

Maine Land Use Planning Commission  
Recreational Lodging Facilities Stakeholder Input  
**Meeting Three Highlight Notes**

Thursday, December 13, 2012

Penobscot County Courthouse (3rd floor), 97 Hammond Street, Bangor

*These Highlight Notes were written on the spot by Craig Freshley during the meeting. They do not reflect the complete discussion, have not been reviewed for accuracy, and have not been approved by the group.*

### Overall Project Objective

At the end of the entire project, including stakeholder input, rule making, and Commission approval, our objective is to have in place a set of rules that efficiently and effectively regulate recreational lodging in LUPC's jurisdiction for the benefit of facility owners, visitors, and Maine residents, striking an appropriate balance between private enterprise and resource protection.

### Meeting Three Objectives

1. Shared understanding of LUPC's role with regard to recreational lodging facilities and of this stakeholder input process.
2. Shared understanding of the emerging proposal for new rules intended to regulate recreational lodging facilities.
3. Stakeholder input on categorization of facilities with particular attention to the following questions:
  - a. Is the general categorization framework reasonable?
  - b. Is the list of factors to be used appropriate? If not what needs to change?
  - c. What should the details/parameters for each factor and category be? Are we in the right ballpark, if not what is?
4. Stakeholder input on any other aspects of the Meeting Three Discussion Items document of December 6, 2012.

### Clarifications

- A facility's "highest factor" determines its category.
- These rules will apply to LUPC regulation of recreational lodging facilities, but other regulations apply to such facilities also. Other permits can also be applied.
- New sub-districts are proposed in order to accommodate cases where less impact can be demonstrated.
- Clarified that bunkhouses should not have plumbing (running water including an outside faucet).
- LUPC wants to make sure that traditional sporting camps are protected yet there is flexibility for sporting camps and others.
- There are currently provisions for reconstruction of non-conforming structures and conforming structures.

- If a sporting camp get condominium-ized, it would not constitute a change of use.
- There are no size limits on either of the two new proposed sub-districts. Size is up to the applicant to propose.

### Comments

- Consider allowances (allowed to do something on the “next category”) for seasonal or one-time activities.
- More flexibility for fuels sales.
  - Perhaps allow level B and level C facilities (perhaps all facilities) to do incidental fuel sales
  - Consider a distinction between propane and gas/diesel
- Like the way fuel sales are currently handled in the table, but mindful of location.
- Sea plane access should be allowed for all categories of facilities.
- LUPC should consider exceptions to the rules in cases where the applicant can demonstrate no additional “impact.”
- Set backs are important for visual impact, water quality, and wildlife habitat.
- Clarify that “cabins” in the definition of Commercial Sporting Camp facilities include housekeeping and other types of cabins.
- Consider have a separate regulatory category for traditional sporting camps.
- Outpost cabins should be much farther away from the Main lodge than proposed.
- Consider being open to performance-based standards in more instances IF the burden is on the applicant to develop, defend, and monitor such standards and activity, AND the standards are replicable.
- Consider requiring conservation balance and conservation considerations in the newly proposed D-PR sub-district.
- If you have categories, allow some gray areas between each category.
- It would be good if there were some parts of the jurisdiction where some things weren’t allowed.
- We shouldn’t allow “big resorts” such as Disney Land, The Balsams, the old Kineo House in the jurisdiction.
- The new sub-districts should be not allowed everywhere.
- There should not be limits on what types of facilities should be allowed in certain areas.
- There should be more limits on new developments than existing developments.
- Consider protections of traditional travel routes.
- There was general approval and encouragement of the categorization framework.

### Additional Way to Provide Feedback

E-mail or Call LUPC staff members Tim Beaucage, Hugh Coxe, or Samantha Horn-Olsen with questions or comments by December 31, 2012.