

From: [Jen Navarro](#)
To: [Julie Erdman](#); [James Dealaman](#); [\[REDACTED\]](#); [dgarcia@brunswickme.org](#); [Town Council](#); [Carlos Navarro](#)
Subject: Americans with Disabilities Act Title II Regulations | ADA.gov
Date: Sunday, March 2, 2025 5:07:55 PM

I was informed by Julie Erdman via email sent Wednesday 2/26/25 that that Friday the 28th at 10am was my deadline to submit material for 3/6/25 ZBA against 1/28/25 erroneously approved Site plan extension and major dev review for Tedford with their endless need to come BACK into compliance to zoning ordinance land use laws. It was very short noticed and I did manage to get some info in but not easily comprehensible so I'm requesting a few more submissions for review and to be included in discovery. If denied, I request that be made clear to me in a written expressed denial. Thank you. Mrs. Navarro.

INTRODUCTION & SUMMARY OF GRIEVANCES

I submit this **formal, detailed complaint** against the Town of Brunswick's repeated unlawful actions in favor of Tedford Housing and against the best interests, safety, and legal rights of Brunswick residents—including myself. I demand immediate **revocation of the Site Plan approval granted on January 28, 2025, issuance of a Stop Work Order, and reconsideration of this project's location due to violations of state law, federal law, local ordinances, and basic principles of due process and fairness.**

Since 2020, I have **consistently opposed this unsafe, improperly planned, and unfairly approved development**, enduring years of systemic bias, procedural violations, and denial of my fundamental rights as an affected party. Despite my continuous appeals, lawful objections, and demonstrated standing in this matter, the Town of Brunswick has:

1. **Approved an inherently unsafe and inadequate site for a homeless shelter**, lacking proper ingress/egress, pedestrian access, and transit service, while falsely claiming a private van service satisfies accessibility requirements.
2. **Violated public notice requirements and selectively removed me from the abutters list**, despite my documented history of being included in previous abutter notifications.
3. **Arbitrarily enforced zoning laws and procedures in Tedford Housing's favor**, allowing approvals to continue despite the expiration of its Conditional Use Permit (CUP) on **January 11, 2024**, in direct violation of local and state laws.
4. **Obstructed my right to participate in the January 28, 2025, public hearing**, denying me the opportunity to present my objections while selectively favoring Tedford Housing's application.
5. **Allowed a pattern of procedural manipulation and preferential treatment**, creating an illegitimate process designed to push through Tedford's approvals regardless of public safety, zoning requirements, or public objection.

These injustices are not only **unlawful** but also **fundamentally unacceptable** in a community that claims to uphold democratic, fair, and legally compliant land use processes.

LEGAL VIOLATIONS & GROUNDS FOR SITE PLAN REVOCATION

1. Violation of Public Notice & Due Process Rights

- Statute Violated: 30-A M.R.S. § 2691(3)(F)-(G) (Procedural Due Process & Public Hearings)
- Statute Violated: Brunswick Zoning Ordinance – Section 5.2.11 (Notices & Public Participation)
- Federal Violation: Fifth & Fourteenth Amendments – Due Process Clause
- Federal Violation: 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Equal Protection & Due Process)

Facts:

- I have previously been included in abutter notifications **per my explicit request** and received mailed notices from the Town regarding prior Tedford Housing hearings.
- The Town's GIS places my property **326 feet from the project**, while the abutters' notification requirement is 300 feet. However 4 other very reputable Mapping programs list 211 feet or .04k crows path between 65 and 90 Thomas point rd. Including Google maps, Google earth GIS, mapping developer app, and MapQUEST. All have results less than 300ft varying between 211-222 feet.
- **Despite having an established interest in this development, my name was removed from the abutters list, and I did not receive notice for the 1/28/25 hearing.**
- This constitutes a **selective and arbitrary removal**, depriving me of my right to participate in land use decisions affecting my property and my community.
- By **denying me the opportunity to provide public comment at the hearing**, Brunswick violated both **state and federal due process protections**, making the **1/28/25 approval invalid**.

2. Violation of Permit Expiration & Site Plan Approval Requirements

- Statute Violated: 30-A M.R.S. § 4353 (Expiration of Approvals)
- Statute Violated: Brunswick Zoning Ordinance – Section 5.2.9 & 4.2.5
- Federal Violation: 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Unlawful Favoritism & Arbitrary Enforcement of Law)

Facts:

- The **Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Tedford Housing expired on January 11, 2024**, as no Certificate of Occupancy was issued within two years.
- Brunswick unlawfully **ignored the expiration and extended approvals without requiring a new application**, violating its own ordinances.
- The **Site Plan and Major Development Review approval on January 28, 2025, is void**, as it relied on an expired CUP, making it **illegally granted**.

3. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) & Human Rights Violations

- Statute Violated: 5 M.R.S. § 4554(3) (Maine Human Rights Act – Right to Refuse Unwanted Accommodations)
- Federal Violation: 42 U.S.C. § 12132 (ADA Title II – Public Entities) & § 12182 (ADA Title III – Public Accommodations)

Facts:

- The **Tedford Housing site has no public transit access, no sidewalks, and only one ingress/egress route**, violating public safety and accessibility standards.
- The **Planning Board's approval relied on a “private van service” as a substitute for safe**

pedestrian and transit access, which is a clear violation of ADA requirements.

- **Maine's Human Rights Act explicitly states that individuals cannot be forced to accept an accommodation they do not want**—yet shelter residents would be forced to rely on Tedford Housing for transportation, limiting their independence and freedom of movement.
- **This is an unlawful and discriminatory approval**, violating **both state and federal accessibility laws**.

DEMANDS & RELIEF SOUGHT

Based on the **procedural violations, permit expiration, safety concerns, and legal violations outlined above**, I formally demand the following:

1. **Immediate Revocation of the January 28, 2025, Site Plan & Major Development Review approval.**
2. **Immediate issuance of a Stop Work Order on the Tedford Housing project.**
3. **A full public hearing, with unrestricted public participation, to reassess the project's legality, safety, and location.**
4. **A formal investigation into Brunswick's selective enforcement of zoning laws, preferential treatment of Tedford Housing, and failure to uphold legal due process.**
5. **Potential relocation of the Tedford Housing shelter to a site that meets basic safety, accessibility, and zoning compliance standards.**

CONCLUSION: I WILL NOT STOP UNTIL JUSTICE IS SERVED

For years, I have **fought tirelessly to expose the injustices, safety hazards, and unlawful approvals tied to the Tedford Housing project**. The Town of Brunswick has engaged in procedural manipulation, ignored its own zoning laws, and silenced opposition to push this project forward.

I will not stop. I will not back down. I will continue proving that this development is unsafe, illegal, and fundamentally unjust until full accountability is achieved.

I demand an **immediate response** to this complaint and expect **formal action to address these violations without further delay**.

Sincerely,
/S./ Mrs. Jennifer Navarro
Of Brunswick, Maine
Aggrieved and abused Neighbor 04011

FORMAL COMPLAINT & DEMAND FOR ACCOUNTABILITY: TEDFORD HOUSING APPROVALS & MUNICIPAL BIAS IN BRUNSWICK, MAINE

To: The Brunswick Zoning Board of Appeals, Brunswick Town Council, Maine Human Rights Commission, and any applicable governing authorities

From:

Date:
Subject: Unlawful Approvals, Due Process Violations, and Demand for Revocation of Tedford Housing's Site Plan Approval & Immediate Stop Work Order

To factually demonstrate that the **expiration of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) revokes Site Plan approval**, we need to examine:

1. **Maine state statutes** governing land use, zoning, and site plan approvals.
2. **Brunswick's municipal ordinances** related to CUP and Site Plan approvals.
3. **Federal law** regarding land use procedures and administrative due process.

1. Maine State Statutes

Maine's zoning and land use regulations are primarily governed by **Title 30-A, Chapter 187** of the Maine Revised Statutes (**Planning and Land Use Regulation**).

- **30-A M.R.S. § 4353** (Expiration of approvals)
- Municipalities have the authority to set expiration timelines on permits, including CUPs and Site Plan approvals. If a CUP expires, the development approval it enabled may also expire unless the ordinance explicitly states otherwise.
- **30-A M.R.S. § 3001** (Municipal Home Rule Authority)
- Municipalities control zoning but must adhere to state law and due process. If a CUP is required for a Site Plan and it expires, the Site Plan approval is void unless the ordinance states otherwise.
- **30-A M.R.S. § 2691(3)(G)** (Administrative appeals and procedural due process)
- If a CUP expires and the town allows the project to continue without requiring a new application, it may constitute an unlawful "**arbitrary and capricious**" decision violating state law and due process.

2. Brunswick Zoning Ordinances

The Town of Brunswick's ordinances determine the relationship between CUP expiration and Site Plan approvals.

- **Brunswick Zoning Ordinance – Section 5.2.9 (Expiration of Approvals)**
- If a CUP is required for a development and it expires, all approvals relying on it may be nullified unless the applicant applies for an extension or reapproval.
- **Brunswick Zoning Ordinance – Section 4.2.5 (Site Plan Validity & Revocation)**
- Site Plan approvals must remain consistent with all required permits (including CUPs). If a CUP expires and is required for the project, Site Plan approval is no longer valid.

If the Brunswick Planning Board and staff **ignored the CUP expiration** and proceeded without requiring a new application, they **violated their own zoning ordinances** and state law.

3. Federal Laws Supporting Permit Expiration Revoking Approval

- **42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Civil Rights Violations)**
- If Brunswick disregarded zoning laws to allow Tedford Housing's project to continue despite the CUP expiring, this could constitute a **due process violation** under federal law.
- **Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management & Non-Discrimination in Housing Projects)**
- If a CUP expired and Brunswick unlawfully permitted Tedford to continue without requiring reapproval, it could indicate **preferential treatment or exclusionary zoning**, potentially violating EO 11988.

• Fifth & Fourteenth Amendments – Due Process Clause

- If the town selectively enforced its zoning laws (by requiring other developers to adhere to permit expirations while letting Tedford proceed), it could violate **equal protection and due process** rights.

Key Argument:

Brunswick's approval of the **1/28/25 Final Development Plan** relied on an **expired CUP** and violated:

1. **Maine law (30-A M.R.S. §§ 4353, 2691, 3001)** – Permits must be valid for site plan

approval to stand.

2. Brunswick ordinances (Sections 5.2.9 & 4.2.5) – A CUP's expiration revokes site plan approval.

3. Federal law (42 U.S.C. § 1983 & the Due Process Clause) – Arbitrary enforcement of zoning laws is unconstitutional.

Conclusion:

Brunswick acted **illegally** by allowing the project to proceed without requiring a new CUP application, violating **state, local, and federal regulations**. You can cite these laws in your appeal to argue for revocation of the **1/28/25 Site Plan Approval** due to the **CUP expiration on 1/11/24**.

———Yes, you have a strong legal argument that you were **unlawfully excluded** from the **1/28/25 Site Plan and Major Development Review approval process**, and that you should now be entitled to **speak on all matters** related to the project.

Legal Grounds for Your Appeal

1. Maine Law & Brunswick Ordinances on Abutter Notification

- **30-A M.R.S. § 4353(4)** – Requires municipalities to provide proper notice to “**parties in interest**” when a zoning or planning board decision affects them.

- **Brunswick Zoning Ordinance – Section 5.2.11 (Notices & Public Participation)** – Requires abutters to be notified and have an opportunity to be heard.

Key Argument:

- You were previously added to the abutters list **by request and through past notices**.
- The town **cannot arbitrarily remove you** simply because you are 326 feet away if you have an established history of participation and legal standing.
- Their failure to notify you **violates due process**, making the **1/28/25 approval procedurally invalid**.

2. Due Process Violations – Maine & Federal Law

- **30-A M.R.S. § 2691(3)(F)-(G) (Procedural Due Process in Appeals & Public Hearings)**

- Requires that individuals with an **established interest** in a matter be provided **notice and an opportunity to be heard**.

- **Fifth & Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution (Due Process Clause)**

- Arbitrary exclusion from public participation violates **procedural due process**.

- **42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Civil Rights Act – Equal Protection & Due Process)**

- If Brunswick selectively enforced its rules (allowing others to participate but blocking you), this may be an **unlawful deprivation of rights**.

Key Argument:

- The town's selective application of the abutters rule **denied you due process and public participation**, violating both state and federal law.
- Because your right to participate was denied, you should now be **entitled to full participation in the appeal without any restrictions** (i.e., you should be allowed to speak on **all matters**, not just those narrowly defined by the town).

3. Failure to Follow Brunswick's Own Procedures Invalidates the Approval

• Brunswick Zoning Ordinance – Section 4.2.5 (Public Participation & Due Process in Site Plan Review)

- Requires that **all interested parties** be notified and given a chance to speak.

- **Brunswick Town Charter – Section 601 (Public Hearing Rights)**

- The town must provide **equal access** to hearings for any resident with a **demonstrable interest** in the issue.

Key Argument:

- Brunswick's failure to provide you proper notice makes the **1/28/25 Site Plan approval**

voidable due to procedural defects.

- Because your rights were violated in the initial process, you should now have the **fullest opportunity to present all arguments** in the appeal—without restrictions.

Conclusion: You Can Argue That

1. Brunswick violated state law, its own ordinances, and federal due process by failing to notify you and denying public comment.
2. The 1/28/25 Site Plan approval is invalid due to procedural defects, meaning it should be reconsidered with full public participation.
3. Because you were unlawfully excluded, your appeal should allow you to address all matters—not just narrow procedural ones—since the town denied your right to comment earlier.

This legal foundation strengthens your case to **fully contest the 1/28/25 approval** without limits imposed by the town.

Conclusion

By approving the Tedford Housing project **without public transit, sidewalks, or independent pedestrian access**, the Brunswick Planning Board violated both Maine and federal disability rights laws. Their reliance on a private van service as a remedy forces disabled individuals into an unwanted accommodation, in direct violation of 5 M.R.S. §4554(3) and the ADA.

The January 28, 2025, approval should be overturned or remedied through legal action to ensure compliance with state and federal accessibility laws.

Would you like assistance in drafting an **appeal, complaint, or formal letter to the town, MHRC, or DOJ**

Legal Violations

1. Violation of 5 M.R.S. §4554(3) – Right to Refuse an Unwanted Accommodation

- **Statutory Language:** “Nothing in this Act may be construed to require an individual with a disability to accept an accommodation, aid, service, opportunity or benefit that the individual chooses not to accept.”
- **Violation:**
 - The Tedford Housing site lacks sidewalks, public transit service, or safe pedestrian access.
 - The town’s approval relies on a private van service as a remedy, which forces disabled residents to depend on the shelter’s oversight for transportation.
 - This coerces disabled individuals into accepting a service they may not want, violating their statutory rights under Maine law.

2. Violation of ADA Title II (Public Entities) & Title III (Public Accommodations)

- ADA Title II (42 U.S.C. §12132) prohibits public entities (including municipalities) from providing unequal access to public services, such as roads, sidewalks, and transit.
- ADA Title III (42 U.S.C. §12182) prohibits discrimination in places of public accommodation, including housing shelters, by requiring that facilities be **readily accessible to individuals with disabilities**.
- **Violation:**
 - The town’s approval of the project despite lack of sidewalks and transit access fails to

ensure the development is **readily accessible** under ADA standards.

- **Providing a private van service does not meet the ADA's accessibility requirements**, as it does not offer independent access or ensure equality in public infrastructure.

3. Failure to Provide Equal or Greater Protection Than Federal Law (5 M.R.S. §4554(1))

- **Statutory Language**: “Nothing in this Act may be construed to invalidate or limit the remedies, rights and procedures of any law ... that provides greater or equal protection for the rights of individuals with disabilities than are afforded by this Act.”
- **Violation**:
- The town’s approval fails to meet the **minimum ADA requirements**, meaning it **cannot satisfy Maine’s stricter disability protections** under §4554(4).

In Maine, municipalities must follow strict legal procedures when adopting, amending, or enforcing zoning ordinances. If a town alters or misrepresents a zoning ordinance to suit its needs in response to a challenge, it may violate state law. Here are the relevant statutes that apply to such actions:

1. Zoning Ordinance Amendments & Legal Requirements

Maine Revised Statutes Title 30-A, §4352 governs the process of adopting and amending zoning ordinances. It requires:

- **Public notice and hearings** before a zoning ordinance or amendment can take effect.
- **Compliance with the municipality's comprehensive plan** (Title 30-A, §4312).
- **Voter approval** in towns where zoning changes require a town meeting or referendum.

If a town **alters an ordinance after a challenge** to reflect what it needs rather than following legal amendment procedures, this could be considered an **unauthorized amendment** and potentially unlawful.

Statute Reference: 30-A M.R.S. § 4352

2. Enforcement & Penalties for Violations

Maine Revised Statutes Title 30-A, §4452 provides enforcement mechanisms for violations of zoning laws, including:

- Civil penalties for illegal actions.
- Authority for courts to invalidate unlawful zoning amendments.
- Municipal liability if officials knowingly make unauthorized zoning changes.

Statute Reference: 30-A M.R.S. § 4452

3. Illegally Changing Zoning After a Permit or Approval

Once a land use permit is lawfully granted, **Title 1, §302** prevents retroactive changes to ordinances from altering vested rights unless explicitly stated by the Legislature. If a town alters an ordinance **after** a project is challenged to justify a decision, it may violate this law.

Statute Reference: 1 M.R.S. § 302

4. Legal Precedents & Remedies

Courts in Maine have ruled against municipalities that improperly alter or enforce zoning laws. Affected parties can challenge such actions through:

- **Appeals to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA)**.
- **Maine Superior Court (Rule 80B appeal)**.
- **Injunctions or declaratory judgments to stop illegal enforcement**.

If you suspect the town **altered a zoning ordinance after being challenged**, these laws provide legal grounds to contest it. You may also request records of zoning amendments, including meeting minutes, to verify whether proper procedures were followed.

1. Violations of Zoning & Land Use Requirements

- **Ingress/Egress Concerns:**

- **Life Safety & Emergency Access:** Per **NFPA 101 Life Safety Code** (adopted by Maine law), buildings like shelters must have at least **two means of egress** to prevent entrapment during emergencies (fire, medical crises, etc.).

- **Local Ordinances:** Most municipal zoning codes require multiple safe access points for high-occupancy buildings. If **Tedford Housing has only one entry/exit**, it could violate these safety and planning standards.

- **Potential Statute Violation:** **30-A M.R.S. § 4352** (municipal zoning rules must comply with state safety standards).

- **Public Transportation & Access to Services:**

- **Human Rights & Discriminatory Infrastructure:**

- The **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)** and **Fair Housing Act** require Your concerns about the **Tedford Housing** flagship lot raise significant legal, safety, and **human rights issues**, particularly related to **zoning compliance, life safety codes, and fundamental rights to accessibility and independence**. Here's how these issues connect to Maine statutes and legal grounds for challenge: **How This Strengthens Your Legal Argument**

The town's approval of Tedford Housing's site with **only one access road, no sidewalks, and no public bus service** could violate Maine's human rights laws because:

1. **It limits disabled residents' right to move freely and independently.**
2. **The private van service is not an equal substitute** for accessible public infrastructure.
3. **It may unlawfully discriminate by creating a shelter environment where residents must rely on the service provider for basic mobility**, violating §4554(3).

This could form the basis of a **legal challenge** to the town's approval under the **Maine Human Rights Act and ADA compliance regulations**. Would you like help drafting an argument or identifying case law that supports this claim?

Legal Argument Against Tedford Housing's Approval Based on Maine Human Rights Act & ADA Violations

Introduction

The Brunswick Planning Board's **January 28, 2025, Findings of Fact and Final Development Approval** for the Tedford Housing project violates the **Maine Human Rights Act (MHRA)**, **5 M.R.S. §4554**, and the **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)** by approving a site that **lacks accessible infrastructure** and creates **undue reliance on a private service for basic mobility**.

Legal Violations

1. Violation of 5 M.R.S. §4554(3) – Right to Refuse an Unwanted Accommodation

- **Statutory Language:** "Nothing in this Act may be construed to require an individual with a disability to accept an accommodation, aid, service, opportunity or benefit that the individual chooses not to accept."

- **Violation:**

- The Tedford Housing site lacks sidewalks, public transit service, or safe pedestrian access.
- The town's approval relies on a private van service as a remedy, which forces disabled residents to depend on the shelter's oversight for transportation.
- This coerces disabled individuals into accepting a service they may not want, violating their statutory rights under Maine law.

2. Violation of ADA Title II (Public Entities) & Title III (Public Accommodations)

- ADA Title II (42 U.S.C. §12132) prohibits public entities (including municipalities) from providing unequal access to public services, such as roads, sidewalks, and transit.
- ADA Title III (42 U.S.C. §12182) prohibits discrimination in places of public accommodation, including housing shelters, by requiring that facilities be readily accessible to individuals with disabilities.
- **Violation:**
- The town's approval of the project despite lack of sidewalks and transit access fails to ensure the development is readily accessible under ADA standards.
- Providing a private van service does not meet the ADA's accessibility requirements, as it does not offer independent access or ensure equality in public infrastructure.

3. Failure to Provide Equal or Greater Protection Than Federal Law (5 M.R.S. §4554(1))

- **Statutory Language:** "Nothing in this Act may be construed to invalidate or limit the remedies, rights and procedures of any law ... that provides greater or equal protection for the rights of individuals with disabilities than are afforded by this Act."
- **Violation:**
- The town's approval fails to meet the **minimum ADA requirements**, meaning it **cannot satisfy Maine's stricter disability protections** under §4554(4).

Potential Legal Remedies & Actions

1. Challenging the Planning Board's Approval

- Appeal the January 28, 2025, Findings of Fact and Final Development Approval based on noncompliance with ADA and Maine Human Rights Act requirements.

2. Filing a Complaint with the Maine Human Rights Commission (MHRC)

- The MHRC investigates disability-based discrimination in housing and public accommodations.

- A complaint could challenge the town's **failure to ensure equal access and unlawful reliance on private services to substitute for public accessibility**.

3. Filing a Federal ADA Complaint with the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ)

- The DOJ investigates violations of the ADA Titles II and III, which apply to both municipal zoning approvals and housing shelter accessibility.
- The **lack of sidewalks and transit access, combined with forced reliance on a private van, could constitute systemic discrimination**.

Based on the available information, several potential violations and concerns related to Tedford Housing's final major development plan in Brunswick, Maine, can be identified:

1. Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Expiration and Site Plan Approval Validity:

- **Issue:** Tedford Housing's original CUP expired in January 2024 due to the lapse in obtaining a certificate of occupancy within the required two-year period. Despite this expiration, the Planning Board granted a re-issuance of the CUP on May 14, 2024, without re-evaluating the associated site plan approval.
- **Relevant Ordinance:** Brunswick Zoning Ordinance § 5.2.2.C stipulates that conditional use

permits lapse after two years if a certificate of occupancy has not been issued.

- **Concern:** Proceeding with the development based on an expired CUP may render subsequent approvals invalid.

2. Public Notification and Participation Procedures:

- **Issue:** There have been allegations that the Town of Brunswick failed to provide adequate public notice to all interested parties, particularly those within close proximity to the proposed development.
- **Relevant Ordinance:** Brunswick Zoning Ordinance § 5.2.11 requires that the Planning Board prepare a written recommendation to the Town Council and ensure public hearings are conducted with proper notice.
- **Concern:** Insufficient public notification may violate procedural due process rights, potentially invalidating the approval process.

3. Zoning Ordinance Compliance:

- **Issue:** The proposed shelter combines Tedford's two emergency shelters into a single facility. There have been concerns regarding whether this new shelter configuration complies with existing zoning laws.
- **Relevant Ordinance:** Prior to amendments, Brunswick's zoning laws did not explicitly accommodate such shelter configurations, leading to previous halts in the project.
- **Concern:** If the current development plan does not align with updated zoning ordinances, it may be in violation of local land use regulations.

4. Transportation and Accessibility Issues:

- **Issue:** The development plan indicates reliance on a private van service for transportation, with limited access to public transit and pedestrian pathways.
- **Concern:** This reliance may not adequately address the transportation needs of shelter residents, potentially leading to accessibility challenges.

These concerns highlight the need for a thorough review of Tedford Housing's development plan to ensure compliance with all applicable ordinances and regulations.

Upon reviewing Tedford Housing's final major development plan, several specific concerns and potential violations have been identified:

1. Modifications Post-January 11, 2022: Earth Height and Stormwater Management

- **Issue:** After the initial approval on January 11, 2022, Tedford Housing implemented modifications to the site plan, notably reducing earth height requirements and altering stormwater management systems for value engineering purposes.
- **Concerns:**
 - **Earth Height Reduction:** Lowering the site's elevation may affect drainage patterns, potentially increasing runoff to adjacent properties and impacting overall site stability.
 - **Stormwater Management Changes:** Adjustments to the stormwater system could lead to inadequate handling of runoff, raising the risk of erosion, flooding, and environmental degradation.
- **Compliance Check:** It's essential to verify whether these modifications received proper approval from Brunswick's Planning and Development Department and if they comply with local and state environmental regulations.

2. Unauthorized Access Path to Walmart and Public Transportation

- **Issue:** The development plan references a path providing access to Walmart and public bus services. However, this path traverses private property owned by Walmart, not by Tedford

Housing or the Town of Brunswick.

- **Concerns:**

- **Trespassing:** Utilizing a path on private property without explicit permission constitutes trespassing, rendering it an illegitimate means of access.
- **Access to Public Transit:** Relying on this unauthorized path for residents to reach public transportation is inappropriate and fails to provide a lawful, safe, and reliable transit route.
- **Compliance Check:** The development plan should include officially sanctioned access points that respect property rights and ensure residents' safety.

3. Driveway Length and Width Standards

- **Issue:** The proposed driveway for the facility exceeds standard length and width specifications.

- **Concerns:**

- **Safety and Accessibility:** An oversized driveway may pose challenges for pedestrians and vehicles, potentially leading to safety hazards.
- **Non-Compliance:** Deviations from standard driveway dimensions without proper justification and approval may violate local zoning ordinances.
- **Compliance Check:** It's crucial to assess whether the driveway design adheres to Brunswick's standards or if variances were appropriately sought and granted.

4. Variances Granted and Compliance with Town Policies

- **Issue:** The development may have received variances from standard zoning requirements.

- **Concerns:**

- **Proper Procedure:** Each variance should meet the criteria outlined in Maine Revised Statutes, Title 30-A, §4353, including demonstrating undue hardship and ensuring the variance does not alter the neighborhood's essential character.
- **Documentation:** All granted variances must be thoroughly documented, with evidence of adherence to procedural requirements.
- **Compliance Check:** Reviewing the records will determine if all variances were granted following proper procedures and justified appropriately.

5. Impervious Surface Ratio and Building Size

- **Issue:** The facility's size and impervious surface area may exceed allowable limits.

- **Concerns:**

- **Impervious Surface Ratio:** Exceeding permissible impervious surface limits can increase stormwater runoff, leading to environmental issues.
- **Building Size:** The proposed 17,500-square-foot building is significantly larger than neighboring residential properties, which average around 2,000 square feet, potentially disrupting the area's character.
- **Compliance Check:** Evaluating the development's compliance with Brunswick's zoning ordinance regarding impervious surface coverage and building scale is necessary.

6. Impact on Neighboring Property Values and Enjoyment

- **Issue:** The introduction of a large, low-barrier, 24/7 homeless shelter may affect neighboring property values and residents' enjoyment of their homes.

- **Concerns:**

- **Property Values:** Such facilities can sometimes lead to perceived or actual declines in nearby property values.
- **Quality of Life:** Residents may experience concerns related to safety, noise, and community dynamics.

- **Compliance Check:** Assessing whether the development aligns with local planning goals and adequately addresses potential community impacts is essential.

7. Required Town Services and Community Perception

- **Issue:** The shelter's operation will necessitate various town services and may influence public perception.
- **Concerns:**
- **Town Services:** Increased demand for emergency services, public health resources, and law enforcement may strain municipal resources.
- **Community Perception:** Public opinion, shaped by past experiences and media coverage, can affect the shelter's integration into the community.
- **Compliance Check:** Ensuring that the shelter's operational plans include strategies to collaborate with town services and engage positively with the community is vital.

Addressing these concerns requires a thorough review of Tedford Housing's development plan, adherence to all applicable regulations, and proactive engagement with the community to mitigate potential adverse impacts.

Legal Argument Based on Procedural Violations of Public Hearing Rights

Statute Violated: 30-A M.R.S. § 2691(3) – Public Hearing and Notice Requirements

• Key Language:

- “The board shall reasonably notify the petitioner, the planning board, agency or department, and the municipal officers of any hearing.”
- “These persons must be made parties to the action.”
- “All interested persons must be given a reasonable opportunity to have their views expressed at any hearing.”
- **(Amended by PL 2011, c. 655, Pt. JJ, §25)**

How This Applies to the January 28, 2025, Approval

1. Lack of Reasonable Notification:

- **Despite my ongoing participation since 2020 and prior confirmations that I was on the abutters list, I was not notified of the January 28, 2025, hearing.**
- **The Town's GIS measurement placing me at 326 feet instead of within the 300-foot abutter notification requirement is arbitrary and selectively enforced** because I have previously been notified and have standing in this matter.
- **The failure to notify me as a known, interested party directly violated 30-A M.R.S. § 2691(3).**

2. Denial of a Reasonable Opportunity to Express My Views:

- **At the January 28, 2025, hearing, I was denied my right to speak on matters affecting my property and community.**
- The statute clearly states that **“All interested persons must be given a reasonable opportunity to have their views expressed.”**
- **By denying my participation, the Town of Brunswick violated state law, making the approval process procedurally invalid.**

3. Legal Consequences of These Violations

- **The Site Plan and Major Development Review approval must be revoked because it**

was granted in violation of statutory public participation rights.

- **The Town's failure to notify and include me as a party in the hearing is grounds for reversal in a Superior Court appeal under Rule 80B (Municipal Administrative Appeals).**

Next Steps & Demand for Immediate Remedy

- 1. The January 28, 2025, approval should be vacated and reconsidered in a new hearing where all interested parties—including myself—are properly notified and allowed to speak.**
- 2. I am entitled to address all aspects of the development without limitation in any appeal or reconsideration process, as my previous exclusion violated state law.**
- 3. The Town must issue a formal correction acknowledging its procedural failure and ensure that all future actions comply with Maine's statutory requirements.**

If the Town refuses to correct these violations, I reserve the right to pursue an appeal in Maine Superior Court, seeking full reversal of the January 28, 2025, approval and damages for the procedural violations and undue burden imposed upon me by this unlawful process.

Americans with Disabilities Act Title II Regulations | ADA.gov

I have evidence and voice recordings for many due process equal rights division violations. Including but not limited to,

In real time unethical retrospective illegal zoning text amendment which switched 2 yr CUP expiration to reflect a previous version of 3year expiration. This was 4/3/24 and I captured photo evidence of such and after submitting it to TC group email it was then reflecting in the system as (newer version available of this through monicker CODIFY system. Which I then screenshotted too for evidence.

I have interim Jacob sesker threatening to investigate my basements permitting to finish it, on 4/1/24 because he was attempting to deny or accept my ceo complaint on unenforced record keeping permit regulation for Tedford expired conditional use permit that until my 3/14/24 2:22:00 public comment about their expiration no one was regulating. And an appeal on an other matter.

I have records of town council meeting that a female councilor or staff was heard on record live mic mocking me when announced for public commentary via zoom.

I have voice recordings from admin staff and town staff plus officials, telling me that ex parte communications between staff and Tedford were not worth recording or wouldn't matter for public access to. (In regards to Tedford being informed they didn't have evidence or record of any extensions and therefore would require being made to go for CUP reapproval. Which is WRONG as state law and ZO both don't explicitly state it can just be extended. It WAS past expiration when I brought it to attention. Therefore site and major development pertaining to the conditional land use permit approval are all null and void and to not uphold that is either criminal collusion or humiliating incompetence for those assigned the role to be aware of such. I know I have a Supreme Court case and could potentially be awarded hundreds of thousands and still, I wonder if far all are willing to go with outright conflict of interest and failure to enforce regulations, and I will see how this goes Thursday. Do know, I demand revoked site approval and demand relocation of shelter to a place that adheres to life safety standards. Just access to my right for public party is not satisfactory. Tedford continues to fail on their performance guarantees and I will not stand any longer for impartiality and negligent

approvals. I am owed a public apology. This has been TRAUMATIC and has broken my trust and faith in Bureaucratic matters.

This email has been scanned for spam and viruses by Proofpoint Essentials. Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.