



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION & FORESTRY
LAND USE PLANNING COMMISSION
22 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0022

AMANDA E. BEAL
 COMMISSIONER

STACIE R. BEYER
 ACTING EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

JANET T. MILLS
 GOVERNOR

Memorandum

To: LUPC Commissioners
CC: Stacie R. Beyer, Acting Executive Director
From: Ben Godsoe, Acting Planning Manager and Stacy Benjamin, Acting Chief Planner
Date: 08/03/2022
Re: Summary of Comments on Draft Moosehead Regional Planning Package

The informal comment period for the preliminary draft Moosehead Regional Planning Package concluded on July 15, 2022. This memo addresses feedback received to date on the planning package and summarizes what the staff have heard so far. Additionally, copies of the submitted comments and meeting notes have been posted on the project website and are linked at the end of the memo.

At the August Commission Meeting, the staff will:

- Summarize written comments on the draft Package received since the July Commission meeting
- Summarize the feedback from the landowner meetings held July 14
- Discuss all feedback received to date on the draft Package
- Briefly discuss next steps

Written Comments Received after July Commission Meeting

After the memo was distributed ahead of the July 13 Commission meeting, comments were received from four residents of the region and five organizations. Following is a table summarizing feedback from each commenter:

Commenter	Summary of Comments
Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about impacts from future development on deer wintering area adjacent to proposed development areas F and I
Brassua Lake Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request to remove remaining Primary Locations along the Brassua lake shoreline in Taunton and Raynham and Rockwood Strip T1 R1 (with the exception of the shoreline directly adjacent to Rt 15) • Concerns about Primary Locations in Tomhegan Twp



Commenter	Summary of Comments
Maine Forest Products Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about property owners losing future flexibility from the proposed removals of Primary and Secondary Locations (including around MC3 Lakes which are considered potentially suitable for development by the Lakes Management Program) • Concerns that there was limited feedback from residents and property owners within the region • Support decisions not to propose P-UA or M-NC subdistrict designations • Suggest LUPC rules should allow more flexibility in lot sizes
Natural Resources Council of Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the proposed removals of Primary and Secondary Locations from townships and from MC-3 lakes • Believe the proposed development zones are appropriately located and will complement existing uses of these areas • Recommend limiting size and scope of allowable development at Location I • Recommend designating protection zoning in former development zones at Lily Bay Township, Brassua Peninsula, the west side of Big Moose Township, and Indian Pond
Appalachian Mountain Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Package responds to broad public support for concentrating development adjacent to rural hubs • Support the decision to leave several parcels previously designated for development zoned as General Management Subdistricts • Support the proposed removals of Primary and Secondary Locations from townships and from Indian Pond, Long Pond, and Brassua Lake.
Individual Commenters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pleased with proposed removal of Lily Bay Township from Primary and Secondary Locations, and proposed removal of Primary Locations around Indian Pond • Requested the creation of new protection zoning for the Lily Bay Peninsula, the East and West Outlets of Moosehead Lake, and Indian Pond • Support the reduction of land slated for development • Would like to see more permanent land conservation • Concern about the impact to services and the region if potentially thousands of homes are built in a short period of time (Locations E and I, and the ski area) • Has not received a good answer as to why M-NC zoning is not proposed

Landowner Meetings

Five individuals participated in the landowner meetings held on July 14¹. Four of the five participants own camps on Moosehead Lake adjacent to Location I. They attended to learn more about the proposal and how the proposed rezoning might affect their properties from an access perspective (there is currently no road access). Other comments from participants included:

- One attendee asked how this proposal relates to the current proposal for the ski area
- One attendee asked for clarification about what can happen in the M-GN without being in a Primary Location
- One attendee asked about the possible development of wind turbines on Misery Ridge and whether it was allowed under the conservation easement

A representative from Brookfield Renewables sent an RSVP and request for the meeting link but did not attend either meeting.

In addition, comments were received by phone from two property owners in the region. One property owner expressed concerns about Location E and asked if buffers to adjacent state-owned lands could be included. He presented information about the proposal to the Harford's Point property owner association annual meeting on July 30 and requested information and resources to share. He then submitted additional written comments on August 1 after the close of the informal comment period. His comments were included above. The other property owner wanted to confirm existing zoning for their property, and also expressed support for Locations E and I as potential locations for needed workforce housing. No property owner expressed concerns about the proposed removal of Primary and Secondary Locations as included in the Plan.

Lastly, staff reached out to the MaineDOT planning staff and the County Emergency Management Directors for Piscataquis and Somerset counties to ask for feedback on the draft proposals. MaineDOT did not see any issues with the proposed rezonings or uses. Staff sent information and materials to the County EMA Directors and will follow up with them before finalizing the proposals. Any new information available will be presented during the upcoming Commission meeting.

Comprehensive Summary of the Feedback Received to Date

Proposed Development Locations

- Concerns about impacts development will have on natural character and wildlife, including deer wintering habitat adjacent to areas proposed for development zoning
- Questions/requests for clarification about the types of uses allowed in a D-GN
- Concern about the size and density at Location I
- Locations are appropriate for development
- Location I should be eliminated
- Proposed D-RS in Long Pond and Taunton and Raynham should be D-GN

¹ Postcards announcing the landowner meetings were sent to 195 property owners identified as potentially impacted by the proposed removal of Primary and Secondary Locations.

- Locations E and I can potentially help address workforce housing needs
- Request consideration for road access for camps adjacent to Location I
- Location I is not proximate to other existing development
- 500 houses on Location I will fundamentally change the nature of Greenville
- Does the LUPC has any influence or control over the type of housing built in these areas as there is a need for work force and affordable housing in the region

Additional Protections Needed

- Need to create new protection zoning in former development areas in Lily Bay Township, Brassua Peninsula, the west side of Big Moose Township, and Indian Pond to protect sensitive resources like native brook trout, Canada Lynx, Bicknell's Thrush, and the Rusty Blackbird
- Use extra scrutiny for any proposal for development that may come forward for the Blue Ridge
- More permanent land conservation needed to protect the region's wildlife habitat and high water quality
- Use M-NC subdistrict designations in former development areas

Primary and Secondary Locations

- Support for the proposed removal of Primary and Secondary Locations in the ten townships and from around Indian Pond, Long Pond, and Brassua Lake
- Removal of primary and secondary locations creates unpredictability for landowners across the UT, impacting multiple landowners and landowner rights
- Remove the Brassua Peninsula in Taunton and Raynham, Rockwood Strip T1 R1 and Tomhegan Township from Primary and Secondary Locations
- Remove Secondary Location from Beaver Cove

General Statements Regarding the Planning Process or the Proposed Moosehead Regional Planning Package or Portions of the Package

- Package is responsive to what the community has asked for
- Comments were received from too few individuals with ties to the region and is not a “locally-driven process”
- Current proposed plan seems to concentrate future development in a way to protect our region's significant and valuable natural, visual, and recreational resources

Miscellaneous Comments

This section includes comments that do not fall under the previous headings.

- LUPC rules should allow more flexibility in lot sizes if the density limit is met
- How does this proposal interact with the development at the ski area?
- What development does the conservation easement allow – what is Misery Ridge zoned for?

Next Steps

Staff are considering the comments received and evaluating site conditions (slopes, soils, road access/access management, mapping constraints, etc.) to determine final subdistrict boundaries to propose for the development areas. A final package, including proposed rule language regarding removals of Primary and Secondary Locations, will be presented at the September Commission meeting.

Links to Written Comments and Meeting Notes

Part 1 – Feedback Received after July Commission Memo

- Written Comments on the Draft Moosehead Regional Planning Package Received After the July 6 Commission Memo
- Notes from July 14, 2022 Virtual Landowner Meetings

Link: [Moosehead Package Comments Part 1 August 2022](#)

Part 2 – Feedback Received before July Commission Memo

- Written Comments on the Draft Moosehead Regional Planning Package Received Prior to the July 6 Commission Memo (sent with July memo)
- Notes from the June 2022 Community Meetings (sent with July memo)

Link: [Moosehead Package Comments Part 2 August 2022](#)