
PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED FOR ADJACENCY REVIEW PROCESS

Maine Land Use Planning Commission
Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry

Adjacency Review Comments, Group #5: *Comments about proposed rule revisions related to application of the adjacency principle*

The Commission appreciates the broad public interest in its review of the adjacency principle, and will consider comments about the review when submitted. Because the comment period will span almost four months, the Commission will generally make written public comments available on the website after a Commission Meeting where the adjacency review is discussed. Groups of comments include those received to date from the last time the Commission published a group.

Comments submitted between: July 7, 2018 – July 31, 2018

Public Comment Deadline: September 24, 2018

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Kip Cleaver <kip16917@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2018 12:08 PM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: Proposed policy to modify the adjacency policy

Writing to express me and my family's strongly felt opposition to this. The precious Maine woods and lakes that have not been spoiled by houses, jet skis and pontoon boats are seriously threatened by this proposal.

Having the vote in November is an obvious rush as well making many observers what kind of influence land owners and developers are having on the Commission.

The one mile adjacency rule is critical to protecting the character of Maines wilderness.

The development happens and the wilderness is gone forever. Its a huge decision the demands much more time and input.

Kip Cleaver
Rockland

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Ayotte, Shannon
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2018 2:21 PM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: FW: N Maine Development

? This was in my junk mail

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

From: lcclark@fairpoint.net [mailto:lcclark@fairpoint.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 5:47 PM
To: DACF <DACF@maine.gov>
Subject: N Maine Development

NODEVELOPMENT!

Carol Clark

Sent from Mail <<https://go.microsoft.com/fwlink/?LinkId=550986>> for Windows 10

RECEIVED

7/5/18

JUL 10 2018

LUPC - AUGUSTA

Dear Ben Groboe —

First, I want to thank you for all the work you have done, and continue to do, for Maine over the years. It is completely clear that you love this state. I am appreciative and grateful.

I would, however, very much like to express some concern over the "one-mile rule" proposal. If this rule changed to a "ten-mile rule", so much of Maine wild space would become vulnerable to development. Development has proven to be a sickness on this planet in many ways. Maine is still a forest heart. Maine is still clean. Maine's wild is maintained and revered. Why would we try to alter it any further?

I understand that Maine's economy would benefit in some ways from this change, but surely there are other ways? Surely we don't need to compromise our integrity to do it? I mean — aren't there other options? Let's learn from other states and big cities. What more can we do? Let's not show the nation that we don't value our remaining wilderness. Let's not ravage the remaining Sacred Native regions. Let's find a new way — together.

Ask the communities for economically stimulating brainstorm on online open forums. Let's keep Maine the way life should be!

With respect, and hope for the future,

Audrey Gidman

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Greg Kimber <gregkimber72@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2018 11:28 PM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: Comment in opposition to doing away with the "one-mile" rule

Dear Members of the LUPC,

I wanted to submit a comment in opposition to the Proposed Rule Revisions Related to Review of the Adjacency Principle. I do not have any special expertise on the subject. Nor do I have any new insights on the issue. I am simply a resident of central Maine (Temple, to be exact) who values the expanse of undeveloped land to my North. I value it for its natural beauty as well as for the habitat it provides to all the many animal and plant species there. I also believe that expanse of land is the thing that makes Maine unique as a State and is therefor important to our culture and our economy. The "one-mile" rule that has governed development in the North woods has proved effective in preserving the wild nature of that land. I believe the proposed changes to that rule would have negative consequences for that land and for the state as a whole. Let's stick with what we already know is working.

Sincerely,
Greg Kimber

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Gary Willhide <garywillhide@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 14, 2018 9:30 AM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: adjacency rules

Adding my comment for the Adjacency rules.

My number one concern is that the proposed rule changes have been put forth with very little notice to the public, from the state. With such a huge area being affected, the state should do much more to let the public know and give the citizens more time and opportunities to voice their opinions on this. I feel as if the process is being rushed.

Another concern of mine is what affect these rules would have on communities like Caribou, Ashland and Woodland. These communities already are struggling to raise enough money to fix their roads. Would the new rules draw people away from these communities and into the unorganized townships? It doesn't seem to me like there has been enough time to study this.

I also have to wonder what these new rules would do to our scenic areas. Tourism is a major industry, in Maine. If we end up with houses all up and down our scenic roads, will people be as likely to visit? I'm thinking not. One of the most beautiful drives in the country is route 11 in the autumn. Now add much more development along that corridor and its not so pretty anymore. Again, more time is needed to ask these questions.

What would happen if under the new rules, an industrial farm or chemical waste facility were placed near Scapan Lake and developed a small leak that went unnoticed for a long time? Not only would the placing of one of these facilities forever change the look and feel area, it could potentially damage the watershed.

The new rules will not only affect the unorganized townships but, will affect almost all of Maine. If I'm off on any of my thoughts on the new rules, that only goes to show that more time should have been spent communicating with the public.

I encourage LUPC to slow down and spend more time on outreach to the public on the new rules. The old rules have been working just fine so, there is no reason to rush.

Thank you for your time.

Gary Willhide
Castle Hill, ME

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Carlton Wilcox <cwilcox.maine@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 9:00 AM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: LUPC Adjacency Comment

Dear Mr. Godsoe:

Following are my comments concerning the proposed LUPC Adjacency change.

The Why Change section posted on the LUPC website

- ***"The one-mile test is a blunt planning tool, long-recognized as needing improvement.*** Existing, dispersed development can provide a springboard for new development into remote areas or onto undeveloped lake shores. This can affect the cost of providing public services (e.g., fire protection, ambulance) and impact forestry operations, wildlife habitat and the character of the UT."

makes it sound that this proposed rule change is going to reduce sprawl in the north Maine woods. It does not seem to pass the straight face test. The proposal will change the 1 mile adjacency limit for a 2 mile of public roads and 10 mile from a rural hub. What defines a rural hub? A remote hunting camp or two. 10 miles is a lot greater than 1 mile. Without better definition and clarity it appears the proposal does not pass the straight face test and is nothing more than proposal by large landowners that want more ability to sell off vacation home lots. Sorry, the existing zoning has been in place for many years. If the landowners were not aware of when they purchased the land that is their fault for not performing due diligence research. As a resident and Maine tax payer I don't want more sprawl in this state particularly in the Maine North Woods. Maine is the most rural state in the nation (lowest percentage of population living in a federal defined urban area). This sprawl has resulted in higher cost to deliver services and higher taxes. The last thing we need is more sprawl. The remoteness of the Maine North Woods is unique east of the Mississippi River. It is why I visit the Maine North Woods.

Sincerely,

Carlton C. Wilcox
New Gloucester, Maine

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Livesay, Nicholas
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 10:45 AM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: FW: North Woods Adjacency

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

From: Marianne McKinney [mailto:mmckinran@icloud.com]
Sent: Monday, July 09, 2018 8:13 AM
To: Livesay, Nicholas <Nicholas.Livesay@maine.gov>
Subject: North Woods Adjacency

Please help me direct my question to who best can address it.

Our natural resources in Maine are our hallmark. Can you please continue their protection by keeping the Adjacency Policy intact?

Thank you,

Marianne McKinney
5 Kerry Gardens
Belfast, ME 04915

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Beyer, Stacie R
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2018 4:00 PM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: FW: Adjacency & subdivision
Attachments: LUPC Letter review of subdivision rules.docx

Ben,

I am forwarding these comments to you, because they include comments on adjacency. I have replied to Hank thanking him for providing feedback on both the subdivision rule and adjacency policy reviews.

Stacie

From: Hank McPherson [mailto:hank@mcpherson timberlands.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2018 1:26 PM
To: Beyer, Stacie R <Stacie.R.Beyer@maine.gov>
Subject: Adjacency & subdivision

Dear Stacie

Pursuant to our conversation please find attached my comment as we discussed.

The below mentioned websites are a few that promote combined recreational & residential leisure opportunities.

www.blackberryfarm.com

Google clayoquot wilderness resort

www.pawsup.com

www.enchantmentgroup.com this one does resort planning and may be a good source

I know of some other good planning resources, if I can be helpful in the future do not hesitate to contact me.

Warmest regards,

Hank



07/17/2018

Hank McPherson
McPherson Timberlands
1182 Odlin Rd.
Hermon, Me 04401

RE: Review of Adjacency and Subdivision Rules

LUPC needs to provide assurances that the new development proposals attached to the proposed revisions to adjacency are not a burden just to property owners, but to the LUPC staff as well.

LUPC says that the new adjacency principle “will bring more certainty to the rezoning process”, but this seems overbroad and not a well-considered conclusion. I suspect LUPC staff that adopted the original adjacency principle mode came to that same assertion.

It is unnecessary for planning criteria and the appurtenant development regulations to be in conflict with one another. This conflict defeats the idea that development, when done properly, could benefit local economies and surrounding areas. It will be difficult for LUPC staff members from different departments to work together.

All parties in this debate want certainty; either certainty that they may develop their land, or certainty that land about which they have no ownership interest may not be developed. On its face, the map entitled “Location of Development; Primary and Secondary Locations” appears to provide that certainty, but apart from the certainty of areas where development will not occur, this “certainty” is misplaced. The map depicts only an approximation of areas where a rezoning would be permitted.

There are two problems with this approach. First, rezoning should not be wholly prohibited in areas outside of the Primary and Secondary Locations. For example, the general rezoning criteria in 10.08 does not adequately address – particularly when read in the context of 10.08B – how LUPC would address rezoning’s from M-GN to D-RS. LUPC must adequately address rezoning’s outside of Primary and Secondary Locations. Saying nothing and relying only on the statutory language in 12 M.R.S.A. § 685-A(8-A) has the effect of prohibiting rezoning outside of Primary and Secondary Locations. LUPC must provide a comparable mechanism for rezoning areas outside the Primary and Secondary Locations.

LUPC should be affirmatively tasked with mapping the Primary and Secondary Locations. It is disingenuous to purport to map such areas, yet state that such a visual depiction is only an

approximation, thereby requiring petitioners and staff to wade through the criteria in Chapter 10. Show us where the Primary and Secondary Locations are.

Another over-riding issue is the need for regulated public to readily understand and evaluate what a particular parcel of land's development potential may be. To date, LUPC staff have essentially required that rezoning petitions be accompanied with development or subdivision applications. This is overly burdensome. LUPC must amend the adjacency principle to provide a cost effective and meaningful way for LUPC to advise petitioners whether a particular proposal or particular parcel of land supports a rezoning. The question LUPC needs to be able to address is: Can I do a 20-lot subdivision at X?

Certain provisions in the proposed adjacency rule are problematic. For example:

1. Few landowners in the jurisdiction are benefitted by deeded easements from the nearest public road and utility structures to their ownership. A requirement that requires deeded access for rezoning's, even if only certain rezonings, effectively prohibits rezoning in the jurisdiction. The more sensible rule – and the rule that LUPC has complied with to date – is to allow rezonings regardless of legal access. Instead, legal access or the lack of it, should be addressed via disclosure. LUPC should formally codify the "Rule of the West". LUPC should recognize that development in the jurisdiction is not like development in, for example, Falmouth, and that access to such development should be consistent with the condition in the jurisdiction.
2. The statements of average lot size in the 10.02 Subdivision Density are too restrictive and should be deleted. It is enough to specify a range of lot size without further limiting the comparative size and layout of lots.
3. LUPC should define with specificity what is meant by "not unreasonably". At a minimum, LUPC must attach certain objective standards to this so-called standard. It is not enough to say "You'll know it when you see it".
4. Low density subdivisions should not be excluded from having water frontage. To do so renders low density subdivisions meaningless and even the most cursory of glances at Maine mapping makes that clear.
5. D-RD should include subdivisions as a use requiring a permit.
6. D-RS should not be limited to areas where public services may be provided efficiently or have close connection to recreational resource. As with access, LUPC's proposed requirement that certain new development be approximate to public services ignores the conditions and history of the jurisdiction. People go to the

jurisdiction to get away from public services, neighbors and so on. To necessitate that rezoning's occur only if previously unprovided public services are made available, ignores a defining characteristic of the jurisdiction.

7. Low density subdivision should be allowed in M-GN.

Density: The proposed subdivision rule and standards could imply that high density means something in the neighborhood of 14 to 30 lots. If a developer wanted to create a significant development with amenities, he or she would be required to create several willy-nilly subdivisions over time under the current proposal. LUPC should assign a senior member of its planning staff to create guidance for true high-density development. Depending on the scope, these developments may be up to 150+ lots, built in two or three phases. There is an emerging market for lodges and recreational areas of this kind and there are several consultants that can assist with this kind of planning. The LUPC jurisdiction has a number of areas where this kind of development could take place and it would be a boom to local economies.

Public view points: These areas should be defined by experts if the property in question is to be restricted based on this. The definition should be eliminated as the definition of a ridgeline is adequate for this purpose.

Page 12 5(f) should be eliminated. What additional requirements should there be after A through E are considered?

Sketch Plan: After consideration, the commission should indicate to the property owner that the plan is acceptable and that the applicant can move to full subdivision review.

Open space requirements are too aggressive, and the non-developable land area should have a tighter description. Are the back two-thirds of building envelopes counted, for example, if there is more than 20,000 square feet per lot?

Subdivision objectives should be reviewed during the sketch plan and indicate that they have been reviewed to meet commission objectives.

RECEIVED

JUL 19 2018

From: William Green green044@gmail.com
Subject: Opposition to Proposal to Change the 1-Mile Adjacency Rule LUPC - AUGUSTA
Date: Jul 9, 2018 at 11:28:40 PM
To: benjamin.godsoe@main.gov
Bcc: cooney.green104@gmail.com, green044@gmail.com

Dear Mr Godsoe,

I'm writing to urge that the 1-Mile Adjacency Rule NOT BE CHANGED. The current 1-mile rule concentrates development and prevents it from sprawling haphazardly. Urban sprawl is one reason I decided to leave New Jersey and move to Maine. The costs of urban sprawl are many- economic as well as environmental. There have been so many urban sprawl areas in my old state that are now decaying and empty. I don't want Maine to end up like New Jersey. I want there to be wild areas like the North Woods (whether I use them or not).

Thank You,
William Green
Green044@gmail.com



25 Wildwood Drive
Cape Elizabeth, ME 04107

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Craig Hadley <craighadley@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 21, 2018 8:47 AM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: Adjacency Rule Proposal

Dear LURC:

I provide a perspective as a Maine resident and landowner in UT (Deer Island, Moosehead Lake) and I access the North Maine Woods territory frequently each year for hunting. I live In Owls Head and work in Bangor.

I believe the LURC intent is well founded and the current one-mile blanket rule is likely outdated. That said, just common sense tells me in looking at the Map of the plan and its impacts that this proposed rule will be a substantial encroachment on and deterioration of the wildlands without compensating benefit of equal or greater value. I would urge a less expansive change and a go slow-gradual approach. Later study can be made to assess the impacts of any rule change and further adjustments offered and implemented.

Thank you,

Craig D. Hadley
102 North Shore Road
Owls Head, Maine 04854

RECEIVED

JUL 23 2018

LUPC - AUGUSTA

Maine Land Use Planning Commission
Board of Commissioners
Everett Worcester, Chair

I am aware that the Maine Land Use Planning Commission is considering revisions to the adjacency principle. As a resident and/or property owner of Lexington Township, it is important to me that my voice is included in this planning decision for my community.

I am requesting that Lexington Twp. be changed to a Resource-dependent Location designation for the following reasons:

1. The townships and plantation along Long Falls Dam Road form a region of shared rural qualities, character and natural resources. Targeting Lexington Twp. for types and densities of development that are different from these other places fractures this regional continuity. The other townships in this region have been designated as Resource-dependent Locations, and Lexington Twp. should be, as well.

2. The Resource-dependent Location designation is more consistent with the findings and ideas expressed in the 2015 regional community guided planning and zoning effort, which included participation by residents of Lexington Twp. The group reported, "The Region includes large tracts of industrial forest lands, mountains, rivers, lakes, and streams that all contribute significantly to an economy driven by a mix of natural resources, outdoor recreation, and tourism," and cited shared resources - Bigelow Mountain Range, Upper Kennebec River watershed, Appalachian Trail, Interconnected Trail System, Maine Huts and Trails, and the Northern Forest Canoe Trail - all of which are accessible through Lexington Twp. via Long Falls Dam Road.

3. Existing infrastructure and services in regional hubs, and rural hubs along Route 16, make those towns more suitable than Lexington Twp. for the types of development allowed in Primary Locations. Many of them are actively exploring and promoting new commercial development in their own towns. In 2006, the Brookings Institution reported, "Maine's regional hubs are far from built-out," and "could absorb all or most of their region's future residential, commercial, and industrial growth".

4. Designating Primary Locations by using a 10-mile straight-line distance as a measure of a township's accessibility to critical services didn't work in some places - the LUPC has already amended its map to account for some of these cases. It also does not work for Lexington Twp. For example, while it shares a border with a rural hub, the reality is that natural barriers such as roadless open spaces, mountains and ponds mean people in Lexington Twp. are over 20 miles away from ambulance service.

Thank you for your considering my request to change Lexington Township to a Resource-dependent Location designation.

Signed *Geoffrey L. Dickson* Date *7/2/18*

Printed Name *Geoffrey L. Dickson*

Address *331 spruce pd RD Lexington Twp*

RECEIVED
JUL 24 2018
LUPC - AUGUSTA

Maine Land Use Planning Commission
Board of Commissioners
Everett Worcester, Chair

I am aware that the Maine Land Use Planning Commission is considering revisions to the adjacency principle. As a resident and/or property owner of Lexington Township, it is important to me that my voice is included in this planning decision for my community.

I am requesting that Lexington Twp. be changed to a Resource-dependent Location designation for the following reasons:

1. The townships and plantation along Long Falls Dam Road form a region of shared rural qualities, character and natural resources. Targeting Lexington Twp. for types and densities of development that are different from these other places fractures this regional continuity. The other townships in this region have been designated as Resource-dependent Locations, and Lexington Twp. should be, as well.

2. The Resource-dependent Location designation is more consistent with the findings and ideas expressed in the 2015 regional community guided planning and zoning effort, which included participation by residents of Lexington Twp. The group reported, "The Region includes large tracts of industrial forest lands, mountains, rivers, lakes, and streams that all contribute significantly to an economy driven by a mix of natural resources, outdoor recreation, and tourism," and cited shared resources - Bigelow Mountain Range, Upper Kennebec River watershed, Appalachian Trail, Interconnected Trail System, Maine Huts and Trails, and the Northern Forest Canoe Trail - all of which are accessible through Lexington Twp. via Long Falls Dam Road.

3. Existing infrastructure and services in regional hubs, and rural hubs along Route 16, make those towns more suitable than Lexington Twp. for the types of development allowed in Primary Locations. Many of them are actively exploring and promoting new commercial development in their own towns. In 2006, the Brookings Institution reported, "Maine's regional hubs are far from built-out," and "could absorb all or most of their region's future residential, commercial, and industrial growth".

4. Designating Primary Locations by using a 10-mile straight-line distance as a measure of a township's accessibility to critical services didn't work in some places - the LUPC has already amended its map to account for some of these cases. It also does not work for Lexington Twp. For example, while it shares a border with a rural hub, the reality is that natural barriers such as roadless open spaces, mountains and ponds mean people in Lexington Twp. are over 20 miles away from ambulance service.

Thank you for your considering my request to change Lexington Township to a Resource-dependent Location designation.

Signed Margaret Murillo Date 7/21/18

Printed Name MARGARET MURILLO

Address 170 Butler Pond Rd Lexington Twp ME

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Janet Laird-Lagasse <lairdart@myfairpoint.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 26, 2018 10:15 AM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: Land use

Business and its endless developments must not be allowed to over-rule the people. Development must not always take undeveloped wild land and destroy the pristine in favor of the wealthy. Development should be directed to land already in human use, to re-vitalize city areas that have fallen into blight.

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Mary Ellen Wilson <merw74@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 26, 2018 10:23 AM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: 1 mile rule

Sir,

Please retain the 1 mile rule. The Maine woods should not have the proposed 10 mile rule for development (nor should any other place). This would devastate this beautiful tract of land. Do the right thing for the American people Mr.

Godsoe, not developers.

Sincerely,

Mary Ellen Wilson

West Bath, Maine

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Esther Mechler <brunswick64@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 26, 2018 6:14 PM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: Comments on the proposed adjacency rule revisions

Esther Mechler
26 Jewell Street
Brunswick, ME 04011

July 26, 2018

Dear Benjamin Godsoe, Maine Land Use Planning Commission,

As a real fan of Mother Earth, I appreciate the chance to review and provide feedback on this extensive change proposed to the current development framework in Maine's Unorganized Territory.

The proposed update would change where new zones for subdivisions and businesses could locate. Many of these new development zones are located along Maine's scenic byways. These routes are popular travel destinations and support a unique experience as a visitor drives from more populated areas into the wild and remote parts of the state. Allowing development to extend along these roads outside of the service center communities would change the character and experience of these specially designated byways.

This proposal also specifically opens up all permanent trailheads and many Maine lakes to residential subdivision development. Trails like the Appalachian National Scenic Trail (AT), the Allagash Wilderness Waterway, the Northern Forest Canoe Trail, and countless others are revered because of the opportunity they provide for users to have a remote backcountry experience. Allowing homes to be developed within a 1/2 mile of the access points to places is too risky without a thorough analysis of which recreational resources can sustain substantial increases in use without altering their character or the user experience.

Instead of making these broad changes to the adjacency principle, LUPC should consider efforts to meaningfully incentivize development within existing communities in rural Maine. These places are already struggling to attract and retain the residents they need to support the services they provide.

There is maybe room for growth in and adjacent to (within 3 miles) established communities. Growth should be focused there rather than expanding into currently undeveloped regions of the Unorganized Territory. Let's keep what is special about Maine special.

Finally, I will note that the background resources on the LUPC website are helpful but complicated. I encourage LUPC to slow down the process and engage in additional outreach around the state to ensure more people understand the content of this proposal.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Esther Mechler

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Drew Darling <drewdarling@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 26, 2018 5:22 PM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: Comments on the proposed adjacency rule revisions

Drew Darling
83 Pearl St.
Camden, ME 04843

July 26, 2018

Dear Benjamin Godsoe, Maine Land Use Planning Commission,

Dear Mr. Godsoe~

I would like to strongly encourage that we keep further residential development in Maine to areas within a close boundary to existing development.

Let us not give in to weak thinking that looks at our open places and thinks to fill them in. They are already filled in and serve as a treasure for the state and the country.

Let us not give in to suburban sprawl by letting developments leach out all across the state. Keep the wild lands wild and preserve critical habitat for the rest of creation and pristine recreational opportunities, opportunities for invigoration and renewal and relaxation from our over-crowded world.

I strongly object to plans to change our land use regulations permitting developments to exceed their present limits.

Maine's unspoiled natural areas are a treasure we must maintain and resist all efforts to water them down with vacation homes and other spurious developments.

Think of what your grandchildren would have wanted you to decide when the world is far more polluted and crowded.

Save it for them. Resist the urge to sell it off to the highest bidder. They will thank you for it.

Then get out there and enjoy the peace and beauty of it yourself, and realize what a critical role you play in preserving these lands for all of creation.

Sincerely,

Drew Darling

Sincerely,
Drew Darling

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Charles Lyons <cpatlyons@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 26, 2018 12:06 PM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: North Maine Woods Development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello, my name is Charlie Lyons and I'm an Environmental Science educator, a lover of Northern Maine where I grew up. I now live in southern ME but try to go north every opportunity I can. The Northern Maine Woods does not need further development. Keeping it pristine, undeveloped is what attracts people to it, not possible proximal conveniences. The few increases to the economy (if purchases are made in ME, they are made from Kittery to surrounding communities) will not outweigh the likely damage to the environment. I hope you will consider this. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.
Thank you.

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Jim Andrews <jaandrews@gwi.net>
Sent: Friday, July 27, 2018 1:26 PM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: Comments on the proposed adjacency rule revisions

Jim Andrews
148 Perham Street
Farmington, ME 04938

July 27, 2018

Dear Benjamin Godsoe, Maine Land Use Planning Commission,

Allowing developmental sprawl to occur near Maine's remote and wild areas , including trailheads for those areas, will substantially degrade the experience for visitors and residents alike. It's already difficult, as a Maine Guide, to find areas for my clients that hold sufficient undeveloped land mass for multi-day self-propelled trips.

Similarly, permitting business development away from the downtown areas of service center communities will substantially further degrade these struggling small towns. These small communities are nearly in their death throes across the most rural parts of the state. With the decline of the wood products industry, one of their few hopes is tourism-based businesses coming in to revitalize the community. If those businesses are permitted to migrate closer to the target recreational areas in unorganized townships it could be the final economic straw.

It's difficult to imagine a proposal that could have a more detrimental effect on Maine's wild lands and the adjacent communities. Please scrap this plan and dedicate the state resources to provide incentive for development within existing communities in rural Maine.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed adjacency rule revisions.

Sincerely,
Jim Andrews

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Sarah Hunter <Raisinghnters@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 27, 2018 12:26 PM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: Comments on the proposed adjacency rule revisions

Sarah Hunter
393 runaround pond rd
Durham, ME 04222

July 27, 2018

Dear Benjamin Godsoe, Maine Land Use Planning Commission,

As an outdoor recreation enthusiast, I appreciate the chance to review and provide feedback on this extensive change proposed to the current development framework in Maine's Unorganized Territory.

The proposed update would change where new zones for subdivisions and businesses could locate. Many of these new development zones are located along Maine's scenic byways. These routes are popular travel destinations and support a unique experience as a visitor drives from more populated areas into the wild and remote parts of the state. Allowing development to extend along these roads outside of the service center communities would change the character and experience of these specially designated byways.

This proposal also specifically opens up all permanent trailheads and many Maine lakes to residential subdivision development. Trails like the Appalachian National Scenic Trail (AT), the Allagash Wilderness Waterway, the Northern Forest Canoe Trail, and countless others are revered because of the opportunity they provide for users to have a remote backcountry experience. Allowing homes to be developed within a 1/2 mile of the access points to places is too risky without a thorough analysis of which recreational resources can sustain substantial increases in use without altering their character or the user experience.

Instead of making these broad changes to the adjacency principle, LUPC should consider efforts to meaningfully incentivize development within existing communities in rural Maine. These places are already struggling to attract and retain the residents they need to support the services they provide.

There is certainly more room for growth in and adjacent to (within 3 miles) established communities. Growth should be focused there rather than expanding into currently undeveloped regions of the Unorganized Territory.

Finally, I will note that the background resources on the LUPC website are helpful but complicated. I encourage LUPC to slow down the process and engage in additional outreach around the state to ensure more people understand the content of this proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed adjacency rule revisions.

Sincerely,
Sarah Hunter

Maine Land Use Planning Commission
Board of Commissioners
Everett Worcester, Chair

RECEIVED

JUL 30 2018

LUPC - AUGUSTA

I am aware that the Maine Land Use Planning Commission is considering revisions to the adjacency principle. As a resident and/or property owner of Lexington Township, it is important to me that my voice is included in this planning decision for my community.

I am requesting that Lexington Twp. be changed to a Resource-dependent Location designation for the following reasons:

1. The townships and plantation along Long Falls Dam Road form a region of shared rural qualities, character and natural resources. Targeting Lexington Twp. for types and densities of development that are different from these other places fractures this regional continuity. The other townships in this region have been designated as Resource-dependent Locations, and Lexington Twp. should be, as well.
2. The Resource-dependent Location designation is more consistent with the findings and ideas expressed in the 2015 regional community guided planning and zoning effort, which included participation by residents of Lexington Twp. The group reported, "The Region includes large tracts of industrial forest lands, mountains, rivers, lakes, and streams that all contribute significantly to an economy driven by a mix of natural resources, outdoor recreation, and tourism," and cited shared resources - Bigelow Mountain Range, Upper Kennebec River watershed, Appalachian Trail, Interconnected Trail System, Maine Huts and Trails, and the Northern Forest Canoe Trail - all of which are accessible through Lexington Twp. via Long Falls Dam Road.
3. Existing infrastructure and services in regional hubs, and rural hubs along Route 16, make those towns more suitable than Lexington Twp. for the types of development allowed in Primary Locations. Many of them are actively exploring and promoting new commercial development in their own towns. In 2006, the Brookings's Institution reported, "Maine's regional hubs are far from built-out," and "could absorb all or most of their region's future residential, commercial, and industrial growth".
4. Designating Primary Locations by using a 10-mile straight-line distance as a measure of a township's accessibility to critical services didn't work in some places - the LUPC has already amended its map to account for some of these cases. It also does not work for Lexington Twp. For example, while it shares a border with a rural hub, the reality is that natural barriers such as roadless open spaces, mountains and ponds mean people in Lexington Twp. are over 20 miles away from ambulance service.

Thank you for your considering my request to change Lexington Township to a Resource-dependent Location designation.

Signed Doralie T. Burbank Date 7-27-18

Printed Name Doralie T. Burbank, hsen H Burbank

Address 31 school st., PO Box 236 Solon, ME 04979

Godsoe, Benjamin

From: Margaret McGinnis <margaretmcginnis@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 11:52 AM
To: Godsoe, Benjamin
Subject: North Woods

I am writing to oppose opening up 2 million acres of Maine's North Woods to development. This part of Maine needs to remain unspoiled for wildlife – more development will mean fragmentation and habitat loss.

M McGinnis