

Camille Leung

From: David Jackson <djackson52@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2023 3:39 PM
To: Alex Henson
Cc: Camille Leung; Anusha Thalapaneni
Subject: Re: 634 Palomar | Payment following Approval

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Re-posting the responses cleanly here, just in case they got lost in email threading:

Aspects of applicants project will significantly impact neighboring properties. The area hillside is a compound landslide with a prolific spring consisting of several parcels. Multiple landslides including in 2018, 2019 and 2023. Three houses have been destroyed in years past. Many experts including; hydrologists, engineering geologists, engineers warn against the following and the basis of our appeal.

[RESPONSE]

All of the above points have been addressed in CEQA, which includes reports from Cotton Shires, one of the most well known and renowned Geotechnical firms in the country, and the state of California. All disputing claims are not regarding 634 Palomar itself, but rather the neighboring property of the appellant. The neighboring property has vastly different geotechnical properties to 634 Palomar, and we have shown empirically and far beyond county requirements that the 634 Palomar plan is geotechnically sound.

1) Expansion leach field should not be located within 100ft of unstable land mass or (E) current 2023 landslide.

[RESPONSE]

The leach field is not located within 100ft of unstable land mass. 634 Palomar Drive is not an unstable land mass (see CEQA), and the proposed leach field is 100ft from the neighboring property in question.

2) 100+year old multi trunk oak, located in 10ft setback and within 20ft of current 2023 landslide and 2018 landslide, should not be removed. Roots are vital to hillside stability & dewatering. Applicant can slightly modify house and slightly trim canopy.

[RESPONSE]

The applicant has demonstrated the preservation of 4 significant trees, where only 2 significant trees (+ 1 insignificant) are now proposed for removal. Replacing the three (3) indigenous trees with a minimum of three (3), 24-inch box Oak trees. These trees to be planted in the right-side setback to provide screening of the residence in the same location as the trees proposed for removal. The applicant has taken measures beyond county requirements, both from the design review (BDRC) feedback and the planning commission hearings, to preserve native trees on the property.

3) Swimming pool should not be allowed as it sits at the base of a repaired landslide adjacent to unstable land mass. Excess pool water will need to drain through neighbors private drainage and flow into creek without treatment.

[RESPONSE]

All aspects of the pool have met or exceeded county regulations. Though we anticipate little to no excess water (the vast majority of water comes from rain and other sources), excess pool water will not need to or will drain through the neighbor's private drainage as claimed. If the pool needs to be emptied, it will be safely emptied through other means as to not damage any property's soil. If there is minor spillage from the pool, it will flow through 634 Palomar drainage, not the neighboring property.

4) Perc test should be conducted under wet season conditions per Environmental Health Ordinance.

[RESPONSE]

The requirements of the perc test meet or exceed county regulations, as summarized in the CEQA and reviewed by the planning commission. County Environmental Health recognizes the recorded tests and approves of the location and design of the new leachfield system.

5) Stacking of (E) neighboring leach fields should not be allowed per Environmental Health Ordinance

[RESPONSE]

The requirements of the leach field meet or exceed county regulations, as summarized in the CEQA and reviewed by the planning commission. There is no existing leach lines on 634 Palomar and the system meets all setbacks from neighboring systems and properties.

On Tue, Aug 22, 2023 at 3:36 PM David Jackson <djackson52@gmail.com> wrote:

Thank you Alex.

@Camille, do these responses look good to you? You had a deadline of Monday, so just making sure you have enough to move forward in a timely manner.

Thank you,
David

On Mon, Aug 21, 2023 at 5:28 PM Alex Henson <ahenson@leabraze.com> wrote:

Edits are inline with yours.

I think they are aware of all the players but will leave that to Camille.

Regards,

Alexander Henson, P.E.

Project Manager II



Hayward • Roseville • Pleasanton • San Jose • San Luis Obispo

www.leabraze.com

Phone: 510-887-4086 x130

Direct Line: 510-961-0163

Email: ahenson@leabraze.com

[LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#) | [Facebook](#)

Lea & Braze Engineering Inc., Your Trusted Partner

From: David Jackson <djackson52@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2023 4:43 PM
To: Alex Henson <ahenson@leabraze.com>
Cc: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>; Anusha Thalapaneni <athalapa@gmail.com>; Jim Toby <jtoby@leabraze.com>
Subject: Re: 634 Palomar | Payment following Approval

Thanks Alex! Are your edits inline to mine below? If so, does this look acceptable to you Camille?

I wonder if it would also be worth calling out all parties involved (including L&B and Atlas)

Thanks,

David

On Aug 21, 2023, at 4:32 PM, Alex Henson <ahenson@leabraze.com> wrote:

Have reviewed and made our edits

Thank you for the great responses David.

Camille – let me know if you have any questions or need anything from L&B.

Regards,

Alexander Henson, P.E.

Project Manager II

<image001.png>

Hayward • Roseville • Pleasanton • San Jose • San Luis Obispo

www.leabraze.com

Phone: 510-887-4086 x130

Direct Line: 510-961-0163

Email: ahenson@leabraze.com

[LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#) | [Facebook](#)

Lea & Braze Engineering Inc., Your Trusted Partner

From: David Jackson <djackson52@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, August 19, 2023 11:56 AM

To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>; Alex Henson <ahenson@leabraze.com>

Cc: Anusha Thalapaneni <athalapa@gmail.com>; Jim Toby <jtoby@leabraze.com>

Subject: Re: 634 Palomar | Payment following Approval

Hi Camille,

I'm adding **Alex** to this thread (cc'ing **Jim**, though there is no action directly for you Jim).

As we worked on the appeal responses, we realized the content we created for the commissioner hearing does not 1:1 address all of the points in the appeal. So we think it would be best if Alex, you could do a once-over of our responses, and modify as needed to be the most professional. Or perhaps completely redo if there is a better response. I'm assuming the responses should be crisp and refer to documentation like CEQA, Cotton Shires, or other reports as applicable.

Alex, Camille is asking for these responses by **Aug 21 (Monday)**, so if this is too quick of a turnaround time for you, please let us know! Sorry for the scramble.

Thanks,

David

Below is the appeal word-for-word, and our draft **[RESPONSE]**'s to each section:

Aspects of applicants project will significantly impact neighboring properties. The area hillside is a compound landslide with a prolific spring consisting of several parcels. Multiple landslide including in 2018, 2019 and 2023. Three houses have been destroyed in years.past Many experts including; hydrologists, engineering geologist, engineers warn against the following and the basis of our appeal.

[RESPONSE]

All of the above points have been addressed in CEQA, which includes reports from Cotton Shires, one of the most well known and renowned Geotechnical firms in the country, and the state of California. All disputing claims are not regarding 634 Palomar itself, but rather the neighboring property of the appealer. The neighboring property has vastly different geotechnical properties to 634 Palomar, and we have shown empirically and far beyond county requirements that the 634 Palomar plan is geotechnically sound.

1) Expansion leach field should not be located within 100ft of unstable land mass or (E) current 2023 landslide.

[RESPONSE]

The leach field is not located within 100ft of unstable land mass. 634 Palomar Drive is not an unstable land mass (see CEQA), and the proposed leach field is 100ft from the neighboring property in question.

2) 100+year old multi trunk oak, located in 10ft setback and within 20ft of current 2023 landslide and 2018 landslide, should not be removed. Roots are vital to hillside stability & dewatering. Applicant can slightly modify house and slightly trim canopy.

[RESPONSE]

The applicant has demonstrated the preservation of 4 significant trees, where only 2 significant trees (+ 1 insignificant) are now proposed for removal. Replacing the three (3) indigenous trees with a minimum of three (3), 24-inch box Oak trees. These trees to be planted in the right-side setback to provide screening of the residence in the same location as the trees proposed for removal. The applicant has taken measures beyond county requirements, both from the design review (BDRC) feedback and the planning commission hearings, to preserve native trees on the property.

3) Swimming pool should not be allowed as it sits at the base of a repaired landslide adjacent to unstable land mass. Excess pool water will need to drain through neighbors private drainage and flow into creek without treatment.

[RESPONSE]

All aspects of the pool have met or exceeded country regulations. Though we anticipate little to no excess water (the vast majority of water comes from rain and other sources), excess pool water will not need to or will drain through the neighbor's private drainage as claimed. If the pool needs to be emptied, it will be safely emptied through other means as to not damage any property's soil. If there is minor spillage from the pool, it will flow through 634 Palomar drainage, not the neighboring property.

4) Perc test should be conducted under wet season conditions per Environmental Health Ordinance.

[RESPONSE]

The requirements of the perc test meet or exceed county regulations, as summarized in the CEQA and reviewed by the planning commission. County Environmental Health recognizes the recorded tests and approves of the location and design of the new leachfield system.

5) Stacking of (E) neighboring leach fields should not be allowed per Environmental Health Ordinance

[RESPONSE]

The requirements of the leach field meet or exceed county regulations, as summarized in the CEQA and reviewed by the planning commission. There is no existing leach lines on 634 Palomar and the system meets all setbacks from neighboring systems and properties.

On Thu, Aug 10, 2023 at 8:49 AM Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org> wrote:

Great, the more formal of a response the better, thanks!

From: Anusha Thalapaneni <athalapa@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2023 7:17 AM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Cc: David Jackson <djackson52@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: 634 Palomar | Payment following Approval

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Yup, I can do that! Does it need to be official responses from the team? I.e. Letterhead. I have their answers so I can draft something for you too.

On Aug 9, 2023, at 9:48 AM, Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org> wrote:

Hi Anusha,

I'm preparing the report for the Board meeting of 10/17. Can you provide me a response to each point of the appeal by 8/21?

Thanks!

From: Camille Leung
Sent: Thursday, July 6, 2023 8:05 PM
To: Anusha Thalapaneni <athalapa@gmail.com>
Cc: David Jackson <djackson52@gmail.com>; Mercedes Segura <mbsegura@smcgov.org>
Subject: RE: 634 Palomar | Payment following Approval

Hi Anusha,

Sorry for the news. Please see attached. We can start scheduling this to go to the Board of Supervisors. Please see dates below and let me know which dates work for you. I also have to coordinate the date with the appellants.

Oct 3 (soonest date for preparation of staff report)

Oct 17

Nov 7

I'm copying Mercedes to see if any of these hearing dates are closed for budget items only.

Thanks

From: Anusha Thalapaneni <athalapa@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 6, 2023 5:06 PM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Cc: David Jackson <djackson52@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: 634 Palomar | Payment following Approval

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Hi Camille,

I just saw online that Denise filed an appeal. Are you able to share the details with us?

Thanks,

Anusha

On Jul 5, 2023, at 12:46 PM, Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org> wrote:

Hi Anusha,

FYI, no appeal filed so far. Appeal period ends tomorrow at 5pm.

We would need a check for the \$2764 plus \$50 recorder's fee, with 4 business days of the final approval.

<https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Environmental-Review/CEQA/Fees>

Thanks

From: Anusha Thalapaneni <athalapa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 5, 2023 12:08 PM
To: Camille Leung <cleung@smcgov.org>
Cc: David Jackson <djackson52@gmail.com>
Subject: 634 Palomar | Payment following Approval

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Hi Camille,

I hope you had a great holiday weekend! I tried finding this communication from you about payment following approval, but we have 100s of emails between us. Would you be able to remind me the dollar amount that we owe upon final approval assuming no appeal or assuming approval following an appeal?

Thanks,

Anusha

<Appeal PLN2020-00251.pdf>