

From: [Mary Gene Martin](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Getting Sugarloaf Region Protections Right
Date: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 10:26:39 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Commissioners ,

I have been watching the Sugarloaf Landscape Management Plan and while I'm happy the plan passed, getting the zoning right is very important.

The common sense boundary of 270 needs to guide where future development should go and the plan must respect that.

Have you seen the horrible density that is Clarksburg in Montgomery County? It is appalling. Crime is up due to people living on top of each other. You don't want this in Frederick County. Keep the agricultural reserve intact. In fact, add to it. Don't mess up Frederick County like they did in Clarksburg.

Mary Gene Martin
mgkm_39@aol.com
23932 JOCKEY CLUB TER
Damascus, Maryland 20872-2140

From: [Elizabeth Wilbur](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Getting Sugarloaf Region Protections Right
Date: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 1:01:31 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Commissioners ,

I have been watching the Sugarloaf Landscape Management Plan and while I'm happy the plan passed, getting the zoning right is very important.

The common sense boundary of 270 needs to guide where future development should go and the plan must respect that.

Elizabeth Wilbur
bwilbur@gmail.com
15428 Conrad Spring Rd
Boyds , Maryland 20841

From: Lorie Wickert <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 4:48 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Getting Sugarloaf Region Protections Right

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Councilmembers ,

I have been watching the Sugarloaf Landscape Management Plan and while I'm happy the plan passed, getting the zoning right is very important.

The common sense boundary of 270 needs to guide where future development should go and the plan must respect that.

Lorie Wickert
lorieanne@verizon.net
10701 Hampton Mill Terrace, Apt 110
N Bethesda, Maryland 20852-5448

From: Charles Alexander <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 3:58 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Keep the Sugarloaf Plan Boundary at 270

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Commissioners ,

I have been watching the Sugarloaf zoning plan discussions in the county and urge caution as the boundaries of the overlay are considered. Any attempt to add density on the west side of 270 is not in keeping with the protections promised by the plan that passed.

Farms and forests, once developed can't be returned to that use. Please keep the plan boundary at 270 where it belongs.

Charles Alexander
ch_a_alex@hotmail.com
Box 4753
Lutherville, Maryland 21094

From: [Marney Bruce](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Keep the Sugarloaf Plan Boundary at 270
Date: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 12:46:53 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Commissioners ,

I have been watching the Sugarloaf zoning plan discussions in the county and urge caution as the boundaries of the overlay are considered. Any attempt to add density on the west side of 270 is not in keeping with the protections promised by the plan that passed. Farms and forests, once developed can't be returned to that use. Please keep the plan boundary at 270 where it belongs.

Marney Bruce
marneyb3@gmail.com
4541 Windsor Lane
Bethesda, Maryland 20814-4724

From: [Patricia Burton](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Keep the Sugarloaf Plan Boundary at 270
Date: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 11:01:37 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Commissioners ,

I am concerned about the county's apparent lack of commitment to the preservation of the Sugarloaf Mountain area.

I-270 should remain the long-recognized boundary and the best line for planning purposes when the commission discusses this plan. No high-density development should occur west of I-270 in the Sugarloaf Plan area.

The decision to change the boundary can not be taken back and it has broad impacts on farmland, water quality and forest cover.

Patricia Burton
pdjburton@yahoo.com
17120 Queen Victoria Ct
Gaithersburg , Maryland 20877

From: Jean S Findlay <jsfindlay3@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 2:39 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Keep the Sugarloaf Plan Boundary at 270

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Commissioners ,

I have been watching the Sugarloaf zoning plan discussions in the county. Please be cautious when considering the boundaries of the overlay. Any attempt to add density on the west side of I-270 does not mesh with the protections promised by the plan that was passed. Farms and forests, once developed, can't be returned to those uses. Please keep the plan boundary at I-270 where it belongs.

Jean S Findlay
jsfindlay3@comcast.net
PO Box 125
Dickerson, Maryland 20842

From: [Julie Ritter](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Keep the Sugarloaf Plan Boundary at 270
Date: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 11:21:43 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Commissioners ,

I have been watching the Sugarloaf zoning plan discussions in the county and urge caution as the boundaries of the overlay are considered. Any attempt to add density on the west side of 270 is not in keeping with the protections promised by the plan that passed. Farms and forests, once developed can't be returned to that use. Please keep the plan boundary at 270 where it belongs.

Julie Ritter
jules_sara@yahoo.com
22134 Dickerson Rd,
Dickerson, Maryland 20842

From: [Fran Rothstein](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Keep the Sugarloaf Plan Boundary at 270
Date: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 11:15:15 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Commissioners ,

I am concerned about the county's apparent lack of commitment to the preservation of the Sugarloaf Mountain area.

I-270 should remain the long-recognized boundary and the best line for planning purposes when the commission discusses this plan. No high-density development should occur west of I-270 in the Sugarloaf Plan area.

The decision to change the boundary can not be taken back and it has broad impacts on farmland, water quality and forest cover.

Fran Rothstein
rothsteinfran@gmail.com
130 Hilltop Road
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

From: [Claire Wolfe](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Keep the Sugarloaf Plan Boundary at 270
Date: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 11:29:01 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Commissioners ,

Although I am a Montgomery County resident, I spend a considerable amount of time in Frederick County birding and hiking, and while there, enjoying the many restaurants and amenities Frederick County offers. The Sugarloaf Mountain area is a frequent destination for me. I am concerned about the county's apparent lack of commitment to the preservation of the Sugarloaf Mountain area.

I-270 should remain the long-recognized boundary and the best line for planning purposes when the commission discusses this plan. No high-density development should occur west of I-270 in the Sugarloaf Plan area.

The decision to change the boundary can not be taken back and it has broad impacts on farmland, water quality and forest cover.

Claire Wolfe
c_wolfe2003@yahoo.com
14305 Long Channel Drive
Germantown, Maryland 20874

From: Janie Benton <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 9:09 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Committing to Strong Sugarloaf Region Protections Right

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Councilmembers ,

I have lived in the shadow of Sugarloaf since 1979. I am a Montgomery county resident who has witnessed countryside converted to outlet malls and concrete covered mega developments. The promise offered by Frederick County's Sugarloaf Landscape Management Plan is a crucial commitment for future healthy land use. Conserving open landscape in a contiguous area is a primary intent of the Plan. In order to follow the promise of keeping green space in a consolidated area land use zoning should be clearly stated. Failure to do so is a violation of the decisions made when the Plan was approved.

I have observed pressures for development and economic profits by businesses who offer hardscape play areas and no parklike settings. Now is the time to clearly state that the line should be drawn now before sprawl removes farmland permanently west of 270. If Montgomery officials can create agriculture reserves so can Frederick officials.

Janie Benton
record-hokey01@icloud.com
16407 Comus Road
Clarksburg, Maryland 20871

1875 Mt. Ephraim Rd.
Adamstown, MD 21710
March 31, 2023

Frederick County Planning Commission
30 North Market St.
Frederick, MD 21701

Commission members:

I have read the submission from the Maryland Forests Association (MFA) regarding timber harvesting requirements that pertain to the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan. I have the following comments:

They make two claims that merit a critical scrutiny. One is that existing requirements "already protect water quality and other resources." The key term here is "and other resources." There is no question that Frederick County and the Maryland Forest Service are sensitive to sediment and erosion control issues. But those are not the major issue on Sugarloaf Mountain. There are creeks and streams, but they do not dominate this landscape. Much of the mountain is dry. The bigger issue is the integrity of this forest, something that existing requirements do not cover. The other claim is that property owners in the Sugarloaf area "maintain and manage resources with public benefit for County residents."

I have lived on Sugarloaf Mountain for 25 years, and I have hiked practically every square foot of it, and I have seen the best and the worst that property owners and loggers have done to this landscape. The most important project from a regulatory perspective is the project that transpired at the backside of my property on Mount Ephraim Road. The property at issue is at 7621 Stewart Hill Road. What this project demonstrates is the severe damage that loggers can do when there is little or no public management, a program that is defined by logging guidelines and the inspector that will administer these guidelines, consistent with programs that other counties have developed to address exactly this issue. I see no reason why Frederick should not follow their lead. A close look at the facts about this project should convince you that public management is absolutely important.

The bulk of the damage that this logger did is not visible from Stewart Hill Road. Naturally. This logger knew how to hide the worst of it from public view. For one thing, he dragged 10 acres of logging debris (something that loggers call "slash") to the very back and back side of this property, creating two gigantic slash piles. I estimate these piles at 25,000 cubic feet and 15,000 cubic feet. I contacted the Maryland Forest Service about this issue.

The State Fire Supervisor, Mr. Chris Robertson, sent someone on his team, Mr. Shannon Wolfe, to assess the situation. For one thing, Mr. Wolfe said that those two piles should not be there. Responsible loggers leave the debris where it falls, something that is better for the regrowth of the forest and less likely to concentrate a forest fire issue. These gigantic piles are something that he called a “fire control issue,” meaning that an ignition of any kind—a spark from a chain saw, a cigarette butt, a lightning strike, arson, etc.—could start a fire that could burn out of control for hours, an issue that the fire department would not be able to access because of this remote location. Mr. Wolfe said that he has never seen a slash pile that large.

This is something that the Planning Commission should take to heart. The county closed out this logging project without addressing a major fire hazard. This is reason enough to say that the libertarian approach that the MFA is promoting is not a sound public policy. Also, these giant slash piles were not the only issue that made the case for public management. There are several other issues that merit a serious scrutiny.

One is a virtual clearing of the forest. What the Frederick County Forestry Board formally approved was not a clearing. It was 142 marked trees, the biggest and the best for commercial purposes. A responsible logger would have worked through the forest to minimize the damage to other trees, something that would secure the future of this forest. What this logger did is something else altogether. He took practically every tree of any value, something that totally opened the forest canopy to direct sunlight and a major weed infestation. He ran a military-scale front-loader through practically every square foot of this 10-acre site. What he left was mostly dead trees and trees that demonstrate little if any commercial value.

After this project was closed out, I asked a number of local tree experts to take a look at this logging site and tell me what they thought of it. One is Mr. Ryan Carroll, a certified arborist with Bartlett Tree Experts, a company that does work on my property. What he said is important to understand. This area of the forest will not recover. The reason is plain to see. There was not enough of a forest left to establish a viable platform for growth going forward. I asked another certified arborist, Mr. Eric Baker, owner of Baker Tree Service, another company that does work on my property, to take a look. He called it what it is—a weed-infested wasteland. Also, I asked Mr. Jimmy Polino, a manager for Arbometrics, a company that does tree pruning and removals for Potomac Edison, to take a look. His exact words were “a scalping of the forest.”

The other issue to look at this weed-infested wasteland. The primary culprit is Japanese stilt grass, something that came to this country about 100 years ago as packing material for porcelain from China. It spread from Tennessee across the whole eastern United States, from Maine to Florida. It became a major issue for Frederick County about 25 years ago. The reality today is stilt grass lining practically every road in the Sugarloaf area. And what does that mean

for logging? The answer is loggers that track this seed wherever they go, from one logging project to another. This is a sun-loving plant, meaning that wherever loggers open up the canopy, this plant will flourish. There are no natural controls. It will grow to about three feet and thicken to the point that other plants, notably the native vegetation, cannot germinate or grow to term. Also, it does not break down or thin out over time. It establishes a seed base that will produce this plant for the foreseeable future. A single plant can produce as many as a thousand seeds. The only native plant that is tough enough to compete with this exotic weed in these open areas is brambles.

There was also a legal issue with this logging project. This property owner and his logger began taking down trees before they were given a permit. I was walking my dog when I heard the sawing. I called Mr. Eric Dodson, the Frederick County Environmental Inspector, and asked him to check it out. When he saw what the logger was doing, he asked him to stop cutting down the trees. The logger simply ignored this request. He continued to take down trees. The county then issued a stop-work order. Here again the property owner and the logger ignored this public intervention. They kept on cutting down the trees. At this point the county administered a fine, something that they simply ignored. The county then countered with a lawsuit. But nothing that these people did disqualified this project. Frederick County Permits and Inspections gave them a permit.

And finally, there was no effort to work with the neighbors to this project, to give them any notice or accommodate their concerns about this project that tore through the middle of this neighborhood. We knew exactly what this property owner was up to before he started this project. We wrote letters expressing our concerns to Gary Hessong, Director, Permits and Inspections and contacted the *Frederick News Post*. Nobody from this government was willing to speak up. The only party that did speak up was the MFA. They promoted this project for the article that the *Post* published. They claimed that it would benefit the forest.

How does all this happen? For one thing, the responsible party was Permits and Inspections, an agency that is largely dependent on outside parties, notably the state forester and the state Forestry Board, parties that are demonstrably pro-logging, to decide on the integrity of a project. That is a mistake. This government should not trust these outsiders to do what is right for the residents of this county. They demonstrate their own agenda, something that this logging project spoke to. Another answer is the practicalities associated with managing a logging project without guidelines. The manager was Mr. Dodson, the Environmental Inspector. What he said to me about this project is important to understand. His exact words were, "Things got out of control." The important question is why. For one thing, once sediment control, the only regulated issue, was settled, his regulatory duties were done. Also, he is not a forester. Absent any guidelines, he was not able to manage this project. Once a logger has a permit from the county, he is free to do more or less whatever he wants, no

questions asked, for 12 months. Mr. Dodson could only check on this project periodically. He took plenty of pictures, but did not challenge this logger. At this point he was something like a janitor, the man that has the keys to open and close the door to a project. The results are plain to see—a project that punished this natural environment and these neighbors for commercial purposes and left behind a major fire hazard.

The idea, then, that existing requirements “already protect water quality and other resources,” and that property owners in the Sugarloaf area “maintain and manage resources with public benefit for County residents” is not on the face of it believable. Bad things do happen, and they will happen again. The only good answer is a public authority and a program, something that is defined by guidelines and inspectors. Nothing less than that is good enough.

What I suggest is two things. One is to hire a county forester, somebody that will demonstrate a responsible approach to the integrity of the forest and the county residents that have to live with the results of a logging project. The other idea is to touch base with other counties, parties that have active programs complete with guidelines and supervisors. I would call that due diligence. What have they learned from their experience, and what do they suggest that you do? Also, what do they make of this idea from the MFA that guidelines and supervisors are not really necessary? Would they choose to abandon their program if somebody gave them that option?

One idea from the MFA that I can endorse is the importance of a broader approach, something that will address the county as a whole. Doing things area-by-area is unnecessarily complicated. The difference that we demonstrate is what to do about this larger area. I would like to see a logging program, something that is defied by guidelines and inspectors, that manages the entire county, consistent with programs that other counties adopt. By contrast, the MFA would not like to see any public management anywhere in this county.

And finally, I would like to show you what exactly I am talking about, the damage that this logger did to this natural environment, notably things that you can only see from the backside of this project, the area that is hidden from public view. You can access this perspective from my property. I am prepared to accommodate you on your schedule. You can reach me by phone or email.

Thank you for your attention to these issues.

John Gehman
301-874-0151
jgehman@hughes.net

From: Ann Connor <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Saturday, April 8, 2023 10:45 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Getting Sugarloaf Region Protections Right

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Commissioners ,

I have been watching the Sugarloaf Landscape Management Plan and while I'm happy the plan passed, getting the zoning right is very important.

The common sense boundary of 270 needs to guide where future development should go and the plan must respect that.

Ann Connor
conrfam@aol.com
17325 Soper St
Poolesville, Maryland 20837

From: Suzanne Taylor Dater <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Saturday, April 8, 2023 5:47 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Keep the Sugarloaf Plan Boundary at 270

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Commissioners ,

I have been watching the Sugarloaf zoning plan discussions in the county and urge caution as the boundaries of the overlay are considered. Any attempt to add density on the west side of 270 is not in keeping with the protections promised by the plan that passed.

Farms and forests, once developed can't be returned to that use. Please keep the plan boundary at 270 where it belongs.

Suzanne Taylor Dater
stdater@gmail.com
12 Sangamore Court
Bethesda, Maryland 20816

From: [Barbara Luchsinger](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [County Executive](#); [Council Members](#); [barbara.luchsinger](#)
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Monday, April 17, 2023 10:40:36 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We strongly support the I270 boundary for the Sugarloaf Plan in order to maintain the Plan's integrity but moreover, to maintain the intent of the Plan. The Plan's area should remain intact for posterity to provide the agricultural atmosphere which is a prized aspect of Frederick County. No infractions should occur because once one starts, more will follow as we have witnessed over and over not far away.

As tree farmers our family strongly supports the forestry language in the Overlay legislation. Trees are more important than ever as humans try to maintain balance with Mother Nature.

Similarly, we oppose the Windridge zoning request: the piecemeal rezoning will only lead to more and there goes all of southern Frederick County.

Barbara Luchsinger

Thurston Road

From: [Steve Poteat](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Council Members](#); [County Executive](#)
Subject: Tree Cutting and Forestry Provisions of the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan
Date: Friday, April 14, 2023 2:49:33 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Comments on in the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan Overlay Zone regarding Tree Cutting and Forestry Provisions

Steve Poteat, Sugarloaf Mountain Road, April 14, 2023.

I strongly recommend that the proposed “Tree Cutting and Forestry” provisions remain in the Sugarloaf Plan and the Overlay Zone. Both the adopted Livable Frederick Plan and the adopted Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan recognize the importance of maintaining and promoting the forest cover in Frederick County. It is time that forests receive the protection that they require and deserve, especially as they experience the ill effects of climate change. For example, please note the widespread stress and decline of Chestnut Oaks in our region, a vital species in our local forests. Forests are our partners in facing climate change challenges and we know that larger and older trees are more effective at sequestering carbon.

Planning staff suggest that the forestry issue should be deferred until a county-wide approach can be developed. On the contrary, the Sugarloaf Plan should be used as a pilot effort to see what works and what needs to be revised. A promise of future action at some unknown later date is too late for our forests, especially in the Sugarloaf area. The County has strict tree and forestry regulations (Forest Resource Ordinance) as part of the subdivision process: we need similar oversight of forest protection and timber harvesting activities.

My urgent concern at this time relates to timber harvesting. I suggest that you review very carefully the letter dated March 31, 2023, submitted to the record on the master plan by Mr. John Gehman of Mt. Ephraim Road. His letter recounts the process of forest destruction that took place adjacent to his property on the west side of Sugarloaf Mountain. In contrast, that current letter to the record from the Maryland Forestry Association states that current regulations are sufficient and no further forestry controls are required. I think Mr. Gehman’s letter challenges that assertion and lays out in vivid detail why more regulation is needed. The clear cutting of 10 acres without a permit, the inability of county staff to stop the illegal logging operation, the subsequent after-the-fact ineffectual approval by State forestry officials, and finally the creation of a significant fire hazard left behind by the logger are ample evidence that more forestry regulations are required now and should be included in the approved Sugarloaf Plan Overlay Zone.

I would like to add my experience over the past 30 years with three selective harvest cuts on my property. I followed all the protocols including the preparation of three successive Forestry Management Plans approved by Maryland Department Natural Resources Forest Service and the acquisition of the costly services of three different registered Maryland foresters. The registered foresters “cruised” the property and prepared selective harvesting plans, secured the review and approval of the Frederick County Forestry Board, bid the projects on my behalf, secured all necessary permits and each time were to act as my representatives in the monitoring and regulating of actual harvest cuts.

While my most recent harvest was done better due in part to my increased forestry knowledge and my insistence that improved forestry be practiced, during the previous two harvests there were practices dramatically different with inappropriate crossing of waterways, damage to wetlands, cutting of trees in floodplains, harvesting on steep slopes, excessive damage to

remaining trees along skidder trails, misplacement of slash in fire trails and inadequate final preparation of landing areas. In short, the best laid plans go out the window when the chain saws hit the trees and the skidders roar through the forests without supervision.

I have never had a forestry inspector from any level of government review the harvesting work in progress or upon completion. While my foresters were responsible for monitoring the harvest cuts, they showed up only once or twice during the multi-month harvests. I have come to realize that there is a built-in natural conflict of interest for the forester and the logger: The foresters and the loggers work closely together from job to job. My harvesting jobs were just some of many and the trees were viewed as a product to be marketed, not a natural resource to be protected. The forester's best interest is working more cooperatively with the logger than the client. It is the nature of the business. More independent regulation is needed.

The Maryland Forest Service is under the State Department of Natural Resources which is charged with the preservation of natural resources, an objective consistent with the objectives of both the Livable Frederick Plan and the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan. The time has come to promote the preservation of forests, especially as we try to prevent and adapt to the effects of climate change. Obviously, selective timber harvesting will continue but much more regulation is needed to protect in the County the forests to the maximum practical extent and to avoid future catastrophes as experienced by John Gehman along Mt. Ephraim Road. Personally, I plan no more harvest cuts, I learned the hard way and to the detriment of my forest. How many more specimen trees and forests will you allow to be removed as part of the subdivision process? Be a part of the solution, not the problem.

Please maintain the "Tree Cutting and Forestry" provisions in the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan Overlay Zone. Remember, this plan is a preservation plan not a development plan. Thank you for considering my comments.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Natelli Communities

April 17, 2023

Members of the Frederick County Planning Commission
Winchester Hall
12 E Church Street
Frederick, MD 21701

Re: Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan

Dear Planning Commission Members:

As the community enters its fourth year of deliberations over the Sugarloaf Area Plan, it was heartening to participate in a work session in January with other community members, County staff and Planning Commission members to discuss ways to bring this all to a satisfactory conclusion. I think most participants engaged in this process over the past three years would agree that being able to freely exchange views is certainly preferable to being limited to three minutes of comments at public hearings. Perhaps more sessions like this, earlier in the process, would have helped forge a better path forward.

Unfortunately, it seems the basic positions staked out by various factions, regarding the extent and applicability of the Overlay District, remain largely irreconcilable. **We, for instance, continue to point out that LFMP is quite clear in setting forth the broader community's intent to preserve property along the I-270 Interstate Corridor for economic development**, while others continue to maintain that no development should occur in the entire 30 square mile planning area.

Applying the Overlay to properties along I-270 runs counter to the intent of LFMP because aspects of the Overlay (like limiting building footprints to 10,000 or 15,000 SF) make future economic development nearly impossible - absent the removal of these restrictions in the future. I-270 is an important economic corridor for Frederick County and the State of Maryland, and it should be studied via an area plan process as Livable Frederick intended. **The Sugarloaf process did not include any economic or long-range planning assessment of the I-270 corridor as part of its work plan.** It seems short-sighted and lacking in sound planning principles to apply restrictions to properties along the corridor now, via the Sugarloaf process, before the County has had the opportunity to fully evaluate the I-270 corridor. These restrictions will likely prevent a fair and equitable evaluation of opportunities for the I-270 corridor in the future.

I believe there are ways to move forward that would overcome these shortcomings in the process. For instance, the County could consider the following alternatives:

- Hold off on making any decision as to where to apply the Overlay District until after the County completes an area plan study for the I-270 corridor. In fact, the Planning Staff presented their 'Annual Progress Report and Implementation Program' last year to the

Planning Commission, which indicated that the 'I-270 Corridor Futures Plan' would be developed during 2023-2024. Applying the Overlay to properties along I-270 now, prior to the completion of the I-270 Corridor Futures Plan, will taint the process and prevent a fair and objective review of the I-270 Corridor for economic development. I seriously doubt there would be any adverse consequence associated with waiting for a more complete picture before deciding where the Overlay should be applied.

- Decide now to set the boundary of the Overlay in the location proposed in the July 2021 recommended plan, with the boundary established along Rt 80 and Thurston Road, instead of along I-270. This would leave unencumbered for now the properties along I-270 near the existing and future interchanges, including our properties. If, after completion of an I-270 corridor study, the County concludes that the Overlay should apply to all properties on the west side of I-270, then the County would be free at that time to expand the applicability of the Overlay as appropriate.
- Introduce clear language into the Overlay and Sugarloaf Plan that the actions taken by the County in adopting the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay are not intended to diminish the opportunity for a thorough evaluation of the development potential of the properties along the I-270 Corridor as part of a future area plan corridor study.

The Livable Frederick Master Plan and the initial draft of the Sugarloaf Plan, released in July, 2021, acknowledged the need to balance the preservation and economic development goals for southern Frederick County, and appropriately accounted for the future potential of the I-270 Interstate Corridor. We can still accomplish this, by bringing some balance to the decisions being made as we complete the Sugarloaf Plan.

Sincerely,



Tom Natelli, CEO
Natelli Communities