

September 10, 2016

To Jocelyn Drake  
Marin County Planning Department

I do not oppose a Friday Night Lights program in areas where such events are benign; however, Marin Catholic is not a viable candidate for such a venture. The school is poorly-sited for even current functions: the school burdens the neighborhood and surrounding communities with its traffic, noise and density of use. Intrusions into daily life are extreme enough to negatively affect property values. To their credit, most neighbors have adapted to the existing conditions even when finding their newly-purchased homes affected in ways of which they had been unaware at time of sale. For those of us who drive SFD, vehicular access at MC is a daily exercise in near-misses with ingress and egress complicated by the site constrictions, pedestrians and sheer number of vehicles.

Years ago when Marin Catholic proposed lighting in order to increase stadium use, then-Supervisor Hal Brown was sufficiently responsive to voters and taxpayers, to veto the proposal. Apparently, administrations evolve in circular fashion, so once again, this inappropriate proposal has emerged for consideration.

If this were “for the children” the decision-makers would be responsive to resident children and their families who spend many more years dealing with existing and potential adverse effects than the MC students could gain from their relatively short terms at the school.

If the proposal is a matter of fiscal necessity for Marin Catholic, then we can reasonably expect the school to take advantage of leasing these light poles to wireless carriers, especially when 5G-associated cell tower needs reach full potential. Will Marin Catholic become as a wireless cell landlord, incurring problems on campus and further impinging on the surrounding area? Due to regulatory breaches, leaseholds of antenna sites and accompanying cabinets have become a benefit to wireless carriers, but a regulatory problem for CA high schools and the Department of General Services.

The field lighting does not appear to be embraced by the surrounding neighbors. Perhaps they are troubled by the uncertain language in the Application wherein “no change to the number of games” morphs into 514 games, practices and ten evenings of over 500 spectators. How are these 500 attendees to be counted, and what measures will prevent over-attendance on more than ten evenings?

Can MC change its policy from one which does “not propose to allow outside groups to utilize the lighting” to one that enables uses by outside groups once these lights are installed? What restrictions control this potential abuse?

Published letters of support list area addresses unaffected by the concerns voiced by resident opponents of the lighting and expansion. I urge you to respect those who will live with the consequences of approval in both their daily lives and their declining property values: deny the Application and Use Permit for this ill-advised proposal.

Garril Page  
San Anselmo