

August 13, 2024 Project No. 220148

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

RE: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND POLICY ISSUES LETTER STANFORD LACROSSE PRACTICE FIELD COMMENT RESPONSE LETTER

Dear Mark,

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, Project Area and Arborist Report

1. The lighting plan appears to incorporate the existing trees (located between the proposed lacrosse practice field and El Camino Real) for the lighting calculation. As such, these trees should be included within the project limit line. The plans should be updated to reflect the revised project area, including the Tree Disposition Table on Sheet C-3.1. If the trees are not intended to be incorporated into the lighting plan, please submit an additional lighting analysis that shows the impact of project without the presence of the trees.

RESPONSE: The lighting plan and illumination analysis does not consider the existing trees located between the proposed lacrosse practice field and El Camino Real for the lighting calculations. As noted in the presubmittal meeting on August 1, the illumination analysis assumes there are no buildings or existing trees for the purpose of illumination beyond the boundary of the project. The project limit line has been maintained as shown previously.

2. If the above-mentioned existing trees are incorporated into the lighting plan and the project area, these trees should be protected and retained such that they continue to shield light spillage associated with the proposed lacrosse practice field and its improvements. As such, please provide an addendum to the arborist report that describes the health of the subject trees, clearly identify trees recommended for protection, as demonstrated by their health.

RESPONSE: The lighting plan and illumination analysis does not consider the existing trees for the lighting calculations. As noted in the pre-submittal meeting on August 1, the illumination analysis assumes there are no buildings or existing trees for the purpose of illumination beyond the boundary of the project. The arborist report remains the same with respect to the trees under evaluation.

BUILD ON. | 1



<u>Programmatic Needs of the Lacrosse Field and Additional CEQA Analysis</u>

3. Provide a description of the programmatic needs of the new lacrosse practice field.

RESPONSE: The description of the programmatic needs has been added to the exhibit on sports field lighting within the DAPER zone.

4. Clarify if any events are proposed.

RESPONSE: No events are proposed for this venue, and this has been added to the program statement

5. With reference to the Stanford University Department of Athletics Master Lighting Plan (2001), provide an updated athletic field light use schedule and time-of-use overlap information between the existing athletic facilities and proposed new lacrosse facility.

RESPONSE: An updated athletic field light use schedule and time-of-use overlap information is included in this resubmittal in a new exhibit. See "Athletic Facilities Sports Lighting Exhibit".

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

Regards,

SANDIS

Nebiyu Taddesse Project Engineer

BUILD ON. | 2