

# Kentfield Planning Advisory Board

*P.O. Box 304, Kentfield, California 94914*

## Minutes of September 14, 2016

Anne Petersen called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. in the COM Student Union and at 10891 Sunshine Coast Hwy, Powell River, BC, Canada. Other board members also present: Bitsa Freeman, Dale Hansen, Eva Long, John Mann, Neil Park (via Skype), Pam Scott. More than 60 members of the public also attended this meeting; most of them came for the presentation on Marin Catholic's Use Permit and Design Review.

### Minutes of August 24, 2016. Deferred

#### COM Facilities Update.

District VP for Finance & Operations Greg Nelson described the current master planning process underway for COM and Indian Valley. Planning has been underway for 18 months, including about 90 meetings with various groups, and a staff draft of the plan will go to the college district's board of trustees on Tuesday, September 19, and revise as needed. Following adoption by the board, the plan will go through environmental review. Among comments he noted:

- Artificial turf will be installed on the football field as soil salinity in the low-lying area makes it difficult to grow grass.
- He hopes to expand the college's solar facilities and to eventually be 90% off grid.
- Tesla's test battery storage facilities on both campuses, installed in May, should eventually reduce peak period power, saving about \$150,000 annually in energy costs.
- The Student Center and the Learning Resource Center are proposed to be redesigned and rebuilt to comply with earthquake safety standards.

#### Mitchell Design Review/2<sup>nd</sup> Unit Approval, 50 Hanken Drive (Alton)

(Guests for project: Tony and Francine Mitchell, neighbors Don and Renate Bixby, 110 Hanken)

Neighbors expressed concern about two items: 1) allowing a second unit in what has historically been a single family neighborhood, and 2) late notice of tonight's KPAB meeting, which they received in the mail on Monday.

Anne noted that provision for a 2<sup>nd</sup> unit is allowed per county ordinance, that the issue in the application is not whether or not the 2<sup>nd</sup> unit should be approved but solely the design review. This is required because the entire project would exceed 4,000 square feet of living area.

Mr. and Mrs. Mitchell briefly reviewed some features, including: three-car garage with three spaces outside the garage, 482 square feet for the studio, the maximum allowable to be considered low-income housing; exceeds height limit; goal is to make their yard more useful.

**Recommendation.** Board members unanimously recommend that this application is incomplete pending story poles being put up.

#### Marin Catholic H.S. Use Permit Amendment/Design Review (Drake)

(Guests: about 60 guests attended the meeting for this project. The applicant was represented by Mike Bentivoglio, a member of the school's board of regents, and Lisa Mango, a parent volunteer who assisted with a Powerpoint presentation)

This meeting was to review additional material submitted by the applicant in response to the incomplete list regarding the application for a use permit amendment and design review approval for a field lighting system at the school. As an Initial Study of possible environmental impacts will be have to be done, the KPAB intended this meeting to give the public another opportunity to discuss the project and make suggestions regarding incomplete information and environmental issues that could be considered in the Initial Study process. Following a summary review by Ms. Mango and Mrs. Bentivoglio of the additional reports, comments including the following.

1. From photos of lighting as it might look after dark, it appears that the lighting analysis only considers light shining directly onto field and stadium areas but not secondary light glare or lighting that “splashes” upward from the direct light and thus wanders further than the lighting report indicates. This secondary light should be included in the study.
2. Could there be an example of lighting from an existing installation in a valley or bowl setting such as Greenbrae, rather than the one used in the report, which is a flat field.
3. Could reflection on surrounding surfaces intensify impact of lighting to uphill properties, extending the effect more than indicated in report?
4. Greenbrae is a vertical neighborhood, not horizontal like the school used as an example.
5. Glare simulations or measurements should show aerial, or birds' eye, view of school.
6. Provide an explanation of how compliance with the use permit would be monitored and enforced? For example how would the County determine that attendance does not exceed the projected maximum capacity, dimming of lights happens as described for games not needing full lighting, noise levels do not exceed permitted maximums for individual games, the school's student population remains as described in terms of home residences, number of students, level of participation in sports that use fields, parking needs are met as described,, or fields are not used by other groups?
7. Are there alternative facilities that would allow these games to be played during the day?
8. If there is an event or situation that stalls traffic flow on SFD it could encourage exiting cars headed east to turn right on Bon Air and go through Larkspur or even Larkspur and Corte Madera, so the Magnolia/Bon Air intersection should be studied in the traffic report along with the other three intersections that are included.
9. Several people questioned if sound/noise measurements were taken at times which would yield accurate information on volume levels.
10. There was uncertainty stated about the availability of the St. Sebastian parking spaces if the church had an event that conflicts with a game time. What other parking users are there at the church and how are these monitored to insure the church has not over-committed its facility? How would the school deal with any conflict in use of these spaces with other users such as Marin General?
11. How are noise levels measured at varying distances from the source and how would these be monitored?
12. One gentleman said his children are kept awake by night noise from Marin Catholic evening activities, that his 6 foot fence does not buffer sound from the valley.

13. How is the "average" noise level defined and how does this mean that a sound level that greatly exceeds maximums allowable would be considered? How are sound levels well above and below standards considered in the measurement and how mitigated?
14. A full EIR should be done and include alternatives, e.g. project, no project, alternatives to accomplish the same goals as project. One option to explore is to explore modifying the class schedule so that participants in games that would be played late in the day or evening could have PE in the last class period, enabling them to leave earlier for games.
15. The traffic study done by applicant is inconsistent with information in the county study for the SFD rehabilitation project.
16. There should be an estimate of sound increases during games as opposed to daylong averages.
17. Describe differences in sound from current conditions at 9 PM and with project, what are differences over a three hour game period?
18. Noise studies should determine differing sources of noise and break down the volumes by source during game time, e.g. what is attributed to crowd noise, music, PA system, etc.?
19. There should be impulse measurements to identify intensity of sound by duration and by source, and consider ways that the volume could be diminished as needed.
20. The character of the community should be considered when evaluating the noise levels.
21. The biological impact report does not consider cumulative impacts and appears to be designed to conclude minimal impacts.
22. Studies should consider cumulative impacts, especially traffic, resulting from activity and buildout at Marin General's planned Ambulatory Care Building.
23. A photo simulation should be done from hillsides.
24. Review the High School State Standards for athletic fields including considerations
25. such as sound and lighting, etc.
26. If it is not realistic to put up 80 foot story poles, then balloons or some other visual element should be used to indicate the light standard heights to the public.
27. What mechanisms would exist to revoke the use permit?
28. Provide a sound map of the field and area based on topography and sound transmission characteristics, e.g. where does sound from the field travel and at what intensity levels would sound arrive at different properties in the area?
29. The notification area for meetings on this project should go the area above the hospital and to Larkspur areas.
30. Is a 20 year lease for parking at St. Sebastian's sufficient?
31. Consistency with Kentfield/Greenbrae Community Plan should be evaluated.

The meeting was adjourned at 10 p.m.

Minutes: Ann Thomas