

**From:** [James Walckner](#)  
**To:** [Gaffney, Heidi](#)  
**Cc:** [robert.lightbody@mainehighlandsdevelopment.com](mailto:robert.lightbody@mainehighlandsdevelopment.com); [janwalckner@yahoo.com](mailto:janwalckner@yahoo.com)  
**Date:** Monday, January 12, 2026 3:21:26 PM  
**Attachments:** [Regarding Maynards LLC Zone Change Application.pdf](#)

---

**EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the State of Maine Mail System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.**

Hello Heidi,

Thank you for sending the Zone Change application along to us. First, would you confirm receipt of this email by simply emailing me back and acknowledging receipt? Second, would you forward this email to the appropriate parties at LUPC? My comments below request a public hearing if the application is not disallowed by LUPC or withdrawn by Maine Highlands Development LLC. In addition to submitting this email and attachment to LUPC, I am also copying Mr. Robert Lightbody at Maine Highlands Development, LLC in this email. Thank you.

Dear Commissioners and Staff of the Land Use Planning Commission,

I am writing to respectfully submit the attached document for inclusion in the record regarding the zone change and development application submitted by Maine Highlands Development, LLC for Maynard's, LLC for the 'Maynard's in Maine' property at 131 Maynard Road, Rockwood, ME 04478 (Somerset County).

The attached document represents a structured, good-faith review of the application as presented, prepared with reference to Chapter 10 standards, zoning intent, and the practical realities of development in an unorganized territory. My purpose in submitting this material is to ensure that the scope, intensity, and implications of the proposal are fully understood and evaluated before any determination is made.

At the outset, I want to be clear that rezoning the property for the limited purpose of properly aligning the zone with existing buildings and historic use is fully supported. Bringing long-standing structures and operations into zoning conformity is reasonable and appropriate.

However, as detailed in the attached analysis, the current application extends well beyond that purpose. In addition to addressing existing conditions, it seeks approval for a substantial expansion of commercial activity, including approximately 30 RV sites, new septic systems, a swimming pool, a pavilion, and related commercial amenities. In my view, this proposal represents a material increase in use intensity, transient occupancy, traffic, noise, safety risk, and infrastructure demand, raising serious questions about whether it can be accommodated under the requested Development-General (D-GN) zoning designation.

The attached document also addresses a threshold issue that I believe warrants careful consideration: the lawful status of existing trailers and accommodations referenced in the application. Rezoning does not retroactively legalize unpermitted or nonconforming structures, nor does it require their automatic acceptance as baseline conditions for expanded development. As outlined in Section 8 of the attached document, verification of lawful establishment is a necessary predicate to any consideration of the zoning change request.

In addition, the analysis highlights concerns related to traffic and road safety, noise impacts, wastewater generation, and the absence of local law enforcement. Given the location on Maynard Road - one of only three paved roads in the town - and the unorganized status of the territory, these issues are not speculative. They bear directly on the Commission's required findings regarding compatibility, enforceability of mitigation, and public safety.

Accordingly, I respectfully request that the Commission carefully consider whether the proposal, as presented, exceeds what can be accommodated under the requested zoning designation, and that this submission be entered into the record. If the application is not otherwise disallowed or withdrawn, I further request that a public meeting or hearing be held to allow for full consideration of these issues.

I appreciate the Commission's role and the care with which it evaluates applications affecting unorganized territories. My intent is not to advocate for a predetermined outcome, but to ensure that any decision is made with a complete understanding of the proposal's implications and in a manner consistent with zoning intent, statutory standards, and public safety.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Walckner

On Behalf of The Walckner Revocable Living Trust, Owner of:

64 Maynard Road  
Rockwood, Maine

## **RE: MAYNARDS IN MAINE/MAYNARD'S, LLC – LUPC ZONE CHANGE APPLICATION**

**The following is the result of research conducted, my review of the Land Use Districts and Standards – Chapter 10 – Revised May 13, 2025, and it presents my opinions regarding the Zone change application for Maynards, LLC. This is not legal advice.**

**The State's document (Land Use Districts and Standards – Chapter 10 – Revised May 13, 2025) is available at:**

**[https://www.maine.gov/dacf/lupc/laws\\_rules/rule\\_chapters/Ch10\\_ver2025\\_May13.pdf](https://www.maine.gov/dacf/lupc/laws_rules/rule_chapters/Ch10_ver2025_May13.pdf)**

**Property:** 130–131 Maynard Road, Rockwood (Somerset County, Unorganized Territory)

**Applicant:** Maynards, LLC / Maynard's of Maine / by: Maine Highlands Development, LLC (Maynards)

**Requested Zoning:** Development – General (D-GN)

**Proposed Use:** Recreational Lodging Facility (Level E) including ~30 RV trailer pads, septic systems, swimming pool, pavilion, retail/bar, docks, maintenance facilities

In summary, while Chapter 10 allows limited campsite uses in Development–General subdistricts by permit, the Maynards proposal, by its scale, amenities, occupancy, and Level E classification, constitutes a commercial campground and RV park that exceeds what D-GN zoning is intended to regulate. Therefore, approval of Maynards's permit request under Development–General zoning would be inconsistent with Chapter 10 and constitute a zoning misclassification.

Under Maine LUPC Chapter 10, the Maynards proposal triggers the review standards of a high-intensity commercial recreational facility, not general development; approving it under D-GN zoning would appear to be a clear misapplication of the law.

### **Definitive Zoning Determination with Chapter 10 Requirements**

The development proposed in the Maynards application cannot be lawfully or properly approved under Development–General (D-GN) zoning because it triggers minimum review standards and impact thresholds set forth in Maine LUPC Chapter 10 that exceed what D-GN is intended to accommodate.

#### **1. Development Subdistrict Purpose Is Exceeded**

Chapter 10 makes clear that Development-General (D-GN) subdistricts are intended to:

- Accommodate development where infrastructure and access are adequate

- Avoid overwhelming rural character
- Prevent development that creates unreasonable traffic, safety, or service demands
- Ensure development is compatible with surrounding uses

I believe that with ~30 RV pads, public amenities, and commercial services that this is a Level E Recreational Lodging Facility and by definition this exceeds the limits listed above.

This is not “general development” under Chapter 10. Instead this is destination-scale commercial recreation. While Development–General zoning can accommodate lower-intensity recreational lodging facilities, nothing in Chapter 10 authorizes the approval of destination-scale, Level E recreational lodging facilities whose “**defining characteristics**” exceed the purpose and limits of the subdistrict.

I believe that this application fails because the proposed Level E use exceeds what D-GN is designed to accommodate at all.

## **2. Level E Recreational Lodging Facilities Are Incompatible with D-GN Zoning**

Chapter 10 explicitly distinguishes Level E Recreational Lodging Facilities as the highest-impact category of recreational lodging, characterized by:

- Large overnight occupancy
- Regular public access
- Commercial amenities
- Increased traffic and noise
- Expanded clearing, lighting, and infrastructure
- Cumulative environmental impacts

These characteristics are defining attributes of the use, not discretionary design choices.

Development-General (D-GN) zoning does not provide a pathway to accommodate Level E recreational lodging facilities of the scale and intensity proposed by Maynards. While Chapter 10 applies heightened review standards to Level E facilities generally, those standards do not authorize approval where the fundamental characteristics of the use conflict with the purpose and limits of the D-GN subdistrict itself.

In this case, the Maynards proposal with Level E characteristics cannot be reconciled with the intent of D-GN zoning, regardless of mitigation measures or additional analysis.

Accordingly, this is not a matter of heightened scrutiny within D-GN; it is a matter of incompatibility. The proposed Level E use exceeds what D-GN zoning is intended or permitted to accommodate under Chapter 10.

### **3. RV Parks and Campsites Are Not Incidental Uses**

Under Chapter 10, campgrounds and RV facilities are treated as intensive commercial uses, not accessory uses, when they involve:

- Multiple pads or sites
- Centralized or aggregated wastewater systems
- High seasonal or peak occupancy
- Regular turnover of transient users
- Associated amenities such as pools, pavilions, retail or bar services, and docks

The Maynards proposal meets each of these criteria in full as an intensive commercial use. It proposes approximately 30 RV trailer pads, consolidated wastewater disposal, high transient occupancy, and a suite of commercial guest amenities that collectively define a destination-scale recreational facility.

Accordingly, the Maynards request for rezoning, as presented, cannot be lawfully or reasonably treated as an accessory use, a minor expansion, or a continuation of an existing nonconforming use under Chapter 10. The proposal squarely triggers the full commercial-use review standards applicable to high-intensity recreational lodging and RV park developments and must be evaluated or denied on that basis alone.

### **4. Traffic, Road Adequacy, and Public Safety Standards Are Not Met**

Chapter 10 requires that rezoning and development proposals demonstrate that:

- Roads serving the development are adequate for projected traffic volumes and vehicle types,
- Traffic increases will not create unsafe conditions for motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, or other users, and
- Any identified impacts can be meaningfully mitigated and enforced over time.

These requirements are not aspirational. They are mandatory findings that must be supported by real-world conditions, not assumptions.

#### ***A. Maynard Road Is Functionally a Community Road, Not a Commercial Access Road***

Maynard Road is one of only three paved roads in the entire town, serving not only vehicular traffic but also functioning as the primary and most safe pedestrian, bicycle, and recreational road for residents. There are no sidewalks. Children ride bicycles on this road. Residents walk dogs, jog, and use the road daily precisely because this is the only road in town offering a relatively safe environment. Ducks cross the street as well as deer all year long.

This functional reality is critical under Chapter 10. Roads are evaluated not merely by width or surface condition, but by how they are actually used. Introducing destination-scale commercial

traffic, including RVs, guest vehicles, service trucks, deliveries, and recreational users, would fundamentally alter the character and safety of this road.

Further, it's my understanding (unconfirmed) that the new owners have verbally disclosed plans to install 75 RV pads, which if true, will require additional permitting by the state. So, the impact of these initial RV pads and other amenities may be just the first step towards the new owner's bigger picture.

### ***B. The Proposal Introduces Inherently High-Risk Traffic Types***

The Maynards proposal would introduce:

- Large RVs with limited maneuverability and long stopping distances,
- Increased trailer traffic entering and exiting the property,
- Service and delivery vehicles,
- Higher volumes of unfamiliar, transient drivers,
- Increased recreational traffic tied to amenities such as a pool, pavilion, and waterfront access.

These traffic types do not coexist safely with a road that is routinely used by pedestrians, cyclists, children, and domestic animals.

### ***C. Existing ATV Issues Demonstrate the Limits of Paper Restrictions***

ATV use is already permitted on Maynard Road under specific conditions, including speed and time-of-day restrictions. In practice, those restrictions are routinely violated, with ATVs traveling at excessive speeds and at inappropriate hours.

These restrictions that are routinely violated demonstrate that rules without enforcement do not function as mitigation, and that increased traffic intensity predictably results in increased safety risk.

### ***D. There Is No Local Law Enforcement Capacity***

The property is located in an unorganized territory with no local police department. Law enforcement response is approximately one and one-half hours away in Skowhegan, making routine enforcement, traffic monitoring, and rapid response effectively unavailable. If response is available from Jackman, that is 30 minutes away.

Under these circumstances:

- Speed limits are unenforceable,
- Traffic restrictions are unenforceable,
- Noise and conduct regulations are unenforceable,
- Emergency response times are materially extended.

Chapter 10 does not permit approval of high-intensity commercial development where public safety depends on enforcement mechanisms that do not exist.

### ***E. Mitigation Measures Are Speculative and Unenforceable***

In this context, commonly cited mitigation measures - signage, posted speed limits, internal rules for guests, or conditions of approval - are purely speculative. Without local enforcement capacity, such measures rely entirely on voluntary compliance by transient users, which Chapter 10 does not accept as a substitute for demonstrable safety.

### ***F. Required Finding Cannot Be Made***

Given the road's function, existing safety issues, the introduction of high-risk traffic types, and the absence of enforceable mitigation or policing capacity, the Commission cannot reasonably find that traffic impacts would be safe or adequately mitigated, as required under Chapter 10.

Accordingly, approval of a high-traffic commercial recreational use at this location is precluded, not because impacts are unknown, but because they are foreseeable, unavoidable, and unenforceable.

## **5. Wastewater and Environmental Impacts Must Be Evaluated in Aggregate**

Chapter 10 requires that wastewater impacts associated with development be evaluated in the aggregate, based on total occupancy, intensity of use, and peak seasonal demand, rather than as a collection of discrete or isolated systems. This requirement applies with particular force to commercial recreational facilities.

The Maynards application improperly separates:

- RV pads
- Pool facilities
- Laundry facilities (x2)
- Bathroom/Shower facilities
- Pavilion gatherings
- Retail/bar wastewater
- Seasonal peak occupancy

Under Chapter 10, the presence of aggregated commercial wastewater generation alone places the proposed development outside the scope of what Development-General (D-GN) zoning is intended or permitted to accommodate. Even if fully analyzed, engineered, and technically compliant, these impacts cannot be reconciled with D-GN zoning, and therefore preclude approval of the rezoning request at the requested level as a matter of law and zoning intent, not documentation.

## **6. Noise and Late-Night Activity Impacts Are Incompatible with the Surrounding Area**

The proposed expansion includes features, such as a pavilion and increased transient occupancy, that reasonably enable large gatherings, amplified music, and late-night activity. In a rural, unorganized territory such as this, nighttime quiet is a defining element of community character, and noise travels significant distances in the Moose River valley and due to the absence of ambient sound.

Under Chapter 10, development proposals must demonstrate compatibility with surrounding uses and must provide for meaningful mitigation of impacts. In this case, mitigation of noise impacts would depend entirely on voluntary compliance or distant law enforcement response, neither of which constitutes effective or enforceable mitigation. The absence of local policing capacity exacerbates this issue.

Accordingly, predictable noise impacts associated with group events, amplified music, and late-night activity represent an inherent incompatibility with Development–General zoning at this location and further confirm that the proposed use exceeds what the subdistrict is intended to accommodate.

Noise that cannot be effectively enforced against is not mitigated noise under Chapter 10.

## **7. Unorganized Territory Heightens, Not Reduces, Scrutiny**

Chapter 10 explicitly recognizes that unorganized territories lack municipal services, requiring LUPC to apply greater caution, not less, when approving intensive development.

Key considerations include:

- Absence of police, zoning enforcement, and code enforcement
- Reliance on self-policing by operators
- Permanent impacts on residents with no local recourse

Approving a Level E commercial lodging facility under D-GN zoning in an unorganized territory runs counter to the intent of Chapter 10's protective framework.

## **8. Required Outcome Under Chapter 10**

Because the Maynards proposal, as submitted, constitutes a high-intensity commercial recreational development that exceeds the purpose, limits, and allowable impacts of Development–General (D-GN) zoning, Chapter 10 requires denial of the requested rezoning as incompatible with surrounding uses, infrastructure capacity, public safety constraints, and the intent of the Development Subdistrict framework.

Approval of the current rezoning request cannot be conditioned, mitigated, or cured through additional studies, design modifications, or impact analyses. The incompatibility arises from the

nature and intensity of the proposed use itself, not from correctable deficiencies in documentation.

If Maynards wishes to pursue expansion of its recreational operations at the scale its proposed, it must do so through a new and fundamentally different zoning request seeking a more intensive commercial classification expressly designed to regulate RV parks and destination-scale recreational lodging facilities, subject to full commercial-use review standards under Chapter 10. That determination, however, lies outside the scope of and cannot be achieved through the present application.

### **9. Existing Trailers and Structures Must Be Independently Verified as Lawful and Are Not Automatically Grandfathered**

The application references trailers and other accommodations currently located on the property as part of the justification for the requested zoning change and proposed expansion. However, the mere existence of structures or uses on a property does not establish that they were lawfully created, nor does it entitle them to recognition, continuation, or expansion under a new zoning designation.

At the time various trailers or similar accommodations were installed on the property, the parcel was subject to residential zoning and applicable permitting requirements. I've identified one incorrect statement on the Maynards application regarding the placement of a structure, one that surely would have required a permit, that should be verified. I think that where there's one, there are likely others. Any structures placed on the property since LURC's Land Use Districts and Standards were first adopted in 1977 are required to comply with the zoning, use limitations, and permit approvals in effect since that time. Rezoning to Development-General does not retroactively legalize structures or uses that were not lawfully established, nor does it automatically convert them into permissible or baseline conditions for future development.

Accordingly, prior to any approval of rezoning or any consideration of expanded commercial use, the applicant should demonstrate, through permit records or other competent evidence, that each existing trailer, RV, or similar accommodation was lawfully permitted and compliant with zoning requirements at the time it was installed. Structures or uses that cannot be shown to have been lawfully established must not be treated as existing, nonconforming, or grandfathered, and must be excluded from zoning calculations, impact analyses, and development entitlements, if not also removed from the property all together.

Importantly, the responsibility for verifying zoning compliance and permitting status rests with the current property owner, regardless of when the structures were installed or by whom. A purchaser's expectation that rezoning might later occur or that existing conditions would be accepted without verification does not create vested rights and cannot substitute for compliance with applicable land-use regulations. Zoning decisions are based on lawful conditions and regulatory standards, not on post-purchase assumptions or business plans.

The well-established land-use principle of *caveat emptor* (“buyer beware”) applies here. Purchasers bear the responsibility to verify zoning compliance, permitting statuses, and the feasibility of any intended expansion **prior to acquisition**. Expectations that rezoning might later occur, or that existing conditions would be accepted without verification, do not create vested rights and cannot substitute for compliance with applicable land-use regulations.

For these reasons, no automatic acceptance of existing trailers or other accommodations should occur as part of the requested rezoning, and any structures not independently verified as lawful should be required to be removed or otherwise brought into compliance prior to, and as a condition precedent to, any further consideration related to a zoning reclassification.

MAINE LAND USE PLANNING COMMISSION

5 EAST MAIN ST SUITE 107  
DOVER-FOXROFT, MAINE 04426

L/2  
1-20-26

ATTN: HEIDI GAFFNEY

SUB: MAYNARD'S IN MAINE  
ZONE CHANGE

Received

JAN 20 2026

LUPC - Greenville

THE LAST NOTICE WE RECEIVED OF PUBLIC HEARINGS REGARDING ZONING FOR SOMERSET COUNTY (UNDATED), WITH A SCHEDULED HEARING OF MAY 20, 1998 AT THE SKY LODGE IN JACKMAN ME.

ABOVE MEETING RESULT WITH THE ISSUING OF LAND USE GUIDANCE MAP  
ROCKWOOD STRIP TWP  
T1 R1 & T2 R1 NBKD  
EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1998

ALL SHORE LINES ON BOTH SIDES OF THE MOOSE RIVER ARE DESIGNATED D-RS RESIDENTIAL.

I HAVE NO OBJECTION TO ESTABLISH A BUSINESS, HOWEVER CERTAINLY NOT IN A D-RS RESIDENTIAL ZONE & CERTAINLY NOT TO CHANGE A M-GM TO D-RS FOR THAT PURPOSE

Received

JAN 20 2026

2/2

LUPC - Greenville

ANOTHER I HAVE IS THE ENFORCEMENT  
OF ANY CHANGES AS A RESULT OF THE  
MAYNARD APPLICATION. MY PAST EXPERIENCE  
WITH LUPC & PREVIOUS ORGANIZATION IS  
THAT THERE IS NOT ENOUGH TO ENFORCE  
THE REGULATIONS

THANK YOU!

*Maren Schmalzer*

*Ernest Schmalzer*

MAREN SCHMALZER ERNEST SCHMALZER

POB 252 - MAYNARD RD.

ROCKWOOD, ME 04478

207-650-9322

**From:** [janwalckner@yahoo.com](mailto:janwalckner@yahoo.com)  
**To:** [Gaffney, Heidi](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Maynard's Zoning Change application - Formal Request for Extension of Abutter Comment Period Due to Inadequate Notice and Lack of Access to Application  
**Date:** Friday, January 23, 2026 9:20:45 AM

---

**EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the State of Maine Mail System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.**

Hello Heidi,

Can you forward this to the appropriate LUPC personnel? Also, hopefully this gets through to you as I sent it yesterday and it was rejected back to me with no reason given. Please confirm receipt of this message. I did leave you a voice mail as well in the event you are not aware there may be a problem with your emails.

Thank you,

Jan Walckner 508-259-0307

To the Maine Land Use Planning Commission Commissioners and Staff,

I am writing to formally request an extension of the abutter comment period regarding requests for the need for a public meeting related to the Maynard Road application.

After reviewing the one-page Notice of Filing of Application mailed to abutters, it is clear that the description of the proposed project is materially incomplete and misleading. The notice describes the application as an effort to bring the property into zoning compliance, update cabins, and allow for a "Recreational Lodging facility." For abutters familiar with the property, this description would reasonably suggest modest adjustments to existing uses.

However, the full application as presented in an 89-page packet prepared by the applicant's consultant reveals a substantially broader and more intensive development, including (but not limited to) approximately 30 RV sites, new water and septic infrastructure, a swimming pool, pavilion, and other associated facilities. **None of these major components are disclosed in the mailed notice.**

As a result, the one-page notice received in the mail does not provide information that would reasonably alert abutters to the scale or intensity of the proposed changes, nor does it provide the type of information that would reasonably prompt affected landowners to request a public meeting.

Compounding this issue is the fact that the notice directs the public in our Moosehead Region to review the application at the Moosehead Region office in Greenville. That office was closed at the time the notice was mailed and remains closed. As a result, abutters were directed to a location that was not available to them, effectively denying in-person access to the application materials during the comment window.

These deficiencies are particularly problematic given the nature of the affected community. This is a rural, largely seasonal area. Many abutters are elderly, are not present during winter months, or reside out of state for much of the year, some requiring forwarding of their mail. Under these conditions, it is unreasonable to assume that all abutters received timely notice, understood the true scope of the project, and had meaningful access to the full application before the January 20, 2026 deadline.

Accordingly, I respectfully request that LUPC:

1. Extend the abutter comment period and deadline for requesting a public meeting;

2. Ensure, by way of an updated notice to abutters, that abutters are clearly informed of the full scope of the proposed development, including major infrastructure and use expansions; and
3. Confirm that application materials are reasonably accessible, both online and at an open regional office, before any final determination regarding public participation is made.

This request is made in the interest of transparency, procedural fairness, and meaningful public participation consistent with LUPC's mandate and the character of the Moosehead Region.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I appreciate the Commission's role and trust that these concerns will be given appropriate consideration.

Respectfully,

Jim Walckner, on behalf of

The Walckner Family Living Trust, owner of the property at:

64 Maynard Road

Rockwood, ME 04478

February 2, 2026

Maine Land Use Planning Commission  
43 Lakeview Street  
P O Box 1107  
Greenville, Maine 04441

Re.: Maynards of Maine Filing

To Whom it May Concern:

My wife and I are full time residents at 96 Maynard Road in Rockwood. We want to acknowledge receipt of the Notice of Filing of an Application with MLUPC. Upon initial review, the information outlined suggested that this was simply “to bring the property into compliance with current zoning standards, and updates to a recreational lodging facility”. However the 89 page application outlines a far reaching aggressive construction of new buildings and facilities not currently on to property. So, it seems that the notice was lacking relevant information important to not only abbuters but the wider area of this rural area.

The location was a Recreational Lodging Facility for over 100 years. Accordingly we along with other abbuters assumed the new owners would have to refile for appropriate re-permitting/licensing needed to bring the property onto compliance with current requirements that had been previously grandfathered.

Elaborating on traffic. The number “trips” can be fairly easily quantified via a traffic study by a Traffic Engineer but the quantity of existing and already growing trips of residents using the minor “dead end” road. Significant safety concerns increase with the cumulative issues with a dead end road, minimal local EMS services which would be impacted by large commercial RV campers.

Although the zone change may be possible within reason, the size and scope of the proposed use change exceeds any allowable limits including but not limited to traffic, noise, impacts to residential zone of closely located homes to the roadway.

It would be prudent to research other uses similar and the performance standards reviewed for identical uses.

Regards,

*Sharon and Christopher Le Conte*

**From:** [Kyle Purington](#)  
**To:** [Gaffney, Heidi](#)  
**Subject:** Support for Maynard's of Maine – Rezoning Petition (ZP 805)  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 3, 2026 7:30:32 PM

---

**EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the State of Maine Mail System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.**

Hiedi,

My name is Kyle Purington, and I am a neighboring property owner at 13 Maynards in Rockwood. I'm writing to express my full support for the rezoning petition submitted by Maynard's of Maine.

I understand that some neighbors are attempting to oppose this project. I want to be very clear that I am completely in disagreement with their position. This proposal is exactly the type of responsible investment our region needs. Rockwood has struggled for years to regain the activity and economic strength it once had, and projects like this are essential to bringing people, opportunity, and energy back into the area.

As someone who is a homeowner directly in the vicinity, I have no concerns about the proposed changes. In fact, I believe this development will be a positive step forward for the community and will help support the long-term vitality of the region.

Please accept this email as my formal statement of support for the application. If any additional information is needed, I'm happy to provide it.

Thank you for you and the commission's time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Kyle Purington 13 Maynards Rockwood, ME 04478

**From:** [mccandu@aol.com](mailto:mccandu@aol.com)  
**To:** [Gaffney, Heidi](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Maynard's - Zoning Permit Application  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 11, 2026 6:06:22 PM

---

**EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the State of Maine Mail System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.**

Hello Heidi,

We are writing to you and your Team regarding the Proposed Maynards Zoning and Development Project. First off, we are landowners on River View Ln, Rockwood and abutters to the Maynards western property line. To begin with, we are Adamantly against the Proposed Re-Zoning to Commercial Land that encompasses Maynards. There are countless, ethical and common-sense reasons / concerns that we as well as other abutters share in why we Oppose this Zoning / Development.

I'd like to begin with just a brief history of my knowledge of Rockwood and Maynard's. My Family-owned property across from (now) Rockwood Cottages since 1962 but no longer do. My wife and I presently own a piece of property on River View as well as our children just a few years ago purchased 1 as well.

I spent practically every summer in Rockwood growing up, even working odd jobs in town ( Tessier's store, Wihttens store, Bait and Tackle shop) including even mowing lawns for old Roger Maynard. So, as you see I have seen many transitions through the years as well as have many friends throughout the area but sadly many are no longer with us.

So back to our concerns regarding this Commercial Zoning endeavor, We All know that there will Most Definitely be a relentless flow of Traffic to even include Commercial Trucking on Maynards Rd. especially if the development of this magnitude is approved. This alone will have an adverse effect on the peaceful tranquility of the area as well as Safety concerns. Also to include the higher potential of mishaps ( walking, jogging, bicycling, children, 4-wheeling) etc. the list goes on. The Moose River Bridge is only one lane. How will that be Enforced? Bridge capacity? (weight limit) Construction Vehicles? Commercial delivery vehicles? This is just scratching the surface, especially if there is to be a restaurant / bar, retail store, gas, and propane. Others in town will definitely travel it to utilize their proposed accommodations. This can all be avoided so long as You and Your Team make the common-sense ethical decision and Do Not Approve / Support this Endeavor. I may entertain a Limit to the development to only what you see on that property as of today. Rebuild the Main Lodge / Restaurant, refurbish / remodel / replace only the existing cabins presently on the property. The application states, the development will accommodate 300-350 people daily? What about the Aquifer? Abutters water supply? The Septic? The Trash (smells / wildlife). Noise Pollution? Light Pollution? Campfire's? Fireworks? Guests roaming Pets? 4-Wheelers? Sleds? Boat slips? The river is way over capacity for watercrafts as it is Today. ie. Boat docks, Jet skis,

Paddleboards, Tubing, Kayaks, Swimmers. Navigating the mouth of river is Already a Nightmare. Pavillion? Swimming pool? (how to fill and or replenish that)? Potential 30 RV sites? (wastewater / trash disposal / dumpsters)? Maintenance and Repair Building? (Hazardous materials, Contaminates)? Sports and Recreation field(s) (noise and light pollution)? 4-Wheelers and Sleds? (we had and have issues with that, as they come thru their western property line and utilize / contribute to the erosion of River View Ln which is shared / deeded to the 6 landowners of it). My driveway is roughly 100ft from their property line. Emergency services? I know its county Sherrif supervised, town volunteer Fire / Emt. God forbid, they're needed. Response time is below minimal, knowing the distance to travel. Also, if approved this will definitely affect other businesses in the area that are doing it for Income and happy with that. Not a Resort Atmosphere like big Corp. What are the Financials? (funding, or is this going to be a Mystery deal like Burnt Jacket Mtn)? There is IMO plenty of accommodations in the area as it stands, with their guest volumes down thru the years, So if this is approved, I'm sure they will be drastically effected Financially, to the point of closure IMO.

LUPC, please do the correct thing and Vote NO on this Commercial Zoning Project. Protect the landowners / abutters, especially on Maynards Rd. We are Hoping that there, will / would / could be a Public Hearing on this matter, If not in person, then possibly Virtual / video.

Thanking You in Advance for Consideration regarding our input on this Project.

Respectfully,  
Michael & Donna Cisewski  
PO Box 3, Raymond NH 03077  
Tel. 603-498-6544  
Email. [mccandu@aol.com](mailto:mccandu@aol.com)

n Wednesday, February 4, 2026 at 11:48:12 AM EST, Gaffney, Heidi <[heidi.gaffney@maine.gov](mailto:heidi.gaffney@maine.gov)> wrote:

Good morning,

Below please find the links to the LUPC website where you can find the application for Maynard's Zoning Permit Application (ZP 805) under the "Featured Projects" page. This page will be updated with any additional application material and other information as the application review process proceeds. Please submit any written comments to me through email or USPS mail at the mailing address below my signature.

[LUPC Projects](#)

[Maynard's of Maine](#)

Sincerely,

**Heidi Gaffney**

Environmental Licensing Specialist II

Land Use Planning Commission

8 Moosehead Lane, Suite 107

Dover-Foxcroft, ME 04426

Phone: (207) 349-0941

**From:** [Arbo, Audie T](#)  
**To:** [Carla Ritchie](#); [Gaffney, Heidi](#)  
**Cc:** [Benjamin, Stacy](#)  
**Subject:** Re: MRLT and LUPC  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 11, 2026 10:45:53 AM

---

Carla, thank you for your email. I have added the Senior regional staff who is reviewing the zoning petition application. We have also added this comment in support to the Commission presentation for today.

Regards,  
Audie Arbo  
Permitting and Compliance Manager  
Land Use Planning Commission

---

**From:** Carla Ritchie <cjritchie9@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 11, 2026 8:16 AM  
**To:** Arbo, Audie T <Audie.T.Arbo@maine.gov>  
**Cc:** Benjamin, Stacy <Stacy.Benjamin@maine.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: MRLT and LUPC

**EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the State of Maine Mail System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.**

Good morning Audie and Stacy,

I just heard about the Maynards planned expansion in Rockwood. I understand there is time on the agenda today to determine if a public hearing is necessary.

I have to work today, but I am writing to support the request for a public hearing on the requested zoning changes for Maynards property in Rockwood.

Thank you,  
Carla Ritchie  
Tomhegan Township

Sent from my iPhone