

C Masterson <masterson2274@comcast.net>

1/26/2022 1:09 AM

Re: STC Field map

To Addison, Andreas D. - City Council <andreas.addison@richmondgov.com> Copy
Daniel.wagner@richmondgov.com <daniel.wagner@richmondgov.com> •
Richard.saunders@richmondgov.com <richard.saunders@richmondgov.com> •
MATTHEW.EBINGER@RICHMONDGOV.COM <matthew.ebinger@richmondgov.com> •
David.Watson@richmondgov.com <david.watson@richmondgov.com>

Andreas,

Thank you for your email. It is thoughtful of you to be spending so much of your time to help St. Christopher's mitigate issues that they are creating for the sole purpose of satisfying the passion of a handful of donors. Not only does it show you have a made decision to approve the project, you are doing everything you can to help. A good and honest representative would be non-biased, concerned for the health and well-being of his citizens, maintaining the character of the neighborhood, and provide a reasonable quality of life to the neighbors living on the property line. Your response does not contain even one sentence that provides an inkling that any of those concerns are a priority.

Ignoring the issues by attempting to detract from them and redirect attention on "*items that I see as cause for concern from most residents*" will not make them go away. The priorities of constituents I know are:

1. Health
2. Safety and Security (personal & property)
3. illegal parking
3. Quality Family Life
4. Environmental
5. Neighborhood aesthetics
6. Traffic Congestion, Accidents
7. Parking

How much time have you spent connecting with health professionals about how the LED lights and noise will harm children, elderly, moms, dads, grandparents? Did you explore and connect with localities that denied similar Musco projects, to even try to understand the harm this project can cause? Do you know the impact on the City of Richmond environment and do you want to be a leader and role model that sets a good example to save our environment? Anyone can sign legislation but can you talk the talk and walk the walk? Do you care about teachers and coaches, especially those that cannot speak out? I do. Mason Leky is going to require teachers that work 12 hours days, to work Friday night athletic events too... to monitor the boys behavior. At what is being called a family event.

Below in red font are responses to mitigation efforts of the risks you called out.

On 01/24/2022 7:53 PM Addison, Andreas D. - City Council <andreas.addison@richmondgov.com> wrote:

Ms. Masterson,

Thank you for this update regarding community response to the proposal. Here are the items that I see as cause for concern from most residents:

1. Parking - impact on parking for residents during games has been a burden in the past. **Residents can make plans to minimally impact their day time schedule.** I have connected the manager of the Westhampton School

development and asked to explore using their parking deck for games and that STC create a shuttle for parents and attendees of games. **A silly solution given spectator demographics. When someone gets hit crossing Patterson in the dark, given the typical UR and young adults that drink and drive on a Friday night. Folks will line up to testify the City knowingly ignored the risk.**

2. Shut down neighborhood streets during games - the streets you are referencing are narrow and not every home has a garage or alley. I respect protecting access to your homes and will see to how we might be able to close those streets during games to emphasize neighborhood only traffic during events. This would make only residents able to use the streets during games and events. Both #1 and #2 would create a protection of the impact of events on the adjacent residents on Kensington. **Great tradeoff, neighbors will have to deal with vehicle and property damage and other personal and property risks from spectators who are angry because they have to walk. COVID has already increased anxiety, stress and crime and this project will bring it to our front... and back door.**

3. Security during events - I have heard about issues with inappropriate behavior (which I am surprised has not been brought up previously with my office), given this proposal includes a change to operating hours and uses, I would like to see event security made available. For example, I recommend STC use RMC which helps manage many events across the city.

RMC does work some events with minimal success. They are positioned in the parking space in front of Mason Lely's house to direct traffic away from it. Other RMC staff are positioned to direct traffic away from turning into the STC parking lots. George McVey and Charlie Stillwell were leaders and men of character. They built trust and developed strong relationships and neighbors reciprocated by being tolerant of the boys behavior, knowing if they pushed the line too far George and Charlie would address the behavior and escalation was never needed. Both had the confidence to say 'no' when donors asked for lighting of athletic fields, because they recognized the risk outweighed the benefit, knowing the school sat in the middle of a residential neighborhood. Mason is young, riding on his father's coat tails and trying to make a name for himself with the donors. He's lost all trust and respect for not following through on commitments. If the Ordinance does not require security, the school is not going to do it because neighbors are not a priority to current leadership. And, to be meaningful it would require multiple dedicated security on the spectator side on the hill, and on the streets before, during, and after the game.

4. Limit and Enforce Number of Events - if approved, it will be required that all events that require use of the lights be scheduled and communicated in advance of any scheduled events. I will also add the ability for submitting complaints for violations or other issues through RVA311 to be documented and addressed. I would also make myself available to be notified when or if there is a violation to the use of this proposal.

Based on feedback from other localities, it is next to impossible to correct a violation and the measures should be taken prior or not approved. The Ordinance was written to protect the school so it will never be in violation. It excluded a 10PM cutoff time, and included posting of tech equipment win-win. With a 10PM cutoff, what would RVA311 do, direct a called to go on the internet and write up a complaint when all the constituent wants is to sleep at 10PM, 11PM or midnight. Your phone goes to voicemail in the day time, and you're going to commit to answering at midnight? The "process" will create more anxiety, stress and frustration.

As for my Ordinance to allow for the implementation of wireless technology and other mobile access infrastructure to be allowed on city-owned poles in the right of way. That does not relate to this proposal as it is only for those city-owned utility poles that are in alleys or on the side of streets. As I understand the ordinance does permit wireless attachments that you reference however, not above the height as defined in the SUP. From the design of the lights at other high school fields I have seen, any attachment is smaller than the existing light fixture and is hardly noticeable and is not higher than allowed.

Seriously! Pictures from other high schools are not relevant. If you do research, you will learn after zoning changes are approved tech companies will come in, replace the poles to hold their equipment. Since you proposed 2020-014, you should know this This is you telling Kensington constituents - negative lights, noise, illness, exposure to bad behavior, crime, and damage to the environment is not enough! I'm going to support financial gain for STC, tech companies, and Andreas. Allowing tech equipment does not "add any value to the athletic experience" and is not needed. When there is no other benefit except the financial gain of the requestor and the approver, there appears intent and a conflict of interest.

Lastly, I apologize that you feel slighted, unvalued, or disrespected during this process. Throughout your response you made several references that are not acceptable in any way. This process is one that invites opposing positions but should never result in anyone feeling the way you have shared. I apologize that you feel the way you have expressed. **Actions speak louder than words. I am not your spokesperson and it's up to you**

what you want constituents to think of you as a person in a public role. Especially, if the rumor about you running for mayor is true.

Happy to serve

This has been an eye opening discouraging experience, starting with Planning not being truthful. It saddens me that a person claiming to be happy to serve, can be cold, callous, and lack the emotional intelligence to be fair and imbalanced; to not consider the harm they will inflict on families.in exchange for their own personal gain. Your response reads like a lobbyist on STC's payroll. God bless us.

Andreas Addison (*he/him*)
First District City Council
804.646.5935 office
andreas.addison@richmondgov.com
<http://firstdistrictrva.com/>

On Jan 24, 2022, at 4:14 PM, C Masterson <masterson2274@comcast.net> wrote:

CAUTION: This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

I updated the St. Christopher's map that the Planning Commission used in their decision making to provide context for the location of the fields and families supporting and opposing the STC project. Field locations were conveniently left off because they might just show the location and that homes with families will be significantly impacted. I don't understand why this type of detail was not required as a requirement for the project. The homes directly impacted by this project are on Kensington which was conveniently excluded from the Notice of Public Hearing as a bounding property. Makes it easy to push through the request because a few white privilege folks, living in surrounding counties, that are donating money are more important than City of Richmond tax payers. The Planning Commission doesn't have to worry about some white trash folks living on Kensington, our health, safety is secondary. There is rarely a STC event where Mason Leky have someone sitting outside his house for security. A security camera had to be installed on the tree outside his house. But, no security is needed on the North side of the field, where males urinate in public. Where spectators were so troubled by a male wearing a long trench coat pacing the hill with his hands in his pocket, that a parent went over to ask STC Security to come over. Children and families could be dead by the time security got there. But Mason and his family will be safe. A slight imbalance in STC's security priorities. Moreso, since past STC leadership did not require such intense security.

As a average person can see, the supporters (red icon) of this project will NOT be impacted at all. The 8 families have off street parking, live on a wider road (St. Christopher's road has line painted down the middle) where lights, noise, safety (no spectators are peeing on their yards) will NOT be an issue. This includes 801 St. Christopher's Road because of the mature trees surrounding it. Two are direct neighbors of Mason Leky, the rest have some affiliation with the school...one being a 10th grader.

12 families (5 have ties to STC) NOT supporting the project (blue icon) are immediately adjacent to the proposed lighted fields. Residents that include elderly 90, mid 80s, and young children (13, new born to grade school). Families that enjoy the students, but do not want exposure to extended LED lighting and loud noise exceeding City of Richmond limits that will harm their health and disrupt family life. The black X icon shows a few of the STC-owned properties.

The map speaks for itself, showing a densely populated single-family neighborhood. Not somewhere the average person would expect to see a beacon shining 365 nights, with tech equipment as an extra bonus. Since Mason Leky, the BOD, the donors... and the City of Richmond will not have to look at the poles 7/24, disregard the impact on the Kensington residents. When I met with David Watson and Matthew Ebinger last year to express concerns related to the project and with tech equipment being installed in our backyards, I was told how wrong I was to assume the updated SUP with "wireless facilities" was for tech equipment, it was for STC internet. My concerns were ignored... why, because I'm female, not smart enough, wasn't going to pay to get what is right?

Only to learn the 1st District Councilman introduced Ordinance 2020-014, to allow tech companies to install their equipment on light poles in the City of Richmond, specifically referring to it as "wireless facilities". What are the incentives the tech companies have with the Planning Commission and City Council to warrant approving 70' poles. 35' poles are adequate to light a field, but not to hold the wireless facilities. Is there a conflict of interest? 2020-014 does apply to City of Richmond poles, but like the Richmond 300 Master Plan can be easily tweaked to allow equipment on the STC poles. Someone will argue how wrong I am and it will never happen... just like "wireless facilities" only applies to STC intranet.

Sharing the information that I will be giving to the media. Unlike my experience with Planning and City Council, I believe in open honest communication.

<image.png>