



July 25, 2022
Job No: 21-278

Carl Hilbrants - Senior Planner
Department of Planning
70 West Hedding St.
San Jose, CA 95110
Subject: **PLN21-089 Grading Approval / Abatement 18525 Vina Drive**
Please see my response to the letter dated April 5, 2022 below.

Planning Office

1. Provide grading quantities in tabular format. Include cut and fill amounts broken down into what is needed for restoration, for removal, for driveway / access improvements, etc. Also include in the table the maximum height of cut and / or fill.
Added to Grading note 6 on sheet 1.
2. Provide a completed Environmental Information Form. The form can be accessed at the following URL: <https://stgenpln.blob.core.windows.net/document/EnvInfoForm.pdf>.
Attached.
3. Provide a Hazardous Sites Questionnaire. The questionnaire can be accessed at the following URL:
https://stgenpln.blob.core.windows.net/document/Hazardous_Questionnaire.pdf. The signed form will be verified by Planning Office staff after submittal.
Attached.

Land Development Engineering

4. Per the previous comments, submit a letter of authorization for the abatement work proposed on the neighboring parcel. The letter is required to be notarized by the neighboring property owner prior to project approval.
This letter will be provided at the time of permit issuance.
5. Provide a notarized letter of authorization for the reconnection of the water line on the western side of the residence that is not on the subject property. The water line appears to be located on the neighboring property.
The existing water line for the adjoining property has no easement (see title report). This is a private matter between owners and the County Government has no authority to require a notarized letter. Please reference a code section. As a courtesy, we will provide a note from the neighbor.
6. Per the previous comment, the grading to abate the violation in the northwest area of the property and on the neighboring property appear to propose a 2:1 slope to abate the violation. Provide a justification as to how that ultimate condition is the minimum

grading necessary for the development when compared with the original condition. The ultimate condition must meet the findings of the Grading Ordinance. Consider a full restoration to the original contours in this location in order to meet the grading findings. Despite the fact that the 2:1 slope is appears near the original slope, it really is not.
Full restoration now shown on C-3.

7. Provide justification as to how the cut area at the northern side of the home will meet the grading findings. Is it impossible to minimally restore the slope at least to some degree to a slope that is at least perhaps at a 2:1 ratio? While a full restoration to the original slope may not be feasible, is abatement impossible at this location? Have C2Earth provide a supplemental letter stating that there is no feasible method for restoring this slope other than the erosion control blanket secured to the slope.

Letter from C2 Earth is enclosed.

Code Enforcement Division:

8. As violation numbers VIO20-0083 and VIO21-0100 are currently active on the parcel, contact James Stephens to discuss the possible need to enter into a compliance
We have requested copies of these violation files 7 times over the past year, but Code Enforcement does not reply.

San Jose Water Company:

9. Provide details regarding the origin of the stockpile located on San Jose Water Company property.

See note on Sheet C-2.

If you have any further questions, please contact me at terry@tscivil.com or call (408)316-2696.



TS/CIVIL ENGINEERING, INC.
Terence J. Szewczyk, P.E. C35527
Principal Engineer