



Maryland Department of Planning

Martin O'Malley
Governor

Anthony G. Brown
Lt. Governor

Richard Eberhart Hall
Secretary

Matthew J. Power
Deputy Secretary

July 19, 2011

The Honorable Winslow F. Burhans III
Town of New Market
39 West Main Street
New Market MD 21774

Re: 2011 Supplement to the 2005 New Market Master Plan

Dear Mr. Burhans:

Thank you for submitting the 2011 Supplement to the 2005 New Market Master Plan to the Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) for our review.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 410.767.4533 should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter G. Conrad', is written over the word 'Sincerely,'.

Peter G. Conrad, Director
Local Government Assistance

Enclosure: Comments on the 2011 Supplement to the 2005 New Market Master Plan, Draft Town of New Market Water Resources Element, Draft Town of New Market Municipal Growth Element, Municipal Growth Element Checklist, MD Department of Agriculture comments, MD Department of Transportation comments

cc: Eric Soter, Director, Frederick County Planning & Zoning
Jenny King, Regional Planner
Rich Josephson, Director, Planning Services
Rita Elliot, MDP Clearinghouse
File



Maryland Department of Planning
Comments on the 2011 Supplement to the New Market Master Plan
July 19, 2011

During the 2006 Legislative Session House Bill 1141 was passed requiring counties and municipalities to address several new elements, one of which is the Municipal Growth Element (MGE) within their comprehensive plans. Under the provisions of this law, all new elements will need to be included in comprehensive plans by October 1, 2009 or if the Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) approved a 6 or 12-month extension, April 1, 2010 or October 1, 2010, respectively.

Guidance documents for the MGE and the Water Resources Element (WRE) are available at the Maryland Department of Planning website: <http://planning.maryland.gov>.

MDP commends the Town and Frederick County as they “prepare a joint master plan that will lead to a Joint Planning Agreement cooperatively developed and recognized by both jurisdictions,” as indicated in the Supplement to the New Market Municipal Growth Element. Through this joint planning process, we believe that the Town and the County will reach a consensus on where and how the areas surrounding the Town should grow to achieve both jurisdictions’ smart growth visions and goals. It is in the community interest in which the New Market’s historical and small town character will be enhanced through the implementation of compact, mixed-use and well-designed developments with adequate public infrastructure, community amenities, and connected street networks safely and effectively accommodating vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles for the existing Town and future growth areas.

Municipal Growth Element

The Maryland Department of Planning appreciates the Town providing additional information regarding New Market’s growth areas and the distinction between Planning Areas and Annexation Areas. As noted in our Departments comments from July 2010, it would be helpful to provide population projections for the Town of New Market and Frederick County in one table. Including population projections for the New Market Region in the same table may confuse readers.

MDP appreciates the Town providing additional information regarding New Market’s anticipated financing mechanisms to support public services and infrastructure. As noted in the supplement, a Joint Planning Agreement allows Frederick County and New Market to work together, allowing both jurisdictions to accomplish mutual goals.

MDP appreciates the modifications made to the Growth Areas and Financing Mechanisms sections in this Supplemental document and encourage you to re-visit MDP’s July 2010 Municipal Growth Element comments. Below are two recommendations to consider.

- A map illustrating the annexation area(s), its zoning, residential development capacity and future land use.
- As referenced on page 10, Article III, Section C, Map 2 New Market Proposed Land Use was not included with this Supplement. Please include if necessary.

It remains that the Plan still conflates the concept of “build out”, which has no set time period, with the amount of growth expected in the Plan’s horizon year.

Population Growth Projections

MDP Population Projections	Census 2000	Proj 2005	Proj 2010	Census 2010	Proj 2015	Proj 2020	Proj 2025	Proj 2030
Population	427	480	594	656	763	990	1,276	1,680
Population Per Household	2.69	2.68	2.67	2.84	2.64	2.62	2.60	2.60
Households	159	179	222	231	289	378	490	647
Vacancy Rate	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%
Housing Units	170	192	238	247	309	404	524	692

As was reported in a previous memo on this subject, above are MDP’s most recent population projections for the Town of New Market. MDP was very close on the 2010 number of households and housing units, as well as getting the vacancy rate right, but underestimated the average household size. The average household size for New Market rose to 2.84 in 2010 (higher than it was in 1980) and therefore its population count of 656 was greater than MDP’s projection of 594.¹ We recommend that the latest Census numbers be included in Table 1 as presented on page 8 of the Supplement.

A review of the population projections in the Master Plan Supplement finds that future population and household trends are still not clearly laid out. Revisions to the “Background and Trend Data” section of the Plan set forth on page 10 of the Supplement show that the Town is using MDP’s household projection of 647 households within the city in 2030. Note that MDP’s population projection does not take annexation or carrying capacity into account, but simply assumes that additional land will be annexed over time to accommodate population growth. Therefore, adding additional population based on the carrying capacity of annexed land would be incorrect as that factor has already been taken into account in the projection. It is possible that there could be more population growth in annexed areas if there are specific factors pushing that growth, but the Plan does not set forth any factors that could drive this population growth within the Plan’s horizon.

The Supplement and the Plan reference the build-out scenario (set forth in modified form in Table 4 on page 12 of the Supplement) as a population projection for 2030, which reports completely different population numbers than the MDP projection referred to earlier in the Plan. This is partly due to the build-out scenario’s need to differentiate between development on land currently within Town boundaries and development occurring on future annexation lands. This difference is attributed to two factors: (1) a different household population number used by the Town (2.65 persons per household vs. 2.60 used by MDP and Frederick County); and (2) an assumed 925 new dwelling units expected to be constructed between now and 2030 on the Smith/Cline lands marked for annexation by the Town. The Plan states that the MDP population projection exceeds available land within the Town by 103 acres, but then implies that the total capacity of the Smith/Cline lands will be built out by 2030. It should be noted that a build-out analysis is not a population projection, as build-out represents the maximum potential carrying capacity of the land, while projections represent expected in population growth based on historic trends and overall countywide growth.

¹ http://planning.maryland.gov/msdc/census/cen2010/sf1/sumyprof/profile/CIP/cip_55650.pdf

Both the Plan and the Supplement conflate build-out and projection for the Smith/Cline annexation area.

The Plan should be adjusted to reflect 2010 Census data for current population, household, housing unit, and household population figures. More importantly, the expected housing unit and population growth on the Smith/Cline land area between now and 2030 should be projected, and the total capacity for development on the Smith/Cline land area should not be treated as a population projection.

Transportation

It is appreciated that the Town provided additional information on the potential traffic impacts of the proposed development and the parkway between Boyers Mill Rd. and MD 75. The traffic impact and other infrastructure adequacy issues should be evaluated as part of the joint master plan development process between the Town and the County to ensure the future expansion and development near the Town will achieve both the Town and the County's growth visions. In addition, it may be helpful for the Town to include related state agencies early on in the process for coordinating and addressing transportation, water/sewer, and other infrastructure impact issues as they would affect state facilities and relate to state funding programs and smart growth policies.

Water Resources

As noted in MDP's comments on the 2010 New Market MGE, the MGE also should include nonresidential water and sewer demand at build-out (demand of the Town's growth areas based on fulfillment of maximum zoning capacity), specifically, from the mixed commercial and industrial growth areas (Delaplaine and Ganley). The Supplement does not provide this information."

Overall, given the significant difference between the Town MGE forecast of water and sewer demand at build-out and the amount of water and sewer allocation available (and projected to be available) for the Town from the County's water and sewer systems (as indicated in the New Market WRE and MGE), the vision of the New Market MGE might not be realized. As noted in MDP's comments on the 2010 New Market WRE, if the County is the only planned source for water and sewer for the Town, the Town's WRE should include a statement that all future development will be contingent upon securing water and sewer allocations from the County. The New Market MGE supplement also should include this statement.