

From: peterblood3213@comcast.net
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Council Members](#); [Constituent Services](#)
Subject: Comments on overlay
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 7:04:55 PM
Attachments: [Overlay comments.docx](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Commissioners,

Attached are my comments on the Sugarloaf Plan overlay.

Peter Blood
Urbana, MD

Comments on the Overlay to the Sugarloaf Plan
Peter Blood
3213 Ramsland Way
Urbana, MD 21704

Commissioners,

The Livable Frederick Master Plan (LFMP) called for a Sugarloaf Plan to preserve the present rural/conservation status of land between I-270 and the Monocacy River. That Plan was approved. It also called for an Overlay District to implement the Plan's goals. Currently there are developers who want to reverse the Plan's approval and cut holes in the plan so they can develop land regardless of the Plan's intent or approval. To approve the plan but not overlay the entire plan area completely defeats the intent of a preservation plan.

I write to request your support for the full overlay as soon as possible. Specifically, I am writing to address four related issues: the overlay, smart growth, data centers, and transparency.

ENSURE THE OVERLAY COVERS THE ENTIRE PLAN AREA

The approved Sugarloaf Plan and its proposed Overlay District are preservation plans, not development plans, and are designed to protect agricultural, scenic and rural lands, which are not merely undeveloped spaces, up for grabs by nonresident developers wanting to line their pockets to the detriment of the community. County planners and elected officials have a responsibility to preserve the land east of 270 which, since 1977, has been recognized and honored as the development boundary for planning purposes.

Having taken three college courses in environmental planning, I know the importance of zoning and honoring plans which focus development. The areas just outside parks, like Sugarloaf, are most vulnerable. The 270/80 interchange has been called the "Gateway to Sugarloaf Mountain" and as such is under very heavy development pressure. That is precisely why it needs MORE protection, not less. If development is allowed west of I-270, residents, reacting to the impact of commercial, industrial or high-density development, will successively appeal their zoning status and cash out creating a race to the bottom in a process that erodes the area's beauty for years.

The best way to avoid overdevelopment is not to let it start. We need to ensure the overlay covers the entire Plan area and keep the development boundary where it has been for decades. The Planning Commission confirmed this idea last year when it approved the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan and Overlay boundaries together. It was a good idea then and remains a good idea. To do otherwise would violate a long-standing "compact" with Sugarloaf area residents.

I urge you to continue to uphold this boundary, keep lands here zoned as agricultural, rural, and Resource Conservation, and limit commercial and high-intensity development to areas east of I-270. Please do not cave to pressure from out-of-county billionaire developers.

MAINTAIN THE CURRENT PRESERVATION/DEVELOPMENT BALANCE

Smart growth seeks to maintain a sustainable balance between development and preservation. Presently, we have a corridor where development can take place west of 270. Those seeking to develop can do so there. It is a compromise that should be maintained by honoring the established

development/preservation balance, keeping the development border at 270, and not allowing exemptions for the Natelli Cutout or other parcels west of 270.

REVIEW DATA CENTERS MORE CAREFULLY

As demonstrated by Amazon's interest in the Natelli Cutout and Quantum Loophole's large data center campus near Adamstown, some would like to site many data centers in Frederick County. Unfortunately, I see no evidence of any government entity having done an objective and adequate cost-benefit analysis of data centers. We seem to be reacting to alleged benefits claimed by those seeking to build the data centers, but, not surprisingly, they exaggerate the benefits and minimize or ignore the costs. Before allowing these facilities to be built in Frederick County, a proper cost-benefit analysis should be conducted to quantify the following:

- **BENEFITS.** The \$35 billion in spending Amazon fed the media based upon their Virginia experience has never been challenged. How was the figure calculated? What fraction of that would Frederick County actually get? I suspect that figure is merely total spending, NOT tax revenue to Frederick County or even the State of Maryland. Further, data centers would not pay business equipment taxes in Maryland as they do in Virginia.
- **COSTS:** Many Virginians are voicing outrage and concern after finding new data centers constructed in their backyards and have identified many costs including:
 - They consume large amounts of power and water, leading to new power lines and access installations. What exactly happens if there is a drought? Who gets the water, residents or the data centers?
 - They are noisy, highly lit at night, and often built too close to residences.
 - That have enormous impervious surfaces that create run-off issues.
 - They are often sited in the wrong places, where water and electricity are vulnerable and where people are impacted.

In addition to performing a thorough cost-benefit analysis, Frederick County should avoid the well documented pitfalls experienced by Northern Virginia by identifying and demanding best practices before approving any data centers.

THE NEED FOR TRANSPARENCY

It is now evident that Amazon, a developer, and the county have discussed plans for data centers in secret and likely in violation of open meetings laws. Residents of the greater Sugarloaf area have a right to know what has been considered and planned. After residents and county planners created the Livable Frederick Master Plan and the Sugarloaf Plan, however, it appears that developers and lobbyists wanted to short circuit the current decision-making process to maximize profits while undermining the public's right to know and participate in the process. I urge the Commissioners to make all of their decisions in a fully transparent manner.

Thank you for your work. In short, ***it is vitally important that the overlay covers the entire Sugarloaf Plan area.*** Listen to the residents who live here. Do not acquiesce to out-of-county developers. Hold the line at 270. Cover the entire plan with the overlay.

From: [rg steinman](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Council Members](#); [County Executive](#)
Subject: EVISCERATED SUGARLOAF OVERLAY
Date: Monday, March 13, 2023 10:15:58 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Councilmembers,

**PRESERVE THE OVERLAY ZONE; MAINTAIN THE
DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY AT 270**

I am writing as a concerned citizen of Maryland. I live in adjoining Montgomery County and have spent time in the area under discussion. I have patronized the farm and fruit stands, recreated on and around Sugarloaf Mountain, visited the Monocacy Battlefield Park, and more. The Sugarloaf mountain and surrounding natural area has unique qualities and attracts tourists and residents from near and far. It is of the utmost importance to preserve this natural area:

- to protect the mountain**
- to protect the water, the wildlife, and the ecosystem**
- to preserve this national historic treasure**
- to protect the rural environment setting**

Please do not permit overdevelopment to gain a foothold in this treasured Sugarloaf Mountain region.

- I support the preservation goals of the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay District.
- I support the Overlay language passed by the Planning Commission in June 2022.
- I support application of the original Overlay language to the full Sugarloaf Plan boundary.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration,

Roberta G. Steinman

9009 Fairview Rd

Silver Spring, MD 20910-4106

From: Carol Waldmann <c.waldmann@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 6:23 AM
To: Planning Commission
Subject: sugarloaf overalay

Categories: Green category

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

I am a district 1 Frederick voter:

- I support the preservation goals of the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay District.
- I support the Overlay language passed by the Planning Commission in June 2022.
- I support application of the original Overlay language to the full Sugarloaf Plan boundary.

Please do not weaken the language!

Sincerely,

Carol Waldmann

From: Johanna Springston <johannaspringston@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2023 3:00 PM
To: Planning Commission
Cc: Council Members; County Executive
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan Preservation Overlay
Attachments: 3-15-23 letter to the Planning Commission.docx

Categories: Green category

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Please find attached my letter to the Planning Commision.

Thank you,

Johanna M. Springston
Urbana, MD

March 13, 2023

Dear Planning Commission members,

I am writing in support of the Sugarloaf Plan preservation overlay as it was passed by you last June. The overlay you approved and sent to the County Council provided the much-needed protections to keep the Sugarloaf area rural and environmentally sound. I urge you to send that overlay version back to the County Council.

I am concerned that recently proposed changes to the overlay will erode the preservation effort. The Planning staff has proposed these changes with no justification. Without compelling reasons to make these changes, I am at a loss as to why they are now in front of you. Last year, you heard from a large number of people that want the Sugarloaf area to remain the same, meaning undeveloped.

Last Fall, the County Council approved the Sugarloaf Plan, affirming its northern boundary at I-270. In order for preservation to be real and meaningful, the entire area must benefit from the protections of the overlay. If dense development is allowed to come into the area it will jeopardize the entire area. Those owning land adjacent to the dense development will seek to rezone. Then, their neighbors will also seek to rezone. These landowners will have strong justification when the farm next to them is now a data center complex or some other development.

Please don't mistakenly conflate the I-270 corridor with the Sugarloaf area. The I-270 corridor should be defined as the land on the east side of I-270. There is sufficient land on that side, including the Urbana Growth Area, that is open to commercial development. Historically, I-270 has proven to be a strong barrier between development to the east and preservation to the west. Let's not muddy the waters and allow the development to merge over this line.

I urge you to continue to listen to the community and preserve the entire Sugarloaf area. I urge to reaffirm your earlier vote and send the preservation overlay back to the County Council sending a message that you are listening to the community and that they should follow suit. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Johanna M. Springston
8101 Fingerboard Rd.

From: Karen Cannon <kc.cannon99@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2023 3:17 PM
To: Planning Commission
Cc: County Executive; Council Members; Elizabeth Bauer; Barb Trader; Andrew Burgoyne; Sam Kebede; Erica Moore; Chris Izzo; Patrice Gallagher; James Baker; careymurphy
Subject: Sugarloaf Rural Heritage Overlay Zoning District
Categories: Green category

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]



March 13, 2023

Frederick County Planning Commission
30 N. Market Street
Frederick, MD 21701

Re: Sugarloaf Rural Heritage Overlay Zoning District

Dear Frederick County Planning Commissioners:

We are writing today to urge the Planning Commission to abide by the decision made in November 2022 by the Frederick County Council to establish the eastern boundary of the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan area as Interstate 270. In addition, we urge the Frederick County Planning Commission to adopt the *Sugarloaf Rural Heritage Overlay Zoning District* ("Overlay") recommended by the Planning department in 2022 and adopted by the Planning Commission. I-270 has long been recognized as the boundary between development in the Urbana growth area to the east and preservation area to the west.

The approved Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan and its proposed Overlay District are preservation plans. The Livable Frederick Master Plan and the Climate Response and Resilience Report establish goals for farmland and forest preservation and the Livable Frederick Master Plan specifically recognizes the area around Sugarloaf Mountain as a priority area for preservation. In an era of climate change and supply chain disruptions due to the COVID pandemic and other international issues, preservation of farm and forest lands to protect our food and water supplies becomes increasingly urgent.

The Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan area, including the Monocacy National Battlefield, is a unique area with cultural and historical significance. Development in this area, particularly commercial and industrial development, would permanently degrade these landscapes and negatively impact visitor experiences at the Battlefield. This area has already been severely impacted through commercial development to the north of the Battlefield and I-270 bordering several sections. The remaining area south of the battlefield is at risk of future development without the preservation overlay. Some nearby properties have already been purchased by development interests. Without the overlay, these interests could apply to change zoning from agricultural to commercial or residential to allow development.

The land east of Route 80 is at the head of the watershed into the Sugarloaf area. Contaminants associated with development, such as heavy metals from vehicle traffic and sediments and discharge from whatever infrastructure might be built, would negatively impact the quality of streams as they flow into the protected area and ultimately into the Chesapeake Bay.

The County should abide by the framework provided by the Livable Frederick Master Plan and limit dense, industrial, commercial, and residential development to the designated growth areas. Land that has been designated for agricultural or forest preservation must be maintained as such. To do otherwise negates the community input that drove the creation of the Livable Frederick Master Plan and puts Frederick County's environment, clean water, and food production at risk.

Frederick County has the opportunity, through the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan, to set an example of preserving a valued landscape by establishing clear and consistent boundaries separating developed and preserved land and by approving the preservation overlay to ensure land uses in this area are consistent with agriculture, forestry, and recreational uses.

We repeat: the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan area must be preserved, and the Overlay should be approved to protect it from development.

We wish to thank the Planning Commission for their support of the Plan and again ask that you approve the *Sugarloaf Rural Heritage Overlay Zoning District* as currently written.

Sincerely,

Karen Cannon
Executive Director

Cc: Frederick County Council Members
Frederick County Executive
Envision Frederick County Board of Directors



March 13, 2023

Frederick County Planning Commission Members:

Thank you for this opportunity to share our thoughts on this second-go-around of the Sugarloaf Overlay. At this point just about everyone involved has made their views clear. While repetitive comments may seem unnecessary, the tone and breadth of the suggested changes to the Sugarloaf Overlay (the new staff draft) demands a review of some basic principles.

The Livable Frederick Master Plan (LFMP) (p.59) called for an Overlay to enforce the preservation goals of the Sugarloaf Plan. ***The expectation in LFMP that the Sugarloaf region deserves special protections is obvious.*** In fact, the now passed Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan, repeats the philosophy of special protection.

We note with concern that a map of the Overlay Area was not included with the staff draft. Neither LFMP nor the Sugarloaf Plan suggested that some parts of the Sugarloaf region were less deserving of these special protections. ***Nowhere in the LFMP or the Sugarloaf Plan is it suggested that parts of the Plan were unworthy of protection and could be exempt from the Overlay.*** In fact, it is axiomatic that, having decided on the Plan boundary, the Overlay coverage should be identical with it. The arguments offered now for a partial Overlay are basically the same arguments that were offered for a partial Plan. They were and they remain unpersuasive.

The Sugarloaf Plan's philosophy of preservation and its physical boundaries were discussed, debated, amended, and unanimously passed by the County Council just six months ago. The Council remanded only the overlay. It is pointedly inappropriate to allow a relitigating of the most basic components of the Sugarloaf Plan.

The Overlay, prepared by competent staff, was discussed, debated, and approved by the Planning Commission last year. The County Council did not find fault with specific provisions. Council failed to take a decision because of disagreement over the Overlay's extent and their own lack of political will. ***If any changes are to be made, they should only be made if there is a persuasive rationale for them.*** There should be strong and compelling reasons to change that earlier version so strongly supported by the community.

The changes suggested in the recent staff draft seem designed only to placate a few landowners and a developer. Why are there no suggested changes that would enhance environmental protections? ***Why make changes that benefit a few property owners when the vast majority of community comments have been in support of preservation?*** The suggested

changes ignore and retreat from the original purpose and intent of the Overlay---as conceived in LFMP and Sugarloaf Plan---to protect and preserve the Sugarloaf region.

It's been more than three years since the official Kick Off of the Sugarloaf Plan development process. Over the course of countless meetings, hearings, and work sessions this planning process has reflected a robust and open debate of ideas and solutions. Also true, uniformly over the entire process, has been the overwhelming public support for an overlay that fully addresses LFMP's and the Sugarloaf Plan's intent to preserve and protect the Sugarloaf region.

The more than 400 members of Sugarloaf Alliance, on behalf of thousands of Sugarloaf supporters call on the Planning Commission to again pass a robust Overlay and apply that Overlay to the entire plan area.

Sincerely,

The Sugarloaf Alliance



March 14, 2023

Frederick County Planning Commission Members:

**Comments on Staff Suggestions for Planning Commission Meeting on March 15, 2023
Concerning Modifications to Chapter 1-19 (Zoning), Article VII: Supplementary District
Regulations, Division 7, Sugarloaf**

Specific Comments: based on the TRACK CHANGES Version 03-07-2023.

1. Page 2, lines 16-18, **Agritourism**: Deletion of site plan requirements for Agritourism is completely inconsistent with recent experiences with the relocation of the Summers Farm to Middletown. Deletion of a site plan requirement allows no consideration of setbacks to protect the adjacent community, building placements and entrance and other transportation considerations. It should be acknowledged that many farm agritourism efforts are effectively amusement parks and should be regulated as such and are not consistent with the PRESERVATION goals of the Sugarloaf Plan.

2. Page 3, lines 12-14. **Site entrances**: In a PRESERVATION setting site entrances are as important as the buildings. This requirement has not received any significant negative comment. Why is this change being made? It should remain in this PRESERVATION plan.

3. Page 4, lines 8 and 12: **Building size**: there is no rationale given for this change in scale from 15,000 square feet to 25,000 square feet. A review of alternative building sizes was presented demonstrated during the Sugarloaf Plan discussions and the majority opinion of the Planning Commission was that very few existing buildings exceeded the 15,000 square foot guideline. A generous exception clause is provided in the text and should address any special circumstances. The 15,000 square foot guideline is consistent with the PRESERVATION goals of the Sugarloaf Plan.

4. Pages 4 and 5: **Paragraph 1-19-7.730. TREE CUTTING AND FORESTRY ACTIVITIES**: Deletion of this entire paragraph of the Bill is completely inconsistent the PRESERVATION goals of the Sugarloaf Plan. To suggest that this Paragraph be deleted so that a county-wide proposal can be made does not recognize the three special preservation areas recognized in the Livable Frederick Plan: Sugarloaf Mountain, South Mountain and Catoctin Mountain areas. These forested mountain areas are unique and are meant to be planned differently as noted in the Livable Frederick Master Plan. To postpone the additional protections called for in this Paragraph would needlessly endanger the Sugarloaf region forest lands until the staff and Planning Commission find time at some point in the future to consider this county-wide. Additionally, County permit review staff will have more appropriate guidelines to protect the Sugarloaf region in the meantime. Experience in the Sugarloaf region could be used as a

test case for application county-wide. This PRESERVATION effort should remain in the Sugarloaf Plan.

5. Page 6, lines 1-31, Paragraph 1-19-7.740. **PROHIBITED USES:** The modifications to the Prohibited Uses are confusing and, in some cases, wrong. Lines 2 and 3 state that these uses are prohibited in only the Agricultural Zone. Limiting this discussion to only Agriculture zoned land is misleading and would lead to confusion on the part of the reader, thinking these uses are allowed in the Resource Conservation zoned land despite the fact that these uses are already prohibited in the Resource Conservation land. The discussion of Prohibited Uses is key element in this PRESERVATION master plan.

6. Page 6, line 4: **Sawmills** should only be temporary and portable to be consistent with the PRESERVATION goals of the Sugarloaf plan. See discussion below under item 10.

7. Page 6, lines 5 and 8: **“Springwater” and rodeos** should remain on the prohibited list. Springwater harvesting and storage should only be for the uses of the property owner, this should not become a commercial operation. Also allowing rodeos is inappropriate since these inevitably become commercial activities. Commercial springwater harvesting and rodeos are inconsistent with the PRESERVATION goals of Sugarloaf Plan.

8. Page 6, lines 21 to 24: **Prohibited uses** in the Resource Conservation Zone is confusing. As currently drafted it appears sawmills and shooting ranges are the only uses prohibited in the Resource Conservation zone when in fact the uses on lines 4-20 are also prohibited in the Resource Conservation zone.

9. Page 6, lines 26-28: **Definitions** section, the exemption of private park use from the Overlay zone restrictions needs to be revised. The private park exemption should be at least 1000 acres instead of 100 acres. In order to be exempted from the Overlay zone the private park needs to be of considerable size. It is not hard to find parcels in the 19,700 acres of the Sugarloaf planning area of 100 acres. A patch-work of private parks exempted from the Overlay zone would be inconsistent with the PRESERVATION objectives of the Sugarloaf Plan as a multitude of private parks pursue their various concepts of private parks in what would be a very limited area. A minimum of 1000 acres would make the park objectives more feasible on a larger scale.

10. Page 8, ARTICLE X: OPTIONAL METHODS OF DEVELOPMENT, DIVISION 7. SOLAR FACILITY, COMMERCIAL FLOATING ZONE DISTRICT, Paragraph 1-19-10.700. SOLAR FACILITY-COMMERCIAL ZONE: After line 16 add the following:

Solar facilities are only permitted on soils rated class 6 or below. This added limit is intended to prevent floating zone proliferation of solar facilities on agriculture and conservation land, including as interim land uses on speculative-and developer-owned Agriculture and Resource Conservation zoned lands in anticipation of rezoning and/or more intensive development. Solar facilities should not be permitted to reduce the County’s thriving agricultural economy or productive farm acreage, the most of any County in Maryland.

11. Page 9, Article XI Definitions, Paragraph 1-19-11.100. DEFINITIONS. lines 5-21:

a. **Timber Harvest Streamside Management Zone:** This definition should not be deleted for the reasons as cited in Note 5 above. Forestry management is an integral part of the Sugarloaf PRESERVATION plan and should not be delayed until some uncertain future.

b. **Sawmill, Temporary:** This definition needs to be modified to ensure this does not become a de facto permanent facility. Drying, finishing, or shipping lumber can be a long-term operation especially drying of lumber. Commercial firewood processing is a long-term effort and becomes a permanent activity. A time limit should be placed on the “Sawmill, Temporary” of no longer than one year.

c. **Limited Outdoor Sports Recreation Facility:** “Limited Outdoor Sports Recreation Facility” needs to be either deleted or heavily modified. A limited outdoor sports recreation facility sets a strong precedent for large scale active recreation as opposed to the conservation and PRESERVATION objectives of the Sugarloaf plan. It is not hard to envision a complex of 30 soccer fields such as has been built in Germantown with tremendous sound, traffic, and stormwater problems. Stadium seating and lighting is not essential to create the traffic and environmental impacts: only one of the fields at the Germantown Soccerplex has lighting and stadium seating. A limit of 81,000 square feet, the size of one large soccer field, is the maximum appropriate size in the Sugarloaf PRESERVATION plan.

d. **Lodge, Private Park:** This definition is much too broad and should be limited in scale if allowed at all. Park lodges in this region are usually only offered in remote locations such as western Maryland and West Virginia. This is not the case for the Sugarloaf Plan area. Folks who want to visit Sugarloaf hardly need a nearby place to stay given the accommodations available in Frederick. A private park lodge could easily commercialize the Sugarloaf area. As written, it could lead to subdivision-type development since no restrictions are placed on design or area of coverage. A stand-alone lodge would create significant potential for ground water and stream pollution since no connections to public water and sewer would be available. Frederick County needs no more small wastewater plants discharging into the high-quality streams around Sugarloaf Mountain. Private Park Lodges are simply inconsistent with the PRESERVATION objectives of the Sugarloaf plan.

Sincerely,

The Sugarloaf Alliance

From: [Jennifer Weidling](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [County Executive](#); [Council Members](#)
Subject: EVISCERATED OVERLAY TO BE DISCUSSED 3/15
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 1:15:17 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

To the Planning Commission of Frederick County:

I am writing as a homeowner on Layton Ct in Urbana to let you know of my concern about the county's commitments to preservation in the beautiful Sugarloaf Mountain region. I have been living in this area for over four years and bought a home because I believed that Maryland's commitment to environmental preservation was strong and steadfast. I very much hope that this trust is not misplaced.

The *Frederick News* reported on January 27th that the County had been in secret talks with Amazon with the objectives of carving up the Sugarloaf Plan to allow Amazon to build data centers for its billion dollar enterprise. Not only is the ultimate end of such talks totally unacceptable, but the lack of transparency around a public policy issue (land use and conservation) is unjustified and wrong.

My position as a concerned resident of this region:

- I-270 should remain the long-recognized boundary and the best line for planning purposes. No high-density development should occur west of I-270 in the Sugarloaf Plan area.
- Allowing the I-270 boundary to be crossed for development purposes would be the beginning of the end for conservation in our region, and a decision that could never be reversed. Any development would affect the wetlands and the quality of the water that flows into the streams (and resident's drinking water), as well as impact upon the wildlife that currently know this region as their home and shelter.
- The approved Sugarloaf Plan and its proposed Overlay District are preservation plans, not development plans.
- Any development west of I-270 will threaten the Monocacy Civil War Battlefield, a national historic treasure and place of memory.
- The Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay are designed to protect the mountain, its rural environment, its natural resources, for now and the future -

including after the land trust expires in 2046.

Please take all of these considerations into account in your coming discussions in the Planning Commission. And do not accept or allow any more secretive conversations about the resource use of our precious Sugarloaf region.

Thank you,

Jen Weidling

From: Bill Woodcock <refertobill@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 10:12 PM
To: Planning Commission
Cc: Council Members
Subject: Sugarloaf Overlay

Categories: Green category

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Respectfully, Planning Commission, I am against the Sugarloaf Overlay Zoning intrusion on Private Property Rights.

We have regulations, Laws, and Rules quite sufficiently in place.

Thank you, PLEASE VOTE 'NO" on added Restrictions to Private Property Rights and Sugarloaf Overlay.

**William Woodcock
9236 Oak Tree Circle
Frederick, MD. 21701**

From: [Pam Burke](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Council Members](#); [County Executive](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Tuesday, March 14, 2023 6:03:29 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

To the Planning Commission of Frederick County,

As 21 year residents of Frederick County we find it disappointing and demoralizing that we must, once again, write to ask that you honor the original boundaries of the Sugarloaf Plan and the Overlay. Faith in institutions is among the casualties of changes being proposed by developers who simply do not want to accept the preservation plan when it comes in conflict with their own personal priorities.

Once again, we ask that you honor the original I-270 boundary and the Overlay. We want to believe that the wishes of hundreds, if not thousands, of residents will not be overridden by the powerful development money that looms over our collective shoulders. Because if it can happen with Sugarloaf, no area of the County is safe, and the word of our elected officials and staff is questionable, at best.

Respectfully, we ask that you align your priorities with preservation, as that was the original goal of the Plan and Overlay, and not attempt some "middle ground" that will only serve to open the door to more efforts for development. The boundaries should remain as they have already been established, and we need to feel confident they will not be compromised in the future.

Paul and Pamela Burke
9233 Bessie Clemson Road