

August 13, 2024
Project No. 220148

David Horwitz
Assistant Planner
County of Santa Clara
70 West Hedding Street
San Jose, CA 95110

RE: PLN24-078 - Architecture & Site Approval and Grading Approval

STANFORD LACROSSE PRACTICE FIELD

COMMENT RESPONSE LETTER

Dear David,

The purpose of this letter is to respond to each comment from your letter dated 05/30/24 regarding the above-mentioned project.

PLANNING OFFICE - Comments by David Horwitz, david.horwitz@pln.sccgov.org, 408-299-5795

File Number: PLN24-078

Lighting Plan

1. The lighting plan is incomplete. Please provide an additional lighting plan sheet that describes the existing lighting on the proposed development site and its vicinity.

RESPONSE: A Lighting plan sheet that shows the existing lighting adjacent the proposed development site and its vicinity has been added. See Sheet E-9 Existing Lighting Plan.

2. Sheets E-2 through E-7 show nine sun-shaped symbols which appear to be the lighting for the proposed field. Please clarify what these symbols are. If they are proposed lighting, please identify them on the plans, provide their specifications, and include them in the illumination summary.

RESPONSE: The sun shaped symbols are existing path lights to remain in place. As they are not a part of the proposed lighting development or the illumination analysis, they have been removed from Sheets E-2 through E-7.

3. Sheet E-3 shows a foot candle of 83.2 near the southwest boundary of the development site. However, the plans do not clearly show the reason for this intensity at this location. Please verify that the foot candles have been accurately calculated, or clarify if there is additional lighting resulting in the intensity in this location.

RESPONSE: The foot candles calculation has been reviewed and corrected. The luminaire has been re-aimed and the resulting foot candle is in line with the other readings. A revised Sheet E-3 has been included in this resubmittal.

4. The topographic survey on Sheet C-2.0 shows a building immediately to the southwest of the proposed development area. Show on the plans if there are any lights attached to the existing building that affect the proposed lighting plan.

RESPONSE: The existing building adjacent to the proposed development is the Masters Grove Restroom, and it does have two wall pack lights at each side. The topographic survey has been updated to show the lights attached to the existing building to the southwest of the proposed development area. See revised Sheet C-2.0.

5. The equipment list for areas shown states that poles F1, F2, F3, and F4 each contain twelve lights at an 80-foot mounting height, and two lights at a 15.5-foot mounting height. The pole assembly drawing on Sheet E-8 does not show the orientation of the lights mounted on the pole. Please provide the orientation of the lights on the pole assembly drawing. A separate drawing should be provided for differing orientations.

RESPONSE: All lights will be oriented parallel to the Lacrosse Practice Field. Please see revised Sheet E-7 Equipment Layout Plan that shows fixture aiming for lights and Sheet E-8 Pole Configuration Drawing.

6. Provide photographs of any existing light pole and fixtures at the project site that are proposed to remain or be repositioned.

RESPONSE: The existing pathway lightings are campus standard lighting. Photographs and specifications of the existing path light poles and fixtures at the project site are included in this resubmittal on Drawing E-9 and E-10.

Grading

7. The preliminary grading plan is incomplete. Pursuant to Sec. C12-424 of the County Ordinance Code, please include at least two cross-sections of all graded areas. Show the vertical dimensions of the cuts and fills on each section. The preliminary grading plan also must include the location, type, size and drip line of all trees with a trunk diameter of 12 inches or more within the development area or where the drip line of the tree is disturbed or affected by the proposed grading.

RESPONSE: Two perpendicular cross-sections through the middle of the field have been added to the drawings. See sheet C-4.1. Grading plan has been updated to show the Location, type, size, and drip line of all trees to remain with trunk diameter of 12" or more within the development area. See revised Sheet C-4.0.

8. The plans state that the proposed grading includes 1,619 cubic yards of cut and 1,488 cubic yards of fill, with a maximum vertical depth of two feet. Describe the material comprising the fill.

RESPONSE: Native soil will be used as fill material to prepare the subgrade level of the field and in areas where fill is required to conform to existing grades. The earthwork calculation has been updated to include the cut/fill amount needed to install the sand and drain rock section of the lacrosse practice field. See revised Sheet C-1.0 for updated earthwork number.

9. Clarify the location of the proposed laydown area. On the Construction and Logistics Plan (sheet C-9.0), indicate the locations of laydown areas for storage of tools, material, and stockpiles. Demarcate the boundary of off-street construction related parking on an enlarged site plan.

RESPONSE: Laydown areas for storage of tools, materials, and stockpiles has been added to the drawing. See sheet C-9.0. Enlarged construction related parking is shown on the parking circulation map on sheet C-9.0. Construction related parking is indicated to be in Parking Lot L-29.

Arborist Report

10. Page no. 44 of the arborist report contains portions colored in white that appear to contain the drip line of trees, while page no. 45 does not show these trees. Aerial imagery also suggests that there are existing trees in these locations. Please clarify on the plans if these trees are existing and proposed for removal. If the trees have previously been removed, please clarify so.

RESPONSE: Page 44 of the arborist report has been updated to show the current topographic survey used on page no. 45 and field verified by WLCA. Many trees were lost in 2023 storms, and an up to date image has been included in this submittal. See "Current Aerial Image".

Amplified Sound

11. Clarify if any amplified sound is associated with the project. If so, provide the location and orientation of the amplified sound system on the plans. Include if the amplification system is proposed to be ground-mounted or elevated.

RESPONSE: The project does not propose amplified sound system installation.

Sign Details

12. Clarify if any signs are proposed with this project. If so, please include the following information on the site plan:

- a. Location of all signs;
- b. Elevations noting the dimensions of the sign (height, width, length);
- c. Landscaping associated with the sign;
- d. For illuminated signs, provide a cross section of the sign to verify what type of illumination is proposed; and,
- e. Copy of master sign program.

RESPONSE: The project does not propose installation of signs.

LAND DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING– Comments by Ed Duazo, ed.duazo@pln.sscgov.org, 408.299.5733

File Number: PLN24-078

13. As required for preliminary grading plans per Section C12-424 of the County Grading Ordinance, provide at least two grading cross-sections through the graded area to help clarify the scope of the proposed grading work; perpendicular cross-sections through the middle of the field are sufficient.

RESPONSE: Two perpendicular cross-sections through the middle of the field have been added to the drawings. See sheet C-4.1.

14. To help clarify the scope of the proposed work, provide typical sections for the natural and synthetic turf. For the natural turf section, include the depth of the drain rock section and show the perforated storm drain system.

RESPONSE: Typical sections for the natural and synthetic turf have been provided on Sheet C-4.1. The depth of the drain rock section and the perforated storm drain system are included in the section. See detail 2 of sheet C-4.1.

15. Per the “Drainage Area” totals in the Stormwater Management Plan (Sheet C-8.0), 139,275 square feet of vehicular impervious area is being replaced; is this correct? Based on the topography, it does not appear there is this much existing impervious area to replace. Please review. If the intent was to use “replaced” to describe the existing condition, then to avoid confusion, please revise the term “replaced” with “existing” as the term “replaced” has a specific meaning/use when assessing potential NPDES Municipal Regional Permit stormwater treatment/management requirements.

RESPONSE: The drainage area total has been corrected to read “Existing Non-Vehicular”. See revised Sheet C-8.0.

Please feel free to contact me at ntaddesse@sandis.net should you have any questions or concerns.

Regards,

SANDIS

Nebiyu Taddesse
Project Engineer