality waters and parts of a Civil War battlefield.

But over the past decade or so, local residents, conservationists and others repeatedly have had to fight off nearby land use projects that could have disturbed the nearby wilderness, including a gun range and megachurch. As part of a larger countywide planning process, Frederick planning officials began putting together what would become the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

"One of the stated reasons for the plan was extra protection for these landscapes to avoid these complete knockdown, drag-out fights every couple of years," said Steven Black, a Frederick County farmer and president of the Sugarloaf Alliance, a nonprofit community group involved in past and current public debates over the land. According to Black, the pressure to develop more land along Interstate 270 is being acutely felt in the region around Sugarloaf Mountain.

"If you don't take public action through land planning and zoning action to preserve the ground, you risk that the development pressure will eclipse the wishes of the people on the ground," he said.

As part of the process for putting together a plan that would map out the future acceptable uses for the region, the county set up a 16-member advisory

board that met seven times between early 2020 and July 2021. Stronghold had three seats on the board.

“We’ve had many, many meetings with Stronghold and their attorneys,” said Tim Goodfellow, the lead county planner on the project. “They have been involved intimately from day one.”

However the final management plan stretches well beyond the Sugarloaf Mountain area to include nearly 20,000 surrounding acres. The plan would restrict certain uses that could impact natural resources or obstruct views. The legal mechanism for implementing the plan would be the council’s passage of an overlay district for the covered area. That would rezone parts of the 20,000 acres, bringing consistent standards for development and banning uses such as rodeos and shooting ranges.

But when the Sugarloaf plan got to the council this October, the park’s owners bristled, saying they would be “unnecessarily restricted” by the conditions of the overlay. On Oct. 3, council members rejected legislation that would have exempted Stronghold’s property from the plan and overlay.

An attorney for Stronghold addressed the council with a stark ultimatum.

“If the Sugarloaf plan as presented for public hearing on Oct. 11, today passes, Stronghold will cease allowing general public access to Sugarloaf Mountain, a privately owned mountain, to allow Stronghold, my client, time to evaluate the effects of the plan on its operations,” attorney Noel Manalo told the council. He added that Stronghold representatives had been in touch with local law enforcement about where best to place signs reading “No trespassing.”

“Stronghold remains committed to its mission of the preservation of the natural resources of Sugarloaf Mountain,” Manalo continued. “We have successfully fulfilled this mission consistent with Gordon Strong’s intent for many decades without help from Frederick County government.”

Walling off the park from public access — was it a bluff or real possibility? Both council members and land conservation groups say they were not sure whether Stronghold was negotiating or serious.

To address the owners’ concerns, the council proposed a new zoning category that would designate the Stronghold acres a “private park.” This new zoning would allow Stronghold to add features such as pavilions, gift shops, and concessions stands.

The park’s owners, however, did not indicate they approved the plan going into the council’s Oct. 18 meeting, where the comprehensive plan, as well as the overlay and private park exemption, were on the agenda. According to council members and local activists, no one knew what Stronghold wanted.

“They have been bad-faith actors in our view in this process,” said Findlay of the Sugarloaf Citizens’ Association. “They have not been transparent about what they want or what their interests are in the future. The only thing they have been transparent about is the threat.”

At the Oct. 18 meeting, after hearing hours of impassioned commentary from locals that included tears, an a-Cappella rendition of a Woody Guthrie song, and no statement from the owner’s representatives, the council voted to push the Sugarloaf votes back a week, with Hagen announcing the seven-member body did not have the votes needed to pass the comprehensive plan and the overlay and private park exemption.

Later that week, Hagen released an update of the plan. In that version, the Sugarloaf Mountain’s area would be cut out from the larger overlay zone. Still, as Hagen pointed out, the Stronghold acres are already protected by the county’s most restrictive zoning category, known as resource conservation.

But after getting ostensibly what they want, Sugarloaf Mountain’s owners have yet to publicly endorse the compromise, which will be voted on at the Frederick County Council meeting on Tuesday.

“Their attorney has noted that the county has addressed all the specific issues originally raised by Stronghold,” Hagen said Sunday. “They are still conferring among themselves, it seems. They have not issued any public statements.”

Hagen added that he is “hopeful” that the plan up for consideration will satisfy everyone.

Many of those involved, however, just seemed exhausted with the process — a saga that had started with local residents, politicians and the mountain’s owners agreeing to work toward the future protection of a beloved area, and that ended with public threats and anger.

“We recognize the reality of needing this compromise to happen to make the larger plan and overlay happen,” said Black of the Sugarloaf Alliance. “So we support this. We recognize having no plan is worse.”

From: [Comcast Email](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf plan
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 1:26:42 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Please vote to approve the

Plan as now constituted w its compromised amendments. It's not perfect, but it is good enough, as more eloquently stated by Kai Hagen in the FNP today.

What possible good can come if your NOT supporting this now, except that the big money operators (Natelli and their attorneys and the politicians who mollycoddle them) will profit in the future and the little people (Me for one) will lose out?

From Ann Andrex

From: [Karen Russell](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf and Wildlife Corridors
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 1:25:41 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Councilmembers:

Wildlife corridors are a widely accepted strategy for facilitating the movement of both plants and animals toward the Appalachians (a globally recognized migration corridor), as climate change shifts habitats toward the poles. They also address the global loss of biodiversity, which has reached a critical point, by connecting habitat that has been fragmented by human development. The C&O Canal National Park is being studied as a wildlife corridor. The adjacent Sugarloaf area is a safe haven for plants and animals (migrating toward the Appalachians or not) because of its size and the fact that most of it has not suffered from human encroachment.

I don't understand why all seven of you aren't in favor of the Sugarloaf plan and overlay. However, I hope that at least 4 of you will vote to approve tomorrow.

Ms. Karen J. Russell
510 E. Mountain Rd.
Knoxville, MD 21758
301-401-2463

From: [Sasha Carrera](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Treasured Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 1:24:15 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear County Council,

First of all, thank you for preserving the I-270 boundary for this proposed plan and for removing the invitation to reopen it.

Clearly we all want this to work, as evidenced by the compromises already agreed to on the issue of steep slopes being rezoned from RC to Ag. Similarly, the compromise to exclude Stronghold from the Overlay requirements would be preferable to yet more delays, reconsiderations and reconfigurations. Historically and in keeping with their mission, the Webster family, Stronghold's trustees, have proven themselves committed to preserving and conserving this area in accordance with Gordon's Strong's will.

However, as today's Washington Post article suggested, Stronghold's threat to close if they don't get their way amounts to extortion and makes no sense since they (the Websters, Stronghold's trustees) are getting everything they wanted from the plan to begin with. I don't need to remind you that in a Democracy, the will of the people is paramount. We have spoken and while it's a shame that the one landowner has so far not gotten on board with the hundreds of us who support this plan, in this country, we say "the majority wins."

Thank you for your stewardship,
Alexandra Carrera, Thurston Rd.

Sasha Carrera



<https://resumes.actorsaccess.com/sashacarrera>
sasha.carrera@gmail.com
213.926.3577

*Catch me as Petra Antonelli, series regular.
Season 3 coming soon!*

<https://www.youtube.com/thespianseries>

From: katielawhon@gmail.com
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Please Compromise and Pass the Plan and Overlay for Sugarloaf
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 1:01:57 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council President and Members:

Thank you Council for supporting the I-270 boundary for the Sugarloaf Plan, and for removing the page 54 invitation to reopen the Plan.

I've attended several meetings and commented several times to you in writing. Together with other supporters of the plan we have already compromised significantly when the change was made to eliminate the rezoning of steep slopes from Ag to RC.

I had hoped the entire Plan area would be protected to the full extent proposed, but at this point I ask you to compromise by excluding RC zoning for Stronghold.

In Stronghold refuses to accept this compromise and continues to insist they will close Sugarloaf Mountain, I urge you to pass the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay as currently amended.

One landowner should not have veto power over County land use policy.

Sincerely,

Catherine Lawhon
242 Dill Avenue
Frederick MD
240/409-0728

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf Overlay Amendment 17 comments
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 1:03:12 PM
Attachments: [102522---Amendment-KH.pdf](#)
[Public perception for recusal please support vote yes to adopt the Sugarloaf Plan.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf Alliance Position on Compromise.msg](#)

From: Abigail Brown <abigail.mommybrown@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 10:44 AM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Sugarloaf Overlay Amendment 17 comments

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear County Council Members,

If this amendment is supported, and the three properties listed in this amendment are excluded from the overlay, I am asking you to again consider removing PGC from the proposed zoning list (because if it's NOT under the overlay, it makes sense to exclude it from a vote at this time) and allow this property to go back to the planning commission to move through a proposed rezoning process as it's own issue, not lost in the weeds of the Overlay conversation as a whole!!

Thank you,
Abigail Brown
8564 Fingerboard rd

Amendment:

"The map on page 65 will be replaced with the map below, reflecting application of the Sugarloaf Rural Heritage Overlay to all properties, except those zoned RC, within the Sugarloaf Planning area. The following three properties, which were previously removed from, or not included in, the Overlay remain excluded from the Overlay: 8710 Fingerboard Road (Tax ID 07-200862), 14 8709 Fingerboard Road (Tax ID 07-195044), and 3051 Thurston Road (Tax ID 07-214863)."

<https://frederickcountymd.gov/DocumentCenter/View/340794/102522---Amendment-KH>

From: smordensky@aol.com
To: [Council Members](#); [Gardner, Jan](#)
Cc: smordensky@aol.com; hayduke2.dh@gmail.com; joenemo422@gmail.com; jek@fklaw.org; jkferrant@aol.com; stan.mordensky@gmail.com; samordensky@gmail.com; kmordensky@gmail.com; bbrown3053@aol.com; emahajan47@gmail.com; traildave@hotmail.com; phil.michelle@gmail.com; brian_s_shilling@mcpsmd.org
Subject: Public perception for recusal & please support & vote yes to adopt the Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 10:41:52 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Good morning County Council & County Executive,

I strongly urge this council to adopt the Sugarloaf Plan as currently written. I am open to appealing Stronghold but that is not as important as passing this current & fair to all, Sugarloaf Plan.

I do not want it remanded back to the FC Planning & Zoning Commission. This plan has consumed too many of hours, with too many individuals adding their input & concerns & having their voices heard. It is as near perfect as it will ever be!

Public perception of wrongdoing (individual lacking integrity) is more important than a councilman remaining stubborn and not following thru with a good case for recusal from this important Sugarloaf Plan vote after the public record shows a very generous campaign contribution of \$3,000.00 was accepted into his campaign coffers from a developer who wants to violate a historic precedent of constructing high-density development or commercial development west of the I-270. This area is meant to remain rural in nature.

The Sugarloaf Plan is a living monument to fighting Climate Change. Passing this plan will be the legacy of this county council.

The Sugarloaf Plan is the first of several such plans that the next FC council will be voting on during the new term (2023-2026). All voters' eyes are closely watching and wondering how will my home area be treated when developers come for this place, I call Home.

Once development is approved it changes forever, this place we call home! More development in the exurbs& rural areas & farmland is usually not good.

Residents do not see development as improvements but the outcome is seen creating congested roads & overcrowded schools with w/set resources (teacher/student ratio, library, gym, computers, and cafeteria) spread too thin and higher taxes.

The citizens of Frederick County have greatly appreciated the support of the majority of the county council on this most worthwhile endeavor.

Let us preserve & protect the little open & green space remaining in south Frederick County.

Sincerely,

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

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Subject: FW: RE: Sugarloaf amendment
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 1:04:11 PM

From: STEVE MCKAY <stevemckay@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 10:08 AM
To: McKay, Steve <SMcKay@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Fwd: RE: Sugarloaf amendment

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

FYI

Sharing some correspondence that I had with Noel Manalo on Friday. This is going to Council members, but bcc'd to avoid group email discussions.

As you'll see, it took a bit of back and forth to clarify what is being proposed, particularly the provision that should a property change zoning from RC to something else, that the Overlay would then apply. The important point in that regard, as I explained several times, is that such a zoning change could likely only be accomplished during a comprehensive planning action - much like the one we're doing now.

At the end, I was satisfied that Noel acknowledged that the proposed amendment fully addressed their #2 request in their September 8 letter. We may or may not get a public acknowledgement of support for the Plan, but I'm good with where we're at right now.

Steve

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

From: STEVE MCKAY <stevemckay@comcast.net> To: "Manalo, Noel" <NManalo@mcneeslaw.com> Date: 10/21/2022 3:59 PM
Subject: RE: Sugarloaf amendment

That's fair. Thank you.

On 10/21/2022 3:52 PM Manalo, Noel <nmanalo@mcneeslaw.com> wrote:

Steve, yes - based on my understanding of what is contained in the four corners of Amendment 17, I would say it does satisfy # (2) of the Sept. 8 letter.

n 1 /21/2 22 3 52 PM Manalo, oel nmanalo mcneeslaw.com wrote

Steve, yes - based on my understanding of what is contained in the four corners of Amendment 17, I would say it does satisfy 2 of the Sept. letter.

I can't speak to any future contingency or "springing" Overlay, since I don't know what that looks like. Not saying my client would be fine with whatever that turns out to look like, or not. Just making objective observation that I can't speak to what we have not read/seen.

Noel Manalo



McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC

8490 Progress Drive, Suite 225 | Frederick, MD 21701 Tel: 301.241.2014

From: STEVE MCKAY <stevemckay@comcast.net>

Sent: Friday, October 21, 2022 3:42 PM

To: Manalo, Noel <NManalo@mcneeslaw.com>

Subject: RE: Sugarloaf amendment

[EXTERNAL]

Thank you Noel. I'm glad that we have been able to talk through this. You're right - amendment 17 doesn't touch upon the future contingency - it describes the "as is" for the Overlay. There will definitely be specific language that captures that for the zoning ordinance discussion.

I understand from your correspondence with Kathy that your opportunities to dialogue with your clients have considerable constraints. That said, and recognizing that you can't speak for them until you can, do you believe that this amendment satisfies condition #2 from the Sept 8 letter? After all, if your client's plans change, then everything can change - but only as part of another comprehensive plan action, much like this one. In the meantime, the amendment accomplishes what was requested - and not without a significant compromise on the part of the Council members who may support this.

Regards, Steve

On 10/21/2022 3:29 PM Manalo, Noel

<nmanalo@mcneeslaw.com> wrote:

Got it, Steve - thanks for the dialogue/clarification. I think I understand.

I assume Council Member Hagen will have some clear language of instruction that would be part of any motion as to instructions on how the Rezoning ordinance is to read.

What you are saying is clear to me, but I think County legal would agree that the springing overlay is not what shows in Amendment 17, on its face.

Noel Manalo



McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC

8490 Progress Drive, Suite 225 | Frederick, MD 21701 Tel: 301.241.2014

From: STEVE MCKAY <stevemckay@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2022 2:13 PM
To: Manalo, Noel <NManalo@mcneeslaw.com>
Cc: disclosures@frederickcountymd.gov; Redmond, Lee
<LRedmond@FrederickCountyMD.gov>;
kmitchell2@frederickcountymd.gov;
ckeller@frederickcountymd.gov
Subject: RE: Sugarloaf amendment

[EXTERNAL]
Noel

Amendment 17 describes the overlay, and the mountain - as zoned - is not in the Overlay. I can't say that any clearer. The mountain will remain outside the Overlay for as long as it remains RC. If in the future your client requests a change in zoning from RC - which would likely only be possible as part of a future comprehensive planning action (like this one) - then the Overlay "might" apply, depending on whether any changes to the Overlay were also enacted during that future comprehensive planning action.

So the bottom line is that your clients' property is not part of the Overlay. The only thing that will ever change that are contingent on zoning change requests and comprehensive planning activities that are far in the future and not - as you acknowledged - part of your client's intent.

As for the zoning ordinance - that hasn't been written. Staff will await Council instruction on Tuesday about the 40-50 individual property rezonings, and there will also be discussion about what happens to land that changes from RC zoning. I believe what you drafted is a reasonable representation of what that language will be, but perhaps Cate can chime in.

I understand that you're trying to be clear but keep in mind that Amendment 17 stands on its own, and the result of it will be that your client's RC-zoned land will not be in the Overlay. Anything that changes this situation will only occur - (1) at your client's initiation and (2) during another comprehensive planning activity, much like this last one, during which we can hash it all out again.

Regards, Steve

On 10/21/2022 1:54 PM Manalo, Noel
<nmanalo@mcneeslaw.com> wrote:

Council Member McKay - interesting, so we don't have all of the info yet, necessarily.

Is the Mountain in the Overlay or is it not?

Amendment 17 appears to show the latter. But your explanation appears to indicate the former. And I am not trying to be obtuse or anything - I'm trying to be in a position to (A) clearly explain to Webster's what is going on and (B) not misrepresent to you Stronghold's position.

Not trying to do Kai's/County Legal's work here, but basically what you are saying is that "Ordinance" language that no one has seen yet will, after Tuesday, come back to the County Council that says *"any property shown in the Sugarloaf Study Area that changes zoning from RC to any other zoning will by operation of law/this Ordinance automatically also be zoned as within the Rural Heritage Overlay District"*.

Something along those lines? If so, I am quite confused, as that is quite different from what I understood of Amendment 17 in which case the only representation I can make at the moment is what I've made in the email below as to Amendment 17 - not to any as-yet drafted ordinance language.

I wouldn't even know what to discuss with the websters, at this point, unless you have draft ordinance language for me to review. Again, not trying to be obtuse, just trying to understand so that I can communicate clearly.

Noel Manalo



McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC

8490 Progress Drive, Suite 225 | Frederick, MD 21701

Tel: 301.241.2014

From: STEVE MCKAY

<stevemckay@comcast.net>

Sent: Friday, October 21, 2022 1:41 PM

To: Manalo, Noel

<NManalo@mcneeslaw.com>

Cc: disclosures@frederickcountymd.gov; Redmond, Lee

<LRedmond@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; kmitchell2@frederickcountymd.gov; ckeller@frederickcountymd.gov

Subject: RE: Sugarloaf amendment

[EXTERNAL]

Hi Noel

Thank you for your note. I appreciate your response and confirmation of your September 8 letter.

As you've noted, the intent and express implication of the amendment - which is now posted to our Tuesday agenda - is that the Overlay will not apply to RC zoned land. Thus, it will not apply to any of your client's land.

However, I do need to clarify/correct the point about zoning change. Kai's statement about what happens if land is rezoned from RC to something else was correct. While not expressed in the amendment, it will be part of the zoning ordinance instructions - assuming this passes, which I believe it will. If land within the planning area that is currently zoned RC is rezoned to something else, then the Overlay will apply to that land. I am glad that your client has no plans for doing this, so I would hope that this won't be an issue.

More importantly, as you're aware, zoning doesn't just get changed. Changing your client's parcels from RC to something else could realistically only be accomplished by a future comprehensive planning action. Neither "significant change" nor "zoning error" would seem to present a viable path for a change in euclidian zoning. Also, neither MXD or PUD can be applied to RC, so that's not really an option outside of a future comprehensive planning activity that first changes the underlying zoning.

So the scenario that may impact your clients - a change in zoning from RC, that they currently have no plan for - would have to be part of a future comprehensive planning action. In that case, I would imagine that the overlay issues could be addressed at that time. In the meantime, your client's requirements have been met.

Regards, Steve

Steve, thanks for the heads up. Yes, you were correct Tuesday as to Stronghold's position being that stated in the Sept. 8, 2022 letter sent to Council (copy attached).

Also, you are correct, the proposed Amendment 17 does fulfill Stronghold's request # (2)("removes Stronghold's holdings from the Sugarloaf Overlay rezoning").

[In fact, Amendment 17 is even more squarely responsive than what Council Member Hagen discussed Tuesday - he said while the Overlay would not apply to RC, if the zoning changed from RC to something else, the Overlay would then apply. This led me to believe the Overlay boundary would still be the same under what he was proposing. However, Amendment 17 does not have anything along those lines - it simply takes RC out. Period. Thus, based on my read of Amendment 17, if RC ground in the Sugarloaf Study Area were to somehow ultimately get rezoned to PUD, MXD, whatever, etc. - it's still not subject to the clearly mapped Rural Heritage Overlay District and the attendant regulations (i.e., if Amendment 17 passes, the Rural Heritage Overlay District becomes distinct from, and no longer coterminous with, the Sugarloaf Study Area). (Should go without saying, but Stronghold of course has no plans to ask for/consider any type of rezoning to any of its RC property)].

If my read as stated above tracks, then as stated in the 9/8/22 letter, my client would not oppose the Plan, and they would consider the County regulatory regime governing it as status quo and therefore no elevated risk/cost to operations.

=====

Totally out of curiosity, and just asking on my own behalf and not on behalf of Stronghold, but:

1. Isn't this what you said earlier you could not really see happening - i.e., a Sugarloaf Plan without the Mountain? Does Kai even get your vote on this - let alone 4 total votes?
2. How does this address the concerns about ability for special exception uses in RC that I thought were the main citizen concerns all along - gun range, houses of worship, etc.?
3. How does Amendment 17 go to a vote without a public hearing, based on the Council's handling of previous Amendments? This Amendment 17 is substantially a mapped/graphic version of Council Member Dacey's 9/13/22 Amendment 15, for which his was the lone positive vote.

I don't need you to answer these in a response email or anything -just curious, and maybe when we next catch up it will be more clear to me.

Noel Manalo



McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC

8490 Progress Drive, Suite 225 |

Frederick, MD 21701

Tel: 301.241.2014

From: STEVE MCKAY

<stevemckay@comcast.net> **Sent:** Thursday, October 20, 2022 3:00 PM

To: Manalo, Noel

<NManalo@mcneeslaw.com> **Cc:**

disclosures@frederickcountymd.gov; Redmond, Lee

<LRedmond@FrederickCountyMD.gov>

Subject: Fwd: Sugarloaf amendment

[EXTERNAL]

Hi Noel

In case you haven't seen it yet, this is the amendment we will discuss on Tuesday. This amendment will result in the Overlay not being applied to RC-zoned land. Your clients asked to be removed from the Overlay, and this amendment accomplishes that. The question for your client is - if this amendment passes, along with the other amendments that were accomplished on their behalf, does this address their concerns with the Plan such that they'll remove their objections. That's my conclusion from their prior letter, but we would like confirmation.

Steve

----- Original Message -----From: Kai Hagen

<kai@catoctinmountain.com>

To: Steve McKay

<stevemckay@comcast.net>

Date: 10/20/2022 12:55 PM

Subject: Sugarloaf amendment

FYI (linked and attached as screenshot):

<https://frederickcountymd.gov/DocumentCenter/View/340794/102522---Amendment-KH>

From: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
To: [Specht, Jennifer](#)
Cc: [Goodfellow, Tim](#)
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 3:45:47 PM
Attachments: [A8990673.pdf](#)
[FW An email reply to County Council needs your review.msg](#)
[PROPOSED SUGARLOAF PLAN OVERLAY.msg](#)
[Sugarloaf Plan.msg](#)
[Please support the Sugarloaf Plan and overlay.msg](#)
[image002.png](#)

From: Cherney, Ragen <RCherney@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 3:32 PM
To: Brandt, Kimberly G. <KGBrandt@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Mitchell, Kathy (Legal) <KMitchell2@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf Plan

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



From: Manalo, Noel <NManalo@mcneeslaw.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 3:24 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Keegan-Ayer, MC <MCKeegan-Ayer@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Blue, Michael <MBlue@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Fitzwater, Jessica <JFitzwater@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Donald, Jerry <JDonald@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; McKay, Steve <SMcKay@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Hagen, Kai <KHagen@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Dacey, Phil <PDacey@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Cc: Mitchell, Kathy (Legal) <KMitchell2@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Keller, Catherine <CKeller@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Black, Bryon <BBlack@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Cherney, Ragen <RCherney@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Honorable Council Members: On behalf of Stronghold, Incorporated attached again is the letter we sent you on September 8, 2022, when you first took up the Sugarloaf Plan.

Based on our review of what is available to the public on the County web site as of this afternoon, I believe Council Member Hagen's proposed Amendment 17 addresses item #(2) of the attached letter. If the County Council were to advance this amendment to public hearing, my client would be more comfortable if it did list the addresses and parcel ID #s of its holdings as not being in the Overlay.

Amendment 17 is substantively different from the concepts Council Member Hagen described at your October 18 meeting. We can only evaluate what we have seen, so if there is any other intended language that you would have the appetite to take to public hearing along with Amendment 17, we can review it at that time as to its potential impacts on Stronghold's operations.

Thank you for your continued support in helping Stronghold in its stewardship and preservation of the Mountain. Regards, Noel

PS: I have a matter before the Emmitsburg Planning Commission this evening, so if you are in the middle of discussing Sugarloaf still at 6:30 PM and I exit the room, that is the reason.

Noel Manalo



McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC

8490 Progress Drive, Suite 225 | Frederick, MD 21701

Tel: 301.241.2014

[Email](#) | [Website](#)

-

The foregoing message may be protected by the attorney-client privilege. If you believe it has been sent to you in error, do not read it. Please reply to the sender that you have received the message in error, then delete it. Thank you.



McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC
8490 Progress Drive, Suite 225
Frederick, MD 21701

Noel Manalo
Telephone: 301.241.2014
Fax: 717.237.5300
nmanalo@mcneeslaw.com

September 8, 2022

VIA E-MAIL & USPS

County Executive
County Council
Frederick County, Maryland
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701

RE: Sugarloaf Plan

Honorable County Executive & County Council:

On behalf of Stronghold, Incorporated, we appreciate the efforts by some of you to attempt to address our serious concerns with the Planning Commission's Draft of the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Plan (the "Plan").

At this time my client reiterates their opposition to the Plan.

While we acknowledge the potential effort by County Council members to craft amendments that may or may not address my client's concerns, we believe the process, momentum and timing will not realistically allow for the thoughtful and considered approach we were hoping for three years ago, when we first began to learn the import of the County's initiative.

A deliberate, thoughtful and rational approach is appropriate for any attempt to understand Stronghold's stewardship of the +/- 3,400 AC of Sugarloaf Mountain, and how any new County regulations may or may not assist Stronghold in its continued stewardship.

In light of these considerations, again, my client will continue to oppose the Draft Plan.

If, however, the County Council forwards a draft to public hearing that:

- (1) shows Stronghold's holdings as having Natural Resource (NR) land use designation;
- (2) removes Stronghold's holdings from the proposed Sugarloaf Overlay rezoning;
- (3) preserves the Resource Conservation (RC) zoning for Stronghold's holdings;
- (4) deletes Initiative 3E (page 42 of the Planning Commission draft); and

County Executive
County Council
September 8, 2022
Page 2

(5) deletes "Stronghold Survey District Form (pp 1-12) (survey file F-7-32)" (pages A-38 through A-49 of the Planning Commission Draft), or, in the alternative adds a note to this portion of the Appendix -- "*For Informational Purposes Only, not Regulatory; This Survey Form Was Completed Without the Appropriate Consent of Owner*";

-- then my client will not oppose the Plan.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Noel Manalo". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Noel Manalo
MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC

cc: Stronghold, Incorporated
Robert A. McFarland, Esquire, Maryland Department of Natural Resources

From: [Luna, Nancy](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Cc: [County Council Staff](#)
Subject: FW: An email reply to County Council needs your review
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 3:27:16 PM

To: l41701@publicinput.com

Subject: Sugarloaf Area Plan - rezoning plan

Hello,

I wanted to express my disinterest in the current Sugarloaf area plan. I own 8330 Layton Court and have talked with my also effected neighbors. All of us do not understand why under a conservation plan any land would be changed from agricultural to residential. The planning commission stated that the properties along Layton court are being changed because they are apart of Ramsburg Estates. This is incorrect and non-researched. We are all individual lot not subject to any neighborhood. Attached are the plats to prove that the reason for changes zoning is unlawful. If the county was changing all similar lots along Roderick Road, then the logic may make more sense. However, our 7 lots have been cherrypicked based on false statements made prior.

PLAT 3 of Ramsburg Estates shows my property (lot 3 P.B. 40 P. 24) is not apart of Ramsburg estates and was previously plated. This can be seen in the Ramsburg Division plat recorded in 1989. The fact that these lots have remained agricultural for over thirty years should be precedence enough.

I recommend that the council reject the planning commissions plan, as the reasoning behind the approved for Layton court is incorrect and false. All of these facts were presented to planning commission prior to their vote, and they had no comment on it.

Thank you,
Alexandria Tomasini, PE

From: [Betsy Franklin](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: PROPOSED SUGARLOAF PLAN & OVERLAY
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 3:09:45 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

TO THE COUNCIL MEMBERS

Of course, as a long-time Thurston Road resident, farm-keeper, and ardent nature enthusiast, I remain grateful to the Council for the joint and several effort in helping Frederick County develop thoughtfully and sensibly, which means also protecting from development some of its most beautiful, natural and sensitive, and sometimes historic, parts. Most recently, of course I thank you for supporting the community's interest in holding the I-270 development boundary line, and for removing the recent "invitation" to re-open the Plan.

I will be in attendance tonight 10/25/22 at the hearing, interested and hopeful to observe the Council consider the latest proposed compromise to the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay to exclude RC. I am "hopeful" provided that the Stronghold people also accept the compromise, and stop threatening to close Sugarloaf Mountain to the public. In truth, I am disappointed that it has come to such a broad compromise that seems to take so much out of the Plan and Overlay, and yet I definitely prefer this compromise (excluding RC zoning from Overlay) to the possibility of a no-vote, or worse yet, a vote to remand this matter back to the Planning Commission. As I understand that this most recent compromise is in the greater interest of gaining the agreement of Stronghold, so they will stop threatening (bullying) the closure of the mountain to the public., I urge the Council to vote in favor. However, if Stronghold refuses this compromise and continues to insist on Sugarloaf Mountain closure, I urge the County Coubi to pass the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay as currently amended.

One landowner should not have such power, tantamount to veto power, over Frederick County land use policy.

Elizabeth "Betsy" Franklin
2669 Thurston Road

From: [Johanna Springston](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 2:31:58 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council Members:

Tonight you will take several votes to either advance the cause of preservation in the Sugarloaf area or leave it vulnerable to development. I encourage you to support the compromise that Councilmember Hagen has proposed which will keep all the agriculturally zoned land within the preservation overlay. While I would prefer for all the land to be covered, I am willing to support this compromise as a step forward.

Rest assured, as a body you have worked hard to meet Stronghold's demands. If Stronghold still insists on closing the mountain to the public, it will be because that is what they really want to do. And, no amount of ceding ground will convince them otherwise. It is up to each of you to represent the broader public good, which in the Sugarloaf area is preservation of the entire area.

I respectfully ask you to support this compromise by passing the plan and the amended overlay legislation. Thank you for your consideration of my point of view.

Sincerely,

Johanna M. Springston
8101 Fingerboard Rd.

From: [Patrice Gallagher](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Please support the Sugarloaf Plan and overlay
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 2:22:09 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hello again, Council members,

I hope you will vote in favor of the Sugarloaf Plan and various amendments tonight.

If you do, you will represent faithfully the citizens you represent. This lengthy process has seen compromise after compromise — and compromise is a good thing generally.

I would have preferred the Plan and overlays to stand in their original form, but I understand that adjustments needed to be made.

From this citizen's point of view, most of the compromising on the Plan has been offered by the County, in the form of amendments from the Council. Not much compromise has come from those opposed to the Plan.

At this moment, please step up on behalf of the County's constituents, and vote in favor of the Plan and overlays, as amended, to preserve and protect this beautiful area that is a jewel of Frederick County.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to our County.

Patrice Gallagher
Frederick

Patrice Gallagher
Gallagher Design
www.patricegallagher.com
102 W Church Street
Frederick MD 21701
301.471.3720