



**TOWN OF LOS GATOS
PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
MAY 12, 2021
110 EAST MAIN STREET
LOS GATOS, CA**

*Kathryn Janoff, Chair
Kendra Burch, Vice Chair
Jeffrey Barnett, Commissioner
Melanie Hanssen, Commissioner
Jeffrey Suzuki, Commissioner
Reza Tavana, Commissioner
Emily Thomas, Commissioner*

PARTICIPATION IN THE PUBLIC PROCESS

How to participate: The Town of Los Gatos strongly encourages your active participation in the public process, which is the cornerstone of democracy. If you wish to speak to an item on the agenda, please follow the participation instructions on page 2 of this agenda. If you wish to speak to an item NOT on the agenda, you may do so during the “Verbal Communications” period, by following the participation instructions on page 2 of this agenda. The time allocated to speakers may change to better facilitate the Planning Commission meeting.

Effective Proceedings: The purpose of the Planning Commission meeting is to conduct the business of the community in an effective and efficient manner. For the benefit of the community, the Town of Los Gatos asks that you follow the Town’s meeting guidelines while attending Planning Commission meetings and treat everyone with respect and dignity. This is done by following meeting guidelines set forth in State law and in the Town Code. Disruptive conduct is not tolerated, including but not limited to: addressing the Commissioners without first being recognized; interrupting speakers, Commissioners or Town staff; continuing to speak after the allotted time has expired; failing to relinquish the podium when directed to do so; and repetitiously addressing the same subject.

Deadlines for Public Comment and Presentations are as follows:

- Persons wishing to make an audio/visual presentation on any agenda item must submit the presentation electronically, either in person or via email, to the Planning Department by 1 p.m. or the Clerk’s Office no later than 3:00 p.m. on the day of the Planning Commission meeting.
- Persons wishing to submit written comments to be included in the materials provided to the Planning Commission must provide the comments to the Planning Department as follows:
 - For inclusion in the regular packet: by 11:00 a.m. the Friday before the meeting
 - For inclusion in any Addendum: by 11:00 a.m. the day before the meeting
 - For inclusion in any Desk Item: by 11:00 a.m. on the day of the meeting

Planning Commission meetings are broadcast Live on KCAT, Channel 15 (on Comcast) on the 2nd and 4th Wednesdays at 7:00 p.m.
Live and Archived Planning Commission meetings can be viewed by going to:
<https://www.kcat.org/government-meetings>

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE CLERK DEPARTMENT AT (408) 354-6834. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS BEFORE THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE TOWN TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING [28 CFR §35.102-35.104]

IMPORTANT NOTICE REGARDING PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

This meeting is being conducted utilizing teleconferencing and electronic means consistent with State of California Executive Order N-29-20 dated March 17, 2020, regarding the COVID-19 pandemic. The live stream of the meeting may be viewed on television and/or online at: <https://meetings.municode.com/PublishPage/index?cid=LOSGATOS&ppid=4bc370fb-3064-458e-a11a-78e0c0e5d161&p=0>. **In accordance with Executive Order N-29-20, the public may only view the meeting on television and/or online and not in the Council Chamber.**

PARTICIPATION

If you are not interested in providing oral comments real-time during the meeting, you can view the live stream of the meeting on television (Comcast Channel 15) and/or online at <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCFh35XRBWer1DPx-F7vvhcg>.

If you are interested in providing oral comments in real-time during the meeting, you must join the Zoom webinar at:
<https://losatosca.gov.zoom.us/j/83662189724?pwd=dUd3NGx4TWpGR2RMS05KWGdGUzNHdz09>
Passcode: 922626.

Please be sure you have the most up-to-date version of the Zoom application should you choose to provide public comment during the meeting. Note that participants cannot turn their cameras on during the entire duration of the meeting.

During the meeting:

- When the Chair announces the item for which you wish to speak, click the “raise hand” feature in Zoom. If you are participating by phone on the Zoom app, press *9 on your telephone keypad to raise your hand. If you are participating by calling in, press #2 on your telephone keypad to raise your hand.
- When called to speak, please limit your comments to three (3) minutes, or such other time as the Chair may decide, consistent with the time limit for speakers at a Council meeting.

If you are unable to participate in real-time, you may send an email to PlanningComment@losatosca.gov with the subject line “Public Comment Item # ” (insert the item number relevant to your comment) or “Verbal Communications – Non Agenda Item.” Comments will be reviewed and distributed before the meeting if received by 11:00 a.m. on the day of the meeting. All comments received will become part of the record. The Chair has the option to modify this action on items based on comments received.

REMOTE LOCATION PARTICIPANTS

The following Planning Commissioners are listed to permit them to appear electronically or telephonically at the Planning Commission meeting: CHAIR KATHRYN JANOFF, VICE CHAIR BURCH, COMMISSIONER BARNETT, COMMISSIONER HANSEN, COMMISSIONER SUZUKI, COMMISSIONER TAVANA, AND COMMISSIONER THOMAS. All votes during the teleconferencing session will be conducted by roll call vote.

**TOWN OF LOS GATOS
PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
MAY 12, 2021
7:00 PM**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

VERBAL COMMUNICATIONS *(Members of the public may address the Commission on any matter that is not listed on the agenda. Unless additional time is authorized by the Commission, remarks shall be limited to three minutes.)*

CONSENT ITEMS (TO BE ACTED UPON BY A SINGLE MOTION) *(Before the Planning Commission acts on the consent agenda, any member of the public or Commission may request that any item be removed from the consent agenda. At the Chair's discretion, items removed from the consent calendar may be considered either before or after the Public Hearings portion of the agenda)*

1. Draft Minutes from April 28, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting

PUBLIC HEARINGS *(Applicants/Appellants and their representatives may be allotted up to a total of five minutes maximum for opening statements. Members of the public may be allotted up to three minutes to comment on any public hearing item. Applicants/Appellants and their representatives may be allotted up to a total of three minutes maximum for closing statements. Items requested/recommended for continuance are subject to the Commission's consent at the meeting.)*

2. Requesting Approval for Demolition of an Existing Single-Family Residence and Construction of a New Single-Family Residence on Property Zoned R-1:8 Located at **140 Arroyo Grande Way**. APN 424-23-048. Architecture and Site Application S-20-013. Property Owner/Applicant: Yogesh Jhamb. Project Planner: Sean Mullin.

REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS / COMMISSION MATTERS

ADJOURNMENT *(Planning Commission policy is to adjourn no later than 11:30 p.m. unless a majority of the Planning Commission votes for an extension of time)*

Writings related to an item on the Planning Commission meeting agenda distributed to members of the Commission within 72 hours of the meeting are available for public inspection at the reference desk of the Los Gatos Town Library, located at 100 Villa Avenue; the Community Development Department and Clerk Department, both located at 110 E. Main Street; and are also available for review on the official Town of Los Gatos website. Copies of desk items distributed to members of the Commission at the meeting are available for review in the Town Council Chambers.

Note: The Town of Los Gatos has adopted the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure §1094.6; litigation challenging a decision of the Town Council must be brought within 90 days after the decision is announced unless a shorter time is required by State or Federal law.

***This Page
Intentionally
Left Blank***



**TOWN OF LOS GATOS
PLANNING COMMISSION
REPORT**

MEETING DATE: 05/12/2021

ITEM NO: 1

**DRAFT
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
APRIL 28, 2021**

The Planning Commission of the Town of Los Gatos conducted a Regular Meeting on Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.

This meeting was conducted utilizing teleconferencing and electronic means consistent with State of California Executive Order N-29-20 dated March 17, 2020, regarding the COVID19 pandemic and was conducted via Zoom. All planning commissioners and staff participated from remote locations and all voting was conducted via roll call vote.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Kathryn Janoff , Commissioner Jeffrey Barnett, Commissioner Melanie Hanssen, Commissioner Jeffrey Suzuki, and Commissioner Emily Thomas
Absent: Vice Chair Kendra Burch, and Commissioner Reza Tavana

VERBAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

CONSENT ITEMS (TO BE ACTED UPON BY A SINGLE MOTION)

1. Approval of Minutes – April 14, 2021

MOTION: **Motion by Commissioner Suzuki to approve adoption of the Consent Calendar. Seconded by Commissioner Barnett.**

VOTE: **Motion passed unanimously.**

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

2. Draft Proposed Five-Year Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 2021/22 to 2025/26

Matt Morley, Parks and Public Works Director, presented the staff report.

Opened and Closed Public Comment.

Commissioners discussed the matter.

MOTION: **Motion by Commissioner Hanssen** to recommend approval of the Draft Proposed Five-Year Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 2021/22 to 2025/26 to the Town Council. **Seconded by Commissioner Barnett.**

Commissioners discussed the matter.

VOTE: **Motion passed unanimously.**

REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Joel Paulson, Director of Community Development

- Town Council met on April 20, 2021; introduced an ordinance to amend the zoning for 246 Almendra Avenue and the zoning and General Plan designation for 4 Tait Avenue. The ordinances will have a second reading and adoption at the May 4, 2021 Town Council meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS/COMMISSION MATTERS

General Plan Update Advisory Committee

Commissioner Hanssen

- GPAC met on April 15, 2021; reviewed the Land Use Element and Community Design Element.
- Anticipated last GPAC meeting will be held on May 6, 2021 where the entire draft of the 2040 General Plan will be distributed to the GPAC for review to ensure it complies with the Vision and Guiding Principles and that the GPAC is ready to forward a recommendation of approval to continue the process, including EIR review, to the Planning Commission and Town Council.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of the April 28, 2021 meeting as approved by the Planning Commission.

/s/ Vicki Blandin

***This Page
Intentionally
Left Blank***



**TOWN OF LOS GATOS
PLANNING COMMISSION
REPORT**

MEETING DATE: 05/12/2021

ITEM NO: 2

DATE: May 7, 2021
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Joel Paulson, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Requesting Approval for Demolition of an Existing Single-Family Residence and Construction of a New Single-Family Residence on Property Zoned R-1:8 Located at 140 Arroyo Grande Way. APN 424-23-048. Architecture and Site Application S-20-013. Property Owner/Applicant: Yogesh Jhamb. Project Planner: Sean Mullin.

BACKGROUND:

On March 24, 2021, the Planning Commission considered the application and continued the matter to May 12, 2021. The Planning Commission directed the applicant to consider the comments of the Planning Commission, including:

- Incorporate the recommendations of the Town’s Consulting Architect;
- Reduce and lower the mass of the roof;
- Meet with the neighbors on either side, behind, and across the street from the property;
- Address privacy concerns related to window height and placement; and
- Clarify if the front yard will be landscaped.

Following the meeting of March 24, 2021, the applicant revised the development plans to incorporate all the recommendations of the Town’s Consulting Architect and to address the Planning Commission’s comments (Exhibits 13 and 15). The story poles have been updated and an updated project sign has been posted in accordance with Town policy.

PREPARED BY: SEAN MULLIN, AICP
Associate Planner

Reviewed by: Planning Manager and Community Development Director

DISCUSSION:

The applicant has revised the development plans in response to the recommendations of the Town's Consulting Architect and the comments received from the Planning Commission (Exhibit 15). The applicant has provided a letter outlining the design revisions, efforts to meet with their neighbors, and a preliminary landscape plan (Exhibit 13). A summary of the applicant's response to the recommendations of the Town's Consulting Architect and the comments received from the Planning Commission is provided below.

Town's Consulting Architect Recommendations:

1. Lower the roof eave height as much as possible. The recommendation illustrations show a one-foot decrease in height.

The applicant has lowered the plate height and corresponding eave height by one foot.

2. Utilize a hip roof on the garage in lieu of the proposed gable.

The applicant has changed the gable-end roofs over the garage and at the rear of the residence to hip roofs.

3. Simplify the window forms and styles and provide wood trim on all façades.

The applicant had previously included wood trim on all façades and the revised plans continue to do so. The windows have been revised to eliminate the arched windows on all façades and simplified the window types to include fixed, sliders, and casements.

4. Eliminate the brick in favor of a uniform stucco treatment and add a moulding trim strip.

The applicant had previously eliminated the brick on all elevations and had provided uniform stucco treatment as suggested.

5. Substantially recess the garage door and select a garage door color to blend with the main body of the home rather than contrasting with it.

The applicant had previously recessed the garage door and specified a dark gray color to match the front door to blend with the residence as recommended.

6. Remove the roof dormer to simplify the roof.

The applicant has eliminated the roof dormer.

DISCUSSION (continued):

Planning Commission Recommendations, March 24, 2021:

In addition to the revisions made in response to the recommendations of the Town's Consulting Architect, the applicant has responded to the direction of the Planning Commission as follows:

- Reduce and lower the mass of the roof;

The applicant has lowered the plate height by one foot, reduced the roof pitch from 5/12 to 4/12, and changed the gable-end roofs over the garage and at the rear of the residence to hip roofs. The overall impact of these revisions reduces the maximum height of the residence by five feet, 11 inches and reduces the prominence of the mass of the roof. The applicant has also simplified the roof above the turret bay on the front elevation.

- Meet with the neighbors on either side, behind, and across the street from the property;

The applicant has indicated that they have discussed the project with their neighbors (Exhibit 13). The public comments included in Exhibit 14 include feedback from the neighbors.

- Address privacy concerns related to window height and placement; and

The applicant has reduced the top window height by one foot, from nine feet, four inches, to eight feet, four inches.

- Clarify if the front yard will be landscaped.

The applicant provided a preliminary landscape plan for the front yard. In line with Town Code requirements, staff has included a Condition of Approval that the front yard be landscaped prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (Exhibit 3, Condition 9). The minimum front yard landscape requirement prior to occupancy is for mulch to be spread on areas disturbed by construction.

DISCUSSION (continued):

A summary of the design revisions made to date is provided in the table below:

Summary of Architectural Revisions to Date

	June 12, 2020 Plans for Consulting Architect	March 24, 2021 Plans for PC	May 12, 2021 Plans for PC
Floor Area, residence	2,127 square feet	2,123 square feet	2,123 square feet
Maximum Height	23 feet – 10½ inches	21 feet – 10½ inches	15 feet – 11½ inches
Plate Height	11 feet – 4 inches	11 feet – 4 inches	10 feet – 4 inches
Height at Top of Windows	9 feet – 4 inches	9 feet – 4 inches	8 feet – 4 inches
Roof Pitch (main)	6/12	5/12	4/12
Roof pitch (turret bay)	6/12 to 8/12	5½/12 to 7½/12	4/12
Roof Form	Hip with gable ends at garage and rear.	Hip with gable ends at garage and rear.	Hip at the garage and rear.
Window Style	Arched top front and rear, and flat top sides. Fixed, slider, double hung, and casement.	Arched top front and rear, and flat top sides. Fixed, slider, double hung, and casement.	Flat top on all elevations. Fixed, sliders, and casement.
Dormer	Above front entry.	Above front entry.	None.

STORY POLES:

The installed story poles have been updated to reflect the revised design. The updated story poles have been certified by a licensed surveyor who indicated that they accurately reflect the height and location of the revised design of the proposed residence.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Updated story poles and project signage were installed on the site by April 28, 2021, in anticipation of the May 12, 2021 Planning Commission hearing. Public comments received between 11:01 a.m., Friday, March 19, 2021, and 11:00 a.m., Friday, May 7, 2021, are included as Exhibit 14. All comments were forwarded to the applicant upon receipt.

CONCLUSION:

A. Summary

The applicant has submitted revised development plans responding to the recommendations of the Town's Consulting Architect and the March 24, 2021 comments of the Planning Commission (Exhibit 15).

B. Recommendation

Should the Planning Commission determine that the revised project meets the direction provided at the March 24, 2021 meeting, the Commission can take the actions below to approve the Architecture and Site application:

1. Make the finding that the proposed project is categorically exempt pursuant to the adopted Guidelines for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 15303: New Construction (Exhibit 2);
2. Make the findings as required by Section 29.10.09030(e) of the Town Code for the demolition of existing structures (Exhibit 2);
3. Make the finding that the project complies with the objective standards of Chapter 29 of the Town Code (Zoning Regulations) (Exhibit 2);
4. Make the finding required by the Town's Residential Design Guidelines that the project complies with the Residential Design Guidelines (Exhibit 2);
5. Make the considerations as required by Section 29.20.150 of the Town Code for granting approval of an Architecture and Site application (Exhibit 2); and
6. Approve Architecture and Site Application S-20-013 with the conditions contained in Exhibit 3 and the revised development plans in Exhibit 15.

C. Alternatives

Alternatively, the Commission can:

1. Continue the matter to a date certain with specific direction; or
2. Approve the application with additional and/or modified conditions; or
3. Deny the application.

PAGE 6 OF 6

SUBJECT: 140 Arroyo Grande Way/S-20-013

DATE: May 7, 2021

EXHIBITS:

Previously received with the March 24, 2021 Staff Report:

1. Location Map
2. Required Findings and Considerations
3. Recommended Conditions of Approval
4. Project Description
5. Letter of Justification
6. Consulting Architect's Report, dated June 29, 2020
7. Applicant's response to the recommendations of the Consulting Architect
8. Neighborhood exhibit by staff
9. Town Arborist's Report, dated November 2, 2020
10. Public comments received by 11:00 a.m., Friday, March 19, 2021
11. Applicant's response to public comments
12. Development Plans

Received with this Staff Report:

13. Applicant Response Letter
14. Public comments received between 11:01 a.m., Friday, March 19, 2021 and 11:00 a.m., Friday, May 7, 2021
15. Revised Development Plans, received May 5, 2021

Planning Commission,
Community Development Department,
Planning Division,
110 E. Main Street,
Los Gatos, CA 95030.

Date: April 30, 2021


RE: Plan Updates – 140 Arroyo Grande Way (S-20-013)

Dear Planning Commissioners:

We appreciate your comments and suggestions on our project that were provided during the review meeting on March 24, 2021. We have made significant changes to the plans to address your concerns and incorporate your suggestions. We have also conscientiously worked with our neighbors to address their concerns.

1. Reduce Mass and Bulk of New Home

We have changed the design and pitch of the roof to achieve a 6' reduction in the height of the home. The height of the home has been reduced from 21'-10.5 to 15'-11.5". The comparison between the design originally submitted and the latest design is depicted in the image below.




In addition to reducing the height of the new home, we have also done the following:

- Simplified the roof forms by replacing the garage gable roof with a hip roof.
- Incorporated consistent window forms of all elevations.
- Removed the roof dormer.
- Lowered the roof eaves by 1'.

We have met all the recommendations of the town's consultant architect, and these changes are consistent with other homes in the immediate neighborhood. As shown in the image below, the height of our new home is a little less than two homes in the immediate neighborhood that are just across the street.



La Cienega Ct




Arroyo Grande Way




140 Arroyo Grande Way

While the new home is 3' taller than the original home, the side elevation given below shows that this maximum height is only reached at a certain point and the majority of the roof is at 14' or less from grade level. This was done primarily to address the sky-view concerns of our neighbors to the right at 124 Arroyo Grande Way.



2. Landscape

We are working with a landscape architect to design a garden in the front of our home. The garden in our front-yard will have drought-resistant and low-water usage plants and shrubs with a view towards water conservation. An image of the plan showing the front-yard is given below.



3. Working with Neighbors

We have reached out to all our neighbors in the immediate neighborhood, and also the neighbors at the back who expressed some concerns during the last review meeting. Most of our immediate neighbors have expressed support for our project and some of their comments are given below.

“Dear Hema and Yogi,

My name is Michael Palaniuk and I am the son of your neighbor, Eva and Sylvester Palaniuk at 120 Arroyo Grande Way. Thank you so much for dropping off your revised building plans. Our family fully supports you building your dream home for your family.

Sincerely

Michael Palaniuk”

“Hello Yogesh,

Thanks for sharing the updated plan of your house. Many LG neighborhoods have gone through similar transitions already. Therefore, I support any project that will improve the curb appeal of the neighborhood. Good luck!

Ayhan Mutlu

Your neighbor from 147 Arroyo Grande Way”

“Hi Hema and Yogi,

Thank you very much for showing me your site plan for your upcoming remodel.

This was a very nice courtesy I haven't ever received from my other neighbors prior to their remodels.


I love the turret. It will add a touch of class to the neighborhood! Even though you had to make it lower, it will still be very nice. I studied your plan, and it looks very nice.
Best regards,
Jane Loomis
109 Arroyo Grande Way”

We have worked diligently to address the concerns of our neighbors who did not support the project based on the original design. Our attempt to resolve their concerns is outlined below.

- a. Sky-view / Sunlight: We have reduced the height of the home by 6', which addresses the sky-view and sunlight concerns. Even though the new home is 3' taller than our current home, it should have minimal impact on the neighbors at the back as their home is at a 2' higher grade level compared to our home.

The neighbors to the right at 124 Arroyo Grande Way have asked that the height of the house be 14' above grade level to get a good sky-view from their side windows. We have explained to them that, as show in the side elevation provided above, only a small fraction of the roof is above 14' and the vast majority of the roof is 14' or lower from grade level. We have also explained that lowering the roof any more makes the house-to-roof ratio disproportionate and increases the prominence of the garage, which is not desirable per the Los Gatos design guidelines.


- b. Privacy: We value the privacy of our neighbors. We have lowered all windows by 1' to address the privacy concerns of our neighbors. The neighbors at our back are at a 2' higher grade level, which effectively makes the fence 8' tall (see image below). We have explained this to our neighbors at the back and they have not raised any more concerns.



We have highlighted to our side neighbors that there is no way for us to look over the 7' fence standing at the floor level, as shown below. We have a 6' fence on one side, and we are willing to share the cost of increasing the height to 7'.




We have limited the number of windows on both the side elevations. The right elevation has only one bedroom window and the remaining two are bathroom windows.



RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION

1/4" = 1'-0"

The left elevation has 2 garage windows; however, they don't face a living area and our neighbor has no windows in their garage. There is one media room window and one bathroom window on the right-side elevation.



LEFT SIDE ELEVATION

1/4" = 1'-0"

We have also offered to mitigate the privacy concerns of our neighbors on both sides by having screening trees. Unfortunately, we have heard conflicting statements from our neighbors to the right (Charlene and Ian Land – 124 Arroyo Grande Way), which makes it

very difficult to reach a resolution. When we offered to lower the height of all windows by 1', Charlene and Ian responded that they have mitigated the problem at their end (see excerpt below).

Excerpt from email sent by Charlene and Ian Land on 03/21/2021

"Lower windows - we appreciate your reducing your windows, but the fence and our top-down/bottom-up blinds mitigate our privacy concerns if you would like to raise the windows back up."

We still lowered the windows by 1', and then we got the following response, asking us to lower the windows below 7'.

Excerpt from email sent by Charlene and Ian Land on 04/17/2021

"Privacy – top of windows should be lower than top of 7' fence."

These emails have been forwarded to the city to add to our project file.

- c. Health / Other Considerations: We have also worked with the neighbor at the back to assuage her health concerns by sharing our plans to begin construction during the winter when windows are closed, mitigating the effect of dust and noise to a large extent. We have also assured all our neighbors that we will keep them informed about the construction timelines and plans to avoid any disruption of their daily routines.

To summarize, we have revised the plans to address all comments and suggestions from the planning commission and the town's consultant architect. We have also worked diligently to address the concerns from a few neighbors. The rest of our immediate neighbors feel that our new home fits well into the neighborhood.

We would also like to reiterate our need for living space. We have two grown-up children, a 21-year-old son and a 15-year-old daughter, who live with us. In addition to that, we have visiting grandparents and family that stay with us for extended periods. Hema's father passed away last year, and her mother intends to visit and stay with us once the COVID situation improves.

We appreciate the time and effort that the planning commission and the Los Gatos planning department has spent on our project to help us build our dream home. We hope for a favorable response to our application.

Sincerely,

Hema and Yogesh Jhamb
140 Arroyo Grande Way,
Los Gatos, CA 95032.

From: Charlene Land <csland@garlic.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 24, 2021 11:47 AM
To: Ian Land <iland_7@yahoo.com>
Cc: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>; IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>
Subject: Re: submission for 140 Arroyo Grande Way

Update and Errata to our document "Reply_140ArroyoGrandeJustification_22Dec20a.pdf" submitted on 12/22/2020 mentioned below in this thread.

Hello Sean,

We would like to provide an update to the data we sent in December. Since the erection of the storyboards, we are now most concerned about the project's impacts to our sky view and privacy. Please refer to the presentation Ian sent this morning (3/24/21).

For the previous chart regarding average home sizes in our neighborhood, the previous calculations wrongly included the garage square footage for 140 Arroyo Grande's new home size. Such was not included for other home data. We now know "percentage of lot size" is referred to as FAR (Floor Area Ratio).

Please see the attached updated chart with the project's actual size of 2123 square feet.

The FAR of the proposed construction is 33% (versus incorrect 40%).

Please note that 33% FAR exceeds all other single-story homes in the 30 nearest subdivision homes used in our chart, the average of which is 21% for interior parcels.


The Los Gatos "Single and Two Family Residential Design Guidelines" focuses on a project site's "immediate neighborhood."

For the seven homes in the immediate neighborhood of the proposed construction, the average FAR for internal parcels is 23%.

None of the applicants' Justification Letter's comparison homes are part of project site's immediate neighborhood.

In addition to updating the chart with the project's actual FAR, the relevant "immediate neighborhood" homes are now marked. Please see the attached updated chart.

Thank you,
Charlene and Ian Land



From: ANNA HELLMER <ahellmer@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, March 24, 2021 12:37 PM

To: Planning <Planning@losgatosca.gov>

Cc: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>; Planning Comment <PlanningComment@losgatosca.gov>; Clerk <Clerk@losgatosca.gov>; Shelley Neis <sneis@losgatosca.gov>

Subject: APN 424-23-048 - 140 Arroyo Grande Way

Dear Mr. Sean Mullin and Planning Commission et al,

This message is to communicate our objection to, and concerns with the proposed project at 140 Arroyo Grande Way.

The project is too large and too complex as currently proposed. 140 Arroyo Grande Way is in the middle of a residential block that is ninety-nine percent single story homes. If the proposed project is executed as planned it would create a structure that is inconsistent with the rest of the neighborhood--in essence shoe-horning in a structure that does not match in style and size with the rest of the neighborhood.

We mostly agree with Cannon Design Group's analysis of the proposed project, with the exception that the structure height is too high.

The Jhamb's stated they consulted with their neighbors on either side of them but they failed to show sensitivity and respect for their neighbors behind them. The back of their house has been our view to the east as the sun rises for the last twenty-five years. From our view point, the sheer height and mass of the proposed structure is too much. We love to garden and grow our own food and the amount of sunlight we currently enjoy would be diminished.

Sincerely,

Mark & Anna Hellmer
147 Las Astas Drive
Los Gatos, CA 95032
(408) 358-6363

From: IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 17, 2021 12:18 PM
To: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>
Cc: Charlene Land <csland@garlic.com>; Hema Jhamb <hemajhamb@gmail.com>; IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>; Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Re: Update Plan - 140 Arroyo Grande Way

Yogi,

Thank you for sending the elevation drawings for our review. We spent some time this morning to clarify our concerns after looking at the modified drawings. We still have the following primary concerns which we have mentioned previously:

- * The 15' 11.5" roof peak will still have a significant impact on our sky view
- * The 8' 4" window peaks will be 1' 4" above a 7' fence and will impact our privacy
- * The 10'4" eaves impact the roof height and the bulk from our south-facing windows

Given those concerns, we would propose the following targets, priorities and requests:

Overarching Targets

Sky View and Natural Light - From 124 Arroyo Grande Way - Target 50% or more of *existing* sky view standing inside at 30" from interior wall, 6' tall person (please note this is substantial reduction) from all five windows

Privacy - No windows over the top of the fence, 7' fence (6' solid +1' lattice)

Must-have

Lower the roof peak(s) to a maximum of 14' from finish grade (not floor level). This is 2' above Immediate Neighborhood Interior Parcels (*INIP) typical and 6" above 124 Arroyo Grande Way's approximately 7' long Clerestory Peak.

Privacy – top of windows should be lower than top of 7' fence.

Lower the eaves to a maximum of 9'4" above finish grade level (INIP typical is 8'6")

All changes in drawings submitted to the city and posted on the website

Changes should be reflected in the storyboards before the May 12th Planning Commission hearing

Strongly Suggest and Other Items

We believe our privacy will be better if you replace the turret and conical roof section with a bay window and hip roof

Lessening the side expansion could reduce the bulk and the overall height

We are concerned that a 2nd-level or additional rooms will be added after initial permits obtained. We would like reassurances that you will follow the permit process for future changes.

*INIP – Immediate Neighborhood Interior Parcel as defined by page 11 of the Los Gatos Residential Guidelines.

Please note that we have used all dimensions from finished grade and not floor level, unless stated differently. Also, I copied Sean to make sure it is clear to the city that we are communicating with you in response to statements you made at the hearing that suggested otherwise.

Thank you,

Ian and Charlene

On April 12, 2021 at 6:30 PM, Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com> wrote:
Charlene / Ian:

Please find attached the revised elevations based on the planning commission review feedback. We have lowered the exterior walls from 10' to 9'. The roof design and pitch has also been updated to decrease the overall height of the proposed home by 6'. We believe that these changes should address your sky-view and privacy concerns. Let us know if you have any other comments or suggestions.

Thank you,
Hema and Yogi

From: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2021 7:56 PM
To: IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>
Cc: Charlene Land <csland@garlic.com>; Hema Jhamb <hemajhamb@gmail.com>; Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Re: Update Plan - 140 Arroyo Grande Way

Charlene / Ian:

We have discussed your suggestions with our architect and our assessment is presented below. First off, we want to clarify our comment during the last planning commission meeting. We were merely trying to explain that when we made an offer to reduce the height of the proposed home by 3'-4', you replied that it would not be sufficient, without indicating the reduction you desire.

1. We have made a significant reduction in the height of the new home by lowering the overall height by 6'. We attempted to lower the roof a bit more; however, it makes the house-to-roof ratio disproportionate and increases the prominence of the garage. The Los Gatos Design Guidelines (page 11) explicit states to avoid garages that dominate street frontage. We have attached an image of the side elevation indicating that the maximum height of the home is only attained at a particular point and it is 14' or lower for the remainder of its length.
2. Your email dated 03/21/2021, which is attached, indicates that you have mitigated the privacy concerns at your end, and you indicated that we should move the window top back to 9'-4". Now you are stating otherwise and want the windows to be even lower.

Excerpt from your email:

"Lower windows - we appreciate your reducing your windows, but the fence and our top-down/bottom-up blinds mitigate our privacy concerns if you would like to raise the windows back up."

The bedroom window on our side elevation towards your home does not align with any of your windows. The remaining two windows are bathroom windows, which will have no visibility. We have attached an image that indicates how a 4' window would look with the top of the window at 5'-6" from floor level to be aligned with the top of the fence at 7'. As you can see, this results in the window being too low on the wall. We hope you can understand that we value your privacy and that there is no way for us to look over the fence standing at the floor level.

3. We have lowered the roof eaves by 1' as recommended by the town's consultant architect. All new homes have either 9' or 10' exterior walls. The current homes have 8' walls as they were built in the 1950s. We are trying to build a house for the future, not the past.
4. All plan updates and story pole changes have to be completed before the planning commission review; otherwise, the city does not schedule the review.
5. Our architect has indicated that the bay window structure does not align with a hip roof, and in any case a hip roof will be taller than a conical roof. If you review the front elevation carefully, you will notice that the top of the garage hip roof is taller than the conical roof.

6. We also don't believe that lessening the side expansion will reduce the bulk and overall height. In any case, the setback of 8'-3" towards our side is 37% more than the setback of 6' that you have on the other side. We are unable to provide additional setback.
7. There is no way to make additions or build a second level without going through a permit process.

We understand and appreciate your concerns as neighbors, and we have made every effort to address them. We hope that you can understand our feelings as property owners—we want to build for the future, not the past, and in addition to serving our everyday requirements, we want our home to have good curbside appeal.

Thank you,
Hema and Yogi

From: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2021 7:56 PM
To: IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>
Cc: Charlene Land <csland@garlic.com>; Hema Jhamb <hemajhamb@gmail.com>; Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Re: Update Plan - 140 Arroyo Grande Way

Charlene / Ian:

We have discussed your suggestions with our architect and our assessment is presented below. First off, we want to clarify our comment during the last planning commission meeting. We were merely trying to explain that when we made an offer to reduce the height of the proposed home by 3'-4', you replied that it would not be sufficient, without indicating the reduction you desire.

1. We have made a significant reduction in the height of the new home by lowering the overall height by 6'. We attempted to lower the roof a bit more; however, it makes the house-to-roof ratio disproportionate and increases the prominence of the garage. The Los Gatos Design Guidelines (page 11) explicit states to avoid garages that dominate street frontage. We have attached an image of the side elevation indicating that the maximum height of the home is only attained at a particular point and it is 14' or lower for the remainder of its length.
2. Your email dated 03/21/2021, which is attached, indicates that you have mitigated the privacy concerns at your end, and you indicated that we should move the window top back to 9'-4". Now you are stating otherwise and want the windows to be even lower.

Excerpt from your email:

"Lower windows - we appreciate your reducing your windows, but the fence and our top-down/bottom-up blinds mitigate our privacy concerns if you would like to raise the windows back up."


The bedroom window on our side elevation towards your home does not align with any of your windows. The remaining two windows are bathroom windows, which will have no visibility. We have attached an image that indicates how a 4' window would look with the top of the window at 5'-6" from floor level to be aligned with the top of the fence at 7'. As you can see, this results in the window being too low on the wall. We hope you can understand that we value your privacy and that there is no way for us to look over the fence standing at the floor level.

3. We have lowered the roof eaves by 1' as recommended by the town's consultant architect. All new homes have either 9' or 10' exterior walls. The current homes have 8' walls as they were built in the 1950s. We are trying to build a house for the future, not the past.
4. All plan updates and story pole changes have to be completed before the planning commission review; otherwise, the city does not schedule the review.
5. Our architect has indicated that the bay window structure does not align with a hip roof, and in any case a hip roof will be taller than a conical roof. If you review the front elevation carefully, you will notice that the top of the garage hip roof is taller than the conical roof.

6. We also don't believe that lessening the side expansion will reduce the bulk and overall height. In any case, the setback of 8'-3" towards our side is 37% more than the setback of 6' that you have on the other side. We are unable to provide additional setback.
7. There is no way to make additions or build a second level without going through a permit process.

We understand and appreciate your concerns as neighbors, and we have made every effort to address them. We hope that you can understand our feelings as property owners—we want to build for the future, not the past, and in addition to serving our everyday requirements, we want our home to have good curbside appeal.

Thank you,
Hema and Yogi



RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION

1/4" = 1'-0"

From: IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 21, 2021 11:25 AM
To: Charlene Land <csland@garlic.com>
Cc: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>; Hema Jhamb <hemajhamb@gmail.com>; IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>
Subject: Re: Response to comments

Dear Yogi and Hema,

Thank you for the response, for your willingness to communicate, and for the proposal of changes.

First off, Charlene apologizes for her behavior the day she spoke to you in August. This has been very emotional for us and we are sure it is also emotional for you. She had more details on her apology in our first draft, but I removed it. I believe she has flogged herself enough over that day.

Second, I would like to address a few items from your recent email.

1. Neither Charlene nor myself communicated with Joe Feng before this email being sent. His words are his own.
2. My March text was not our first time prioritizing our concerns. I listed our priorities in the December note in the first line of paragraph 3. The March text is a clarification of our priorities after the storyboards have gone up.
3. I want to get out of the 'house too big discussion.' We understand and respect your family's need for space. Our concern is that the size of the house on this small lot in the center of the neighborhood that pushes city setbacks on all sides. We believe the changes have an impact on not only the families around you (including us), but also the long-term feel of the neighborhood. As I mentioned in my text, this would not be an issue if we had bigger lot sizes.
4. I was quite offended at your accusation that we have been anything less than truthful. I/we want to avoid a blaming and defensive argument, so we will continue to try to work with you in good faith and will ignore accusations and attribute them to the emotions we are all working through.

Third, regarding the proposals, the foremost concern we have today is the roof height and how it impedes our sky view. The responses below reflect that.

- Wall height - we appreciate the 1' reduction since it reduces the roof height.
- Lower windows - we appreciate your reducing your windows, but the fence and our top-down/bottom-up blinds mitigate our privacy concerns if you would like to raise the windows back up.
- Fence - I am glad we can make this change and share the cost for this.
- Roof height - we appreciate the proposal. However, it will still have a significant impact on the sky view from our South-facing windows. For example, at the desk I am typing this letter at right now, my sky view will be at best a sliver after proposed changes.

Regarding saying nothing at the hearing - unfortunately, it is too late for us to agree to that. Without seeing drawing and story board changes submitted to the city, we feel it is unwise for us to go without expressing our concerns.

Thank you again for the communication. I wish it had not been so difficult for all of us and I hope this is all part of learning to work together going forward.

Ian

On Mar 15, 2021, at 9:56 PM, Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com> wrote:
Charlene / Ian:

This is in response to the text you sent us on March 14th, 2021, in which you stated your concerns about our remodel project. First of all, we would like you to know that we are extremely disappointed at how you have focused on only your concerns as neighbors, completely ignoring or caring for our needs as property owners. It is also surprising that you expect empathy and consideration from us after sending such a strongly worded letter to the city. We also don't understand why you are assuming that both of you are the only people distressed by this situation.

We believe that this is the first time you have listed and prioritized your concerns, and earlier you were not interested in working together to resolve the differences regarding the project. We remember how Charlene invited us to see your new home on a Sunday morning while Ian was away. After a quick tour of the house, Charlene surprised us by listing concerns about our project in front of our children. The ideal way to handle your concerns would have been to give us a heads-up and then the four of us could have gotten together to discuss the project. We tried to address Charlene's concerns by sending the latest plans and providing our view on the privacy and height concerns. We never got any response from your side, and we believe that you started communicating with Joe Feng, our neighbor on the other side. Joe Feng had sent some initial concerns to the city, but later he started adding other concerns about sunlight / sky-view, which we believe reflected your thinking. We still didn't get any prioritized list of concerns from you and on Jan 05th, 2021, we received an email from the city planner on the letter dated Dec 22nd, 2020, in which you sent all your concerns to the city. You later dropped a printed copy of the same letter, along with a handwritten note in our mailbox the same day. It seems like you were not aware that the city forwards all concerns to the homeowner and you were hoping to achieve your objectives behind our back. If you were truthful, then you should have sent that letter to us first, checking with us to see if we can reach a resolution.

Anyhow, we will attempt to address the concerns you have raised and propose a resolution that seems fair to both sides:

1. First of all, we don't believe that our house is too big. We have a bigger family, and our needs are different compared to yours. You have a single child, who is away studying in Utah so 1,647 square-foot of living space is sufficient for you. However, we have two grown-up children, who intend to stay at home as long as possible. Nitya still has three more years of high school and is planning to attend college in the Bay Area. Dhruv is

planning to attend a graduate program at Stanford in the fall of 2021 and intends to live at home through the graduate program and even while working at a job. Children are increasingly living with their parents well into adulthood to mitigate the problem of high rents in the Bay Area. This is why we require 2,123 square feet of living space for our new home. We never told you how much to build when you remodeled your home, and you built what you felt was appropriate for your family's size and needs. In the same way, we would like to build what is appropriate for our family within the limits allowed by the city.

2. We also don't agree that if everyone builds to the maximum allowed setback, then there would be wall-to-wall houses. There will still be a 16' gap between adjacent homes (8' setback for each property), and a 30' gap between back-to-back homes (15' setback for each property). The land utilization will still be at 40%, and 60% of the land in each parcel will be left for open space. We are not willing to increase the setback to more than 8' towards your home, as other neighbors may also start asking for additional setback, and then we will have no space to build our home. We also feel that the bay window style at the corner of our home is essential to the selected architecture style. We fail to see how a view of people walking or driving on the street is more important than our need for living space on land that we own. We also believe that you have a clear view of the street from all your front windows, and if you would like, we can provide a photo highlighting that.
3. In regard to the privacy concerns, we are willing to share the cost of increasing the height of the fence to the maximum limit allowed by city. We have only kept windows on both sides when there was no other choice. When placing windows towards the backyard or the street were possible, we avoided placing side windows. The floor level of the new home also remains the same.
4. We believe that the proposed home will not block sunlight or view of the sky. The roof of the proposed home increases gradually and keeping in mind the trajectory of the sun, it will be always be visible over the proposed home. We also don't believe that you would have insufficient light in the rooms of your house due to the proposed home. Our current home has two bedrooms with south-west facing windows and one bedroom with north-west facing windows, and we get ample light. The bedrooms in the new home are either north facing or south-west facing, and we hope to get ample light.

After reviewing your prioritized list of items, we are willing to make the following changes to the plan:

1. Reduce the height of all exterior walls from 10' down to 9'.
2. Lower all windows so that the top of the window is at 7'.
3. Share the cost to increase the height of the fence to 7', which is allowed by the city. We are willing to share the cost and effort to obtain a permit to increase the height more than 7', if that is what you desire.
4. Decrease the height of the home by an additional 2'-3', either by reducing the slope of the roof, or by changing the roof design.

The above changes will reduce the overall height of the proposed home to the 17'-18' range, which is in line with other homes in neighborhood—the home across the street (143 Arroyo Grande Way) has a height of 16'-17' and Jim and Lynne's home (115 La Cienega) stands around 15'-16'. These changes will address your concerns regarding the sunlight and privacy. If you agree to these changes, then we are willing to make them even if the city doesn't ask us to do so. However, we would require assurance that you will not request any other changes and not raise any other concerns to the city, either in writing or at the planning commission review.

We are unable to reduce the living area as we require space for a bigger family and we also have family visiting us from India for extended periods. Hema's mother intends to visit and stay with us once the Covid situation improves.

The fact is that we no longer live in 1958, the period when these homes were built. With the increased cost of housing, people are building to maximize the living area. Note that even with a living area of 2,123 square-feet, we are only utilizing 33% of the available land. We believe that we have proposed a fair and just resolution to your concerns regarding the project. If you don't agree to this proposal, then let us both put our case in front of the planning commission and let them make a decision.

Thank you,
Hema and Yogi

From: IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>

Sent: Saturday, April 24, 2021 11:29 AM

To: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>

Cc: Charlene Land <csland@garlic.com>; Hema Jhamb <hemajhamb@gmail.com>; Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>

Subject: Re: Update Plan - 140 Arroyo Grande Way

Yogi and Hema,

We are having trouble with formatting of our response, so we turned it into a PDF. It is attached.

Thank you,
Ian and Charlene

Hi Yogi and Hema,

We have spent many hours trying to maintain our relationship, meet your key needs, and meet a fraction of our key concerns. We are tired. We continue to ask for reasonable requests and you keep pushing to take more away. Let's be clear:

- We have tried to understand your needs and work with you in good faith
- We have acquiesced to your expansion in our direction, the bulk of your house, and your square footage
- We have offered a decrease in our sky view of up to 50%, even though this is one of two key concerns.
- We are trying to find a way to live with the privacy impact of your increased number of windows, your raised windows, the closer wall, and the turret window – all of which face our home and/or our outdoor garden – privacy is our second key concern.

Your note sounds like we are giving up nothing with a nearly 100% increase in your square footage, your wall moving toward us 8' to the setback limit, your window height increasing, your wall height increasing, your roof height increasing, and numerous additional windows facing us. With all of those compromises we are making, we expect you to meet our two key concerns left: >50% of existing sky view and keeping privacy with windows below the top of a 7' fence.

Our responses in this email are intended to be consistent with the presentation to the planning commission at the hearing. The hearing presentation and all communications since that time supersede those before the commission hearing in late March. Finally, the specifics in the last email are still our requests.

Responding to individual points below:

1. We have made a significant reduction in the height of the new home by lowering the overall height by 6'. We attempted to lower the roof a bit more; however, it makes the house-to-roof ratio disproportionate and increases the prominence of the garage. The Los Gatos Design Guidelines (page 11) explicit states to avoid garages that dominate street frontage. We have attached an image of the side elevation indicating that the maximum height of the home is only attained at a particular point and it is 14' or lower for the remainder of its length.

LANDS' RESPONSE: A 16' roof is a 4' increase in roof height. We request you to limit the increase to 2' for a total height from finish grade to peak of 14' and we still want to see the storyboards before the hearing to verify the impact to our sky view is less than 50%. The sky view impact on a house closer to ours limits the height to 14' based on the existing storyboards.

2. Your email dated 03/21/2021, which is attached, indicates that you have mitigated the privacy concerns at your end, and you indicated that we should move the window top back to 9'-4". Now you are stating otherwise and want the windows to be even lower.

Excerpt from your email:

"Lower windows - we appreciate your reducing your windows, but the fence and our top-down/bottom-up blinds mitigate our privacy concerns if you would like to raise the windows back up."

LANDS' RESPONSE: I NEVER stated I was comfortable with windows at 9'4". I said windows should be lower than the top of the fence. Since that time, we spoke with a real estate expert who suggests that an 8' fence is too high for a number of reasons, including for resale considerations. Thus, we are asking for the top of windows to not be above a 7' fence (which is 1' higher than the current fence).

3. We have lowered the roof eaves by 1' as recommended by the town's consultant architect. All new homes have either 9' or 10' exterior walls. The current homes have 8' walls as they were built in the 1950s. We are trying to build a house for the future, not the past

LANDS' RESPONSE: Taller walls equals taller roof. Please decide how to use the requested 14'. I include some ideas to lower the roof at the end of this email.

In my last email I was trying to be accommodating by offering 9'4" eaves at 8" above the typical for immediate neighborhood interior parcels and, yet again, you have disregarded an attempt to work together.

All plan updates and story pole changes have to complete before the planning commission review; otherwise, the city does not schedule the review.

LANDS' RESPONSE: Good.

4. Our architect has indicated that the bay window structure does not align with a hip roof, and in any case a hip roof will be taller than a conical roof. If you review the front elevation carefully, you will notice that the top of the garage hip roof is taller than the conical roof.

LANDS' RESPONSE: We are not particular to hip or gable, just that it matches the neighborhood and minimizes roof height. Garage height is higher because it is a wider structure – please see the explanation in #5. I am not sure how garage height is relevant. We walked through our neighborhood today and saw more than 5 bay windows that did not increase the height of the roof. Here are two examples in our neighborhood:



123 Las Astas

5. We also don't believe that lessening the side expansion will reduce the bulk and overall height. In any case, the setback of 8'-3" towards our side is 37% more than the setback of 6' that you have on the other side. We are unable to provide additional setback.

LANDS' RESPONSE: Your 8' setback is at the code limit as is my *legacy* garage side setback. The opposite side of our house is 8' from an 8' setback. These numbers are unrelated to the discussion at hand.

Regarding reducing the side expansion – if the roof pitch is maintained, a reduction in the width of the home will reduce the roof height. It follows the [Pythagorean Theorem](#). For example, with a pitch of 3/12, the roof will be 3' tall if 12' from center and 2' tall if 8' from center. By the way, 3/12 is the pitch of the roofs of the immediate neighborhood interior parcels.

6. There is no way to make additions or build a second level without going through a permit process.


LANDS' RESPONSE: We want your commitment in writing that you will follow the permit process for any future changes whether building out the garage, adding upstairs changes, or any other.

Finally, to help with roof and window height, here are a few ideas:

- Consider coffered ceilings to lower exterior walls while you still have the benefit of high interior ceilings
- Consider lowering your 1'4" floor level. Immediate neighborhood interior parcel floor levels are 4" above finished grade and the garage.
- Consider matching the roof pitch of immediate neighborhood interior parcels at 3' rise for 12' length

Please come back to us with a proposal that is fair to you *and* your neighbors. The city has made it clear we need to work together. We have done our part to meet your request of a new, larger, taller, and more imposing home. Please find a way to accommodate our reasonable requests that are also aligned with Joe Feng's, Anna and Mark Hellmer, and other neighbors' concerns.

Regards
Ian and Charlene
April 24, 2021



RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"

From: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 25, 2021 6:33 PM
To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: FW: Thank you for sharing the updated house plan

Sean:

We met many of our neighbors in the immediate neighborhood today. All of them expressed support for our project and one of them even complimented our bay window and turret design saying that “it brings a feeling of richness to the neighborhood”. One of our immediate neighbors at 147 Arroyo Grande Way has sent an email supporting our project. Please include this email in our project file for review by the planning commission.

Thank you,
-Yogi

From: Ayhan Mutlu <ayhan.amutlu@gmail.com>
Date: Sunday, April 25, 2021 at 5:24 PM
To: "jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com" <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>
Subject: Thank you for sharing the updated house plan

Hello Yogesh,
Thanks for sharing the updated plan of your house. Many LG neighborhoods have gone through similar transitions already. Therefore, I support any project that will improve the curb appeal of the neighborhood. Good luck!

Ayhan Mutlu
Your neighbor from 147 Arroyo Grande Way

From: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 25, 2021 11:01 AM
To: IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>
Cc: Charlene Land <csland@garlic.com>; Hema Jhamb <hemajhamb@gmail.com>; Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Re: Update Plan - 140 Arroyo Grande Way

Charlene / Ian:

We have reviewed the document attached to your email and our response is given below. We have also spent many hours trying to address your concerns by working with the architect and communicating with you. In addition to that, we are also in correspondence with the other neighbors, with the city for plan review and approval, with the story pole contractor and surveyor to coordinate the story pole adjustments and certification. We have already expressed our requirements for living space and certain architectural elements in our new home. Moving forward, we would like to focus our communication on just your sky-view and privacy concerns as this is both mentally and physically exhausting for us.

1. It doesn't seem to us that you have acquiesced to our expansion as you keep asking for more setback towards your home. As we stated, we are providing a setback of 8'-3", which is 3" more than what is required by the city.
2. The town's consultant architect had initially reported an increase of 9' in height for the new home. Since we have made a 6' reduction in height, the new home will be 3' taller than the current home, and not 4' as you stated. As depicted in the side elevation, 90% or more of the roof is at or below the 14' height that you have asked. It is unfortunate that you are not willing to compromise with only a very small portion of the roof being above 14'.
3. We also want to point out that a 100% increase of a 1,150 s.f. home is 2,300 s.f., not 2,123 s.f. Therefore, we don't have a 100% square footage increase as you stated, and we are disappointed at the way you continue to exaggerate your claims and concerns.
4. As we previously stated in our email, there is only 1 bedroom window on the side elevation towards your home. This is the same as the existing bedroom window that we currently have. The remaining two windows in the new home are bathroom windows that would have no visibility. We can mitigate this issue by having a screening tree or other landscape option.
5. As far as privacy is concerned, we have heard two different contradictory statements from you. We fail to understand the logic of conveniently choosing to supersede one over another. Again, we are talking about a single bedroom window, and we can mitigate this issue by having a screening tree or other landscape option. We have already reduced the top of the windows by 1'.
6. We have also explained that all new homes have either 9' or 10' exterior walls, which results in 10'-4" or 11'-4" roof eaves. We have already lowered the roof eaves from 11'-4" to 10'-4" and you are not willing to compromise.
7. We have already expressed our desire to keep certain architectural elements in our new home, which have been approved by the town's consultant architect. Therefore, we wish to retain the bay window structure with the conical roof.
8. We are repeating ourselves that all changes for additions and expansions will be done following the city's permit process.
9. As far as the recommendations on reducing the height are concerned:
 - a. We already have coffered ceilings, which raise the ceiling height to 10' inside the house. As we stated earlier, all new homes (even in Los Gatos), are being built with 9' or 10' exterior walls.

- b. The floor level of 1'-4" is to provide for crawl space, which is required by the building code for all new homes. This guideline may not have been there in the 1950s when these homes were originally built.
- c. The roof pitch of 4"-12" has been selected to maintain the appropriate house-to-roof proportion. As we stated before, lowering the roof any further impacts this ratio and increases the prominence of the garage.

We understand that the city wants us to work together; however, this entails accommodations on both sides. If we have decreased the height of the new home by 6', then you should be willing to accept an increase of 3' from the existing home on only a small portion of the roof. The same way, lowering the exterior walls and windows from the proposed 2' increase to 1' is a reasonable compromise for both sides.

Thank you,
Hema and Yogi

From: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 8:02 AM
To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: FW: Building

Sean:

Here is another email from our immediate neighbor at 120 Arroyo Grande Way expressing support for our project. Please include this in our project file for review by the planning commission.

Thank you,
-Yogi

On 4/26/21, 6:48 AM, "Michael Palaniuk" <michael.palaniuk@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Hema and Yogi,

My name is Michael Palaniuk and I am the son of your neighbor, Eva and Sylvester Palaniuk at 120 Arroyo Grande Way. Thank you so much for dropping off your revised building plans. Our family fully supports you building your dream home for your family. There are numerous two story homes in this tract and I think it's wrong that someone tells you that you can't build a multi story home. Especially when so many families in this tract are remodeling their homes lately. We wish you all the best in your endeavors to build your new home. All the best.

Sincerely

Michael Palaniuk

From: Jiuhua Feng <joe_feng@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 3:29 PM
To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Re: My Neighbor's Remodel

Sean,

Thanks for your assistant trying to find my house's record.

The plan of 140 shows that my house is 14' for roof and 9' (8' + 1') for side wall. But my measurements are 12' for roof and 8' for side wall.

May I obtain current 140's record? I think that houses of 144 and 140 are originally built with same heights of roof and side wall.

Thanks again.

Joe

On Apr 26, 2021, at 3:12 PM, Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov> wrote:

Hi Joe,

I checked through the Town records and did not find any plans on file for your house. This is not uncommon for homes built in tracts in the 50s and 60s.

Thank you,
Sean

Sean Mullin, AICP • Associate Planner

Community Development Department • 110 E. Main Street, Los Gatos CA 95030
Ph: 408.354.6823 • smullin@losgatosca.gov
www.losgatosca.gov • <https://www.facebook.com/losgatosca>

From: Jiuhua Feng <joe_feng@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 12:10 PM
To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Re: My Neighbor's Remodel

Sean,

May I get my house's records of roof and side wall height from city building department? The numbers showed in the plan of 140 Arroyo is quite different from what I measured (attached image)

Thanks.

Joe

From: IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 6:00 PM
To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Re: quick question(s)

Thanks, Sean. I appreciate your continued help and guidance.
Best Regards
Ian

On April 26, 2021 at 2:45 PM, Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov> wrote:
Hi Ian,

I have responded to your questions below.

Thankyou,
Sean

From: IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2021 10:06 AM
To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Cc: Charlene Land <csland@garlic.com>; IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>
Subject: quick question(s)

Sean,

My apologies for including you on the previous email regarding 140 Arroyo Grande Way - I don't mean to disrespect your time and I understand you are not our arbitrator. I just wanted to start to set the record straight after the statements Yogi made in the last hearing that implied we were not working with him. I will take you off my next response as we negotiate the changes.

No problem at all. I will include all correspondence received as an attachment to the Planning Commission staff report for May 12th.

The key question I have is what the code for the floor is. Their floor is raised to 1'4" above finish grade. Other homes that are immediate neighborhood interior parcel have floors that are 4" above ground. Is this part of the code for new homes or is this something they are doing for another reason?

There is not a requirement from Planning relative to the height of the finished floor. This may be a design choice of the applicant.

The 2nd question I have is how much the city wants me to solve this problem. I am trying to focus on the concerns of my family, direct neighbors and the neighborhood and he keeps countering with his design preferences. For example, if he were to lower the floor, use coffered ceilings, and change the roof pitch to the 3/12 in immediate neighborhood interior parcels, I suspect we would be pretty close. I would expect he and his designer could figure this out on their own, but that clearly has not happened since our original discussions last August. I would appreciate your guidance here on expectations of us as neighbors. We neighbors have all spent a crazy amount of time on these changes.

You are welcome to continue to discuss your concerns and preferences with your neighbor. You may also continue to submit comments to me via email that I will include as an attachment to the Planning Commission staff report for May 12th.

Thanks in advance
Ian

From: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 6:08 PM
To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: FW: your building plan

Sean:

Attached is another email from an immediate neighbor. We would really like all these comments to be added to our project file. Please let us know if you can do so based on my forwarding them to you, or do they need to come directly to you from the neighbor. We will be highlighting these emails during our presentation, so it would be great to have them on file.

Thank you,
-Yogi

From: JANE LOOMIS <janeloomis@comcast.net>
Date: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 at 4:08 PM
To: Hema and Yogi Yogesh <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: your building plan

Hi Hema and Yogi,

Thank you very much for showing me your site plan for your upcoming remodel. This was a very nice courtesy I haven't ever received from my other neighbors prior to their remodels.

I love the turret. It will add a touch of class to the neighborhood! Even though you had to make it lower, it will still be very nice. I studied your plan, and it looks very nice.

If ever you want to contact me for any reason, please feel free. I am retired from the semiconductor world and am almost always at home. I am the current president of the Los Gatos Art Association, and this keeps me extremely busy.

Next year I too plan to build an addition, so I would welcome any advice. Even if you or your architect make any mistakes, I could learn a lot from knowing those things if you would ever care to share them with me!

Best regards,
Jane Loomis

109 Arroyo Grande Way
408 391-1850 cell
janeloomis@comcast.net

From: Jiuhua Feng <joe_feng@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 10:46 AM
To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Re: My Neighbor's Remodel

Sean,

Thank you very much for your assistant to check through the city database for my house records. Now, my question is where did the plan of 140 Arroyo obtain my house's roof and side wall heights? These data are important because the plan of 140 Arroyo makes comparisons between my house and 140 of Arroyo. According to my measurements, the charts in the plan of 140 Arroyo raises my roof 2' and side wall 1', respectively. I hope that these incorrect charts of the plan of 140 Arroyo can be revised before the next conference.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Joe

From: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2021 12:24 PM
To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Privacy Comments from Neighbors

Sean:

I have attached two emails from our neighbors to the right, Charlene and Ian Land, who live at 124 Arroyo Grande Way. These two emails contain two different contradictory statements with regard to privacy, which are highlighted below.

When we offered to lower the windows by 1', they wrote the following:

Excerpt from email dated 03/21/2021:

"Lower windows - we appreciate your reducing your windows, but the fence and our top-down/bottom-up blinds mitigate our privacy concerns if you would like to raise the windows back up."

In spite of their comment to raise the windows back up, we still updated the plans to lower all windows by 1'. We sent them the updated plans and they responded with the second email:

Excerpt from email dated 04/17/2021:

"Privacy – top of windows should be lower than top of 7' fence."

We would like this information to be added to our project file, as we intend to present this information during the review on May 12th.

Thank you,
-Yogi

From: IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 21, 2021 11:25 AM
To: Charlene Land <csland@garlic.com>
Cc: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>; Hema Jhamb <hemajhamb@gmail.com>; IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>
Subject: Re: Response to comments

Dear Yogi and Hema,

Thank you for the response, for your willingness to communicate, and for the proposal of changes.

First off, Charlene apologizes for her behavior the day she spoke to you in August. This has been very emotional for us and we are sure it is also emotional for you. She had more details on her apology in our first draft, but I removed it. I believe she has flogged herself enough over that day.

Second, I would like to address a few items from your recent email.

1. Neither Charlene nor myself communicated with Joe Feng before this email being sent. His words are his own.
2. My March text was not our first time prioritizing our concerns. I listed our priorities in the December note in the first line of paragraph 3. The March text is a clarification of our priorities after the storyboards have gone up.
3. I want to get out of the 'house too big discussion.' We understand and respect your family's need for space. Our concern is that the size of the house on this small lot in the center of the neighborhood that pushes city setbacks on all sides. We believe the changes have an impact on not only the families around you (including us), but also the long-term feel of the neighborhood. As I mentioned in my text, this would not be an issue if we had bigger lot sizes.
4. I was quite offended at your accusation that we have been anything less than truthful. I/we want to avoid a blaming and defensive argument, so we will continue to try to work with you in good faith and will ignore accusations and attribute them to the emotions we are all working through.

Third, regarding the proposals, the foremost concern we have today is the roof height and how it impedes our sky view. The responses below reflect that.

- Wall height - we appreciate the 1' reduction since it reduces the roof height.
- Lower windows - we appreciate your reducing your windows, but the fence and our top-down/bottom-up blinds mitigate our privacy concerns if you would like to raise the windows back up.
- Fence - I am glad we can make this change and share the cost for this.
- Roof height - we appreciate the proposal. However, it will still have a significant impact on the sky view from our South-facing windows. For example, at the desk I am typing this letter at right now, my sky view will be at best a sliver after proposed changes.

Regarding saying nothing at the hearing - unfortunately, it is too late for us to agree to that. Without seeing drawing and story board changes submitted to the city, we feel it is unwise for us to go without expressing our concerns.

Thank you again for the communication. I wish it had not been so difficult for all of us and I hope this is all part of learning to work together going forward.

Ian

On Mar 15, 2021, at 9:56 PM, Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com> wrote:
Charlene / Ian:

This is in response to the text you sent us on March 14th, 2021, in which you stated your concerns about our remodel project. First of all, we would like you to know that we are extremely disappointed at how you have focused on only your concerns as neighbors, completely ignoring or caring for our needs as property owners. It is also surprising that you expect empathy and consideration from us after sending such a strongly worded letter to the city. We also don't

understand why you are assuming that both of you are the only people distressed by this situation.

We believe that this is the first time you have listed and prioritized your concerns, and earlier you were not interested in working together to resolve the differences regarding the project. We remember how Charlene invited us to see your new home on a Sunday morning while Ian was away. After a quick tour of the house, Charlene surprised us by listing concerns about our project in front of our children. The ideal way to handle your concerns would have been to give us a heads-up and then the four of us could have gotten together to discuss the project. We tried to address Charlene's concerns by sending the latest plans and providing our view on the privacy and height concerns. We never got any response from your side, and we believe that you started communicating with Joe Feng, our neighbor on the other side. Joe Feng had sent some initial concerns to the city, but later he started adding other concerns about sunlight / sky-view, which we believe reflected your thinking. We still didn't get any prioritized list of concerns from you and on Jan 05th, 2021, we received an email from the city planner on the letter dated Dec 22nd, 2020, in which you sent all your concerns to the city. You later dropped a printed copy of the same letter, along with a handwritten note in our mailbox the same day. It seems like you were not aware that the city forwards all concerns to the homeowner and you were hoping to achieve your objectives behind our back. If you were truthful, then you should have sent that letter to us first, checking with us to see if we can reach a resolution.

Anyhow, we will attempt to address the concerns you have raised and propose a resolution that seems fair to both sides:

1. First of all, we don't believe that our house is too big. We have a bigger family, and our needs are different compared to yours. You have a single child, who is away studying in Utah so 1,647 square-foot of living space is sufficient for you. However, we have two grown-up children, who intend to stay at home as long as possible. Nitya still has three more years of high school and is planning to attend college in the Bay Area. Dhruv is planning to attend a graduate program at Stanford in the fall of 2021 and intends to live at home through the graduate program and even while working at a job. Children are increasingly living with their parents well into adulthood to mitigate the problem of high rents in the Bay Area. This is why we require 2,123 square feet of living space for our new home. We never told you how much to build when you remodeled your home, and you built what you felt was appropriate for your family's size and needs. In the same way, we would like to build what is appropriate for our family within the limits allowed by the city.
2. We also don't agree that if everyone builds to the maximum allowed setback, then there would be wall-to-wall houses. There will still be a 16' gap between adjacent homes (8' setback for each property), and a 30' gap between back-to-back homes (15' setback for each property). The land utilization will still be at 40%, and 60% of the land in each parcel will be left for open space. We are not willing to increase the setback to more than 8' towards your home, as other neighbors may also start asking for additional setback, and then we will have no space to build our home. We also feel that the bay window style at

the corner of our home is essential to the selected architecture style. We fail to see how a view of people walking or driving on the street is more important than our need for living space on land that we own. We also believe that you have a clear view of the street from all your front windows, and if you would like, we can provide a photo highlighting that.

3. In regard to the privacy concerns, we are willing to share the cost of increasing the height of the fence to the maximum limit allowed by city. We have only kept windows on both sides when there was no other choice. When placing windows towards the backyard or the street were possible, we avoided placing side windows. The floor level of the new home also remains the same.
4. We believe that the proposed home will not block sunlight or view of the sky. The roof of the proposed home increases gradually and keeping in mind the trajectory of the sun, it will be always be visible over the proposed home. We also don't believe that you would have insufficient light in the rooms of your house due to the proposed home. Our current home has two bedrooms with south-west facing windows and one bedroom with north-west facing windows, and we get ample light. The bedrooms in the new home are either north facing or south-west facing, and we hope to get ample light.

After reviewing your prioritized list of items, we are willing to make the following changes to the plan:

1. Reduce the height of all exterior walls from 10' down to 9'.
2. Lower all windows so that the top of the window is at 7'.
3. Share the cost to increase the height of the fence to 7', which is allowed by the city. We are willing to share the cost and effort to obtain a permit to increase the height more than 7', if that is what you desire.
4. Decrease the height of the home by an additional 2'-3', either by reducing the slope of the roof, or by changing the roof design.

The above changes will reduce the overall height of the proposed home to the 17'-18' range, which is in line with other homes in neighborhood—the home across the street (143 Arroyo Grande Way) has a height of 16'-17' and Jim and Lynne's home (115 La Cienega) stands around 15'-16'. These changes will address your concerns regarding the sunlight and privacy. If you agree to these changes, then we are willing to make them even if the city doesn't ask us to do so. However, we would require assurance that you will not request any other changes and not raise any other concerns to the city, either in writing or at the planning commission review.

We are unable to reduce the living area as we require space for a bigger family and we also have family visiting us from India for extended periods. Hema's mother intends to visit and stay with us once the Covid situation improves.

The fact is that we no longer live in 1958, the period when these homes were built. With the increased cost of housing, people are building to maximize the living area. Note that even with a

living area of 2,123 square-feet, we are only utilizing 33% of the available land. We believe that we have proposed a fair and just resolution to your concerns regarding the project. If you don't agree to this proposal, then let us both put our case in front of the planning commission and let them make a decision.

Thank you,
Hema and Yogi

From: IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 17, 2021 12:18 PM
To: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>
Cc: Charlene Land <csland@garlic.com>; Hema Jhamb <hemajhamb@gmail.com>; IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>; smullin@losgatosca.gov
Subject: Re: Update Plan - 140 Arroyo Grande Way

Yogi,

Thank you for sending the elevation drawings for our review. We spent some time this morning to clarify our concerns after looking at the modified drawings. We still have the following primary concerns which we have mentioned previously:

- * The 15' 11.5" roof peak will still have a significant impact on our sky view
- * The 8' 4" window peaks will be 1' 4" above a 7' fence and will impact our privacy
- * The 10'4" eaves impact the roof height and the bulk from our south-facing windows

Given those concerns, we would propose the following targets, priorities and requests:

Overarching Targets

Sky View and Natural Light - From 124 Arroyo Grande Way - Target 50% or more of *existing* sky view standing inside at 30" from interior wall, 6' tall person (please note this is substantial reduction) from all five windows

Privacy - No windows over the top of the fence, 7' fence (6' solid +1' lattice)

Must-have

Lower the roof peak(s) to a maximum of 14' from finish grade (not floor level). This is 2' above Immediate Neighborhood Interior Parcels (*INIP) typical and 6" above 124 Arroyo Grande Way's approximately 7' long Clerestory Peak.

Privacy – top of windows should be lower than top of 7' fence.

Lower the eaves to a maximum of 9'4" above finish grade level (INIP typical is 8'6")

All changes in drawings submitted to the city and posted on the website

Changes should be reflected in the storyboards before the May 12th Planning Commission hearing

Strongly Suggest and Other Items

We believe our privacy will be better if you replace the turret and conical roof section with a bay window and hip roof

Lessening the side expansion could reduce the bulk and the overall height

We are concerned that a 2nd-level or additional rooms will be added after initial permits obtained. We would like reassurances that you will follow the permit process for future changes.

*INIP – Immediate Neighborhood Interior Parcel as defined by page 11 of the Los Gatos Residential Guidelines.

Please note that we have used all dimensions from finished grade and not floor level, unless stated differently. Also, I copied Sean to make sure it is clear to the city that we are communicating with you in response to statements you made at the hearing that suggested otherwise.

Thank you,

Ian and Charlene

On April 12, 2021 at 6:30 PM, Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com> wrote:
Charlene / Ian:

Please find attached the revised elevations based on the planning commission review feedback. We have lowered the exterior walls from 10' to 9'. The roof design and pitch has also been updated to decrease the overall height of the proposed home by 6'. We believe that these changes should address your sky-view and privacy concerns. Let us know if you have any other comments or suggestions.

Thank you,
Hema and Yogi

From: Charlene Land <csland@garlic.com>
Sent: Monday, May 3, 2021 10:41 AM
To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Cc: Ian Land <iland_7@yahoo.com>; joe_feng@yahoo.com; ramya.rasipuram@gmail.com; chakkamuralimohan@gmail.com; ANNA HELLMER <ahellmer@comcast.net>
Subject: Adjacent Neighbors' Response to 140 Arroyo Grande project

Hello Sean,

This is a follow-up to the planning session meeting regarding the proposed new construction for 140 Arroyo Grande Way. As you know, in that meeting the planning commission suggested that the Jhambbs and their designer meet with concerned neighbors to review and address their feedback, essentially a request to work together to find some common ground.

The Lands never received an invitation to a meeting. We also did not receive a request for feedback on whether the updated design (now posted on the web and stoyboarded) mitigated our concerns.

On April 25, one full month after the planning meeting, adjacent concerned neighbors met together to discuss the project. The results of that meeting and later discussions is the PDF attached to this email.

Each concerned adjacent neighbor will be sending a copy of this same PDF to you. We are each sending it to show that it is indeed our common response to the original design and other correspondence from and experiences with the Jhambbs.

We appreciate your ongoing support of the community practice for citizens to voice their feedback on proposed new construction in the Town.

Thank you,

Charlene and Ian Land

From: ANNA HELLMER <ahellmer@comcast.net>

Sent: Monday, May 3, 2021 11:35 AM

To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>

Cc: Planning <Planning@losgatosca.gov>; Planning Comment <PlanningComment@losgatosca.gov>;

Clerk <Clerk@losgatosca.gov>; Shelley Neis <sneis@losgatosca.gov>; csland@garlic.com;

iland_7@yahoo.com; joe_feng@yahoo.com; ramya.rasipuram@gmail.com;

chakkamuralimohan@gmail.com

Subject: Adjacent Neighbors Response 140 Arroyo Grande Way Project

Dear Mr. Mullin and Planning Commission et al,

My husband Mark and I are part of the concerned neighbors adjacent to 140 Arroyo Grande, and this communication is to forward a joint letter regarding our collective concerns from us and the adjacent neighbors.

Mark and I received a letter from Mr. Jhamb, delivered in person, on 4/20/2021. It was not opened by us until 4/22 (Friday) because I was sick and Mark was on a business trip and did not return home until the evening of 4/22. We opened Mr. Jhamb's communication with the full expectation that there would be an offering of a few dates for the Jhamb's to meet with us concerned neighbors adjacent to them. There was nothing of the sort in the letter. Instead, we were told the proposed height of the roof would be reduced and the story poles would be adjusted. There was no date given for when the poles would be adjusted, so we had to just keep looking every day. Honestly, it was off-putting to not even see the Jhamb's mention having a round-table discussion with the adjacent concerned neighbors. We did not contact the Jhamb's, thinking that they might still reach out to us for a gathering date and time to discuss our collective concerns. Then we learned that the Jhamb's plans were revised again and sent to the Planning Commission with a statement from the Jhamb's that they were working diligently with the neighbors.

In our opinion, if the Jhamb's were as diligent with us concerned adjacent neighbors as they have been in seeking out other neighbors who appear to agree with them, then we would not be in this quagmire.

We are sympathetic to the need and desire to improve one's living space. We just ask that it be done in a manner that is mindful to the immediate neighbors and the neighborhood in general in size and style.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Anna & Mark Hellmer
147 Las Astas Drive

From: Murali Mohan Chakka <chakkamuralimohan@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 4, 2021 11:43 AM
To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Cc: Ian Land <iland_7@yahoo.com>; joe_feng@yahoo.com; ramya.rasipuram@gmail.com; chakkamuralimohan@gmail.com; ANNA HELLMER <ahellmer@comcast.net>
Subject: Adjacent Neighbors' Response to 140 Arroyo Grande project

Dear Sean,

Me and my wife Ramya are the neighbors right behind 140 Arroyo Grande Project.

Attached document combinedly created by all adjacent neighbors' of 140 Arroyo Grande project, clearly captures our concerns too.

We kindly request your support in getting these concerns resolved.

Thanks & Regards,
Murali & Ramya.

From: Jihua Feng <joe_feng@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 4, 2021 1:24 PM
To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Re: My Neighbor's Remodel

Sean,

Attached PDF file is a joint letter by four adjacent neighbors of 140 Arroyo. It expresses the common concerns on their plan.

Thanks.

Joe

Attachment to the Land and Hellmer emails received May 3, 2021, and the Chakka and Feng emails received May 4, 2021 above:

May 2, 2021

The Adjacent Neighbors of 140 Arroyo Grande Way:

Anna and Mark Hellmer
Ramya and Murali Rasipuram
Charlene and Ian Land
Lynn and Joe Feng

Sean Mullin and the Planning Commission, City of Los Gatos:

We are writing to you regarding the remodeling plans for 140 Arroyo Grande Way, owned by Hema and Yogesh Jhamb. The neighbor team listed above met last Sunday, April 25th, to discuss the situation and how negotiations with the Jhambes had been going. As discussed at the March hearing, all neighbors listed above are adjacent properties to the Jhambes. We believe as adjacent neighbors, our comments should carry more weight than those who are not adjacent. What the adjacent neighbor group found at the Sunday meeting was that we are all doing our best to work together and accommodate the Jhambes requested changes while representing our own concerns. We also found we had a number of common interests that we feel have been disregarded that we would like to communicate to you, Sean, and the Planning Commission. These key items of common concern are:

- The Planning Commission's request to meet and *work together*.
- Sky views, eaves, and roof height
- Privacy and window/floor height
- Home size, bulk, mass, scale, and style
- Construction concerns
- Inaccurate, mis-leading drawings

Working Together

At the Sunday meeting we realized the Jhambes have not complied with the request by the City made at the hearing in March. Anna Hellmer recently reviewed this video and highlighted that the City asked the Jhambes to sit down (outdoors due to Covid) with the neighbors and the Jhambes architect present to discuss alternatives. That has not happened. Instead, Yogesh and Hema have been communicating with us individually, they have often represented their uncompromising design decisions as required by the City, or their designer, and their responses often diminished or disrespected our concerns. Each of us were given the impression by the Jhambes that we were the only ones with an issue. That divide and conquer behavior is why we decided to write this joint letter. Additionally, each neighbor has stories regarding how the Jhambes behavior has been dividing and disrespectful. We find their distributive methods of negotiation to be difficult to work with, exhausting, and stressful.

The neighbor group does not feel part of the change process to search for creative solutions that meet the interests and needs of all concerned. Several of us discussed the feeling of being managed. We also feel that the Jhambes have misrepresented our efforts, accommodations, and willingness to work together at the hearing and after the hearing in emails. At times, these negotiations seem combative and hostile.

One neighbor seems to have had a retaliatory attack against them – the Feng’s gardener was reported for having a gas blower. When Joe asked the gardener to not use the gas blower again, the gardener told him that the ‘neighbor of 140 took the pictures.’ The Fengs have had this gardener for years, yet the issue was only reported in March 2021.

Sky views, eaves, and roof height

All neighbors have concerns about sky views and roof height. While the recent change to a peak of 3 feet 11-1/2 inches above the approximately 12 foot peak of Immediate Neighborhood Interior Parcels is an improvement over the previous 9 foot 11-1/2 inch proposed increase, it still has a significant impact for all of our sky views.

We also have concerns about the proposed 10 foot 4 inch eave height that adds to the bulk and imposing feel of the home. Immediate neighborhood interior parcels have approximately 8 foot height eaves and all neighbors measured their eave height between 8 and 8.5 feet from finished grade. As you know, the residential guidelines have many clauses regarding the bulk, mass, and scale of the home, including *eaves which are not substantially larger than nearby homes*.

Privacy

All neighbors have significant concerns about privacy. There are many more and larger windows in the proposed design in comparison to their existing home. Other than bathroom windows, the majority of the proposed windows facing neighbors’ homes are 5 feet tall with tops at 8-foot 4 inches above finished grade. These are quite large in comparison to the neighboring homes and are 1 foot higher than surrounding immediate neighborhood interior parcel home window height and 2+ feet higher than a standard fence that is 6 feet tall. This privacy concern is exacerbated with a floor height 1 foot above adjacent homes on Arroyo Grande. Additionally, these windows often have significant overlap with existing windows. There are numerous residential guidelines that clearly advise against windows that are larger and taller as well as windows should be placed to minimize views into living spaces and yard spaces. If you have not lived in a home where the neighbors could stare into your own, it is very uncomfortable. This is an area where we feel *particularly disregarded* about our concerns.

Home size, bulk, mass, scale, and style

All neighbors feel that the proposed home at 140 Arroyo Grande Way is an obtrusive structure. One neighbor even stated that the house was “massive” at the hearing and two others agreed that their concern is that their view will be “a wall of house”. The lower proposed roof height does improve this, but the width expansion, the eave height, and the proposed roof (taller than existing) still create an intrusive feel that will be difficult to live with *daily*. All adjacent neighbors believe the adjusted storyboards still show the eave height contributes significantly to the bulky feel of the house.

Beyond the proposed bulk, Joe Feng and the Lands have concerns about the 5 foot tall windows in the garage. These are the same windows that are in the living spaces and we have a hard time understanding why anyone wants two 5 foot tall windows in their garage unless they plan to build out that area as a living space at a later date. If they do build out that area as a living space after permits are achieved for the present proposed changes that would result in a home with $2,123 + 400 = 2,523$ square feet of living space. This would result in a floor area ratio of $2,523/6,200$ of 39%, 6% more than their proposed 33% and 17% more than the neighborhood average of 22% (reference Land hearing

presentation for data). This would be the largest FAR in the neighborhood, even more than existing two story homes. We would like written assurances that the Jhamb's will not build out their garage as a living space from the Jhamb's and the City to monitor and enforce the Guidelines during and after the build.

Construction Concerns

Most neighbors have expressed a concern about dealing with the noise and dust of the destruction of an old home and the complete build of a new home. We imagine the noise from jackhammering and removing a full foundation as well as the complete build of a new structure will be substantial. Even more concerning, one neighbor has severe asthma and the length of a new home construction could significantly impact that person's health throughout the build project.

Inaccurate, misleading drawings on the web, at the hearing, and in the April note

Joe Feng, Ian Land and Charlene Land all have concerns that our homes are *repeatedly mis-represented* on proposed plans and related communications. *The inaccurate data is so extensive that we feel the hearing should be delayed until the drawings are changed. We do not believe good decisions can be made without accurate data. We would also like the City or an objective 3rd party to verify the drawing dimensions, the figure scale, and the storyboards.*

The following is **not** a complete list of all items identified as inaccurate and/or misleading. First, the plans submitted for the hearing show Joe Feng's peak roof height at about 14 feet 6 inches. Joe measured this to be 12 feet. Additionally, the scale for the proposed Jhamb home is not proportional to the Feng or the Land homes regarding roof height misrepresenting the size and scale of the homes adjacent to 140 Arroyo Grande Way.

Revised plans were submitted on April 26. These plans still show Joe Feng's roof peak at 14 feet 6-1/2 inches and they now show the Lands pre-remodel roof peak at 14 feet 8 inches (upper figure drawing A3.3). The Land's remodel drawings show this roof peak is 11 feet 11 inches and Ian recently measured the peak at the back of the home at 12 feet 3 inches. Even more confounding about these inaccuracies is that the Lands have pointed out discrepancies in their presentation at the March hearing and provided the Jhamb's a copy of their drawings in the middle of 2020. Beyond the inaccurately shown dimensions, the scale of the homes at the bottom of drawing A3.3 shows the Jhamb's 15 foot 11-1/2 inch home at a similar height or less than the Land's clerestory peak (drawings have it at 13 feet 6 inches) and slightly more than the Feng's 12 foot peak (it is nearly 4 feet higher). Additionally, it shows the houses with similar floor heights, yet the floor levels of all of our homes is 4 inches above finished grade (garage level). This is 1 foot lower than the proposed elevated floor at the Jhamb's house.

A note was sent to the City by the Jhamb's on April 30th. That note continues the inaccurate dimensions and scale of neighboring homes as described above. It also shows the Land home as equal distance from the fence – that is not true as the proposed home is nearly 8 feet closer to the fence. It uses pictures of *immediate neighborhood corner parcels* as comparisons for roof height. The LG Residential guidelines explain that the Jhamb's must compare the proposed changes to *immediate neighborhood interior parcels*. This letter quotes the Jhamb's have worked with neighbors that did not speak at the hearing, are not adjacent, and, in one case, the person does not own the home. It addresses privacy in a strange way showing a person standing at finished grade. The privacy concern is from a raised floor looking through

high windows, not from finished grade outside. Finally, it quotes the Lands out of context in a public forum without their permission.

We would like to ask the City to manage this information, especially verifying permission to post as well as remove mis-leading and/or false information. We would also like to make sure the Planning Commission compares the proposed home to the Los Gatos Residential guidelines. Finally, the Planning Commission should de-prioritize the comparisons or comments from homeowners or temporary residents who are not adjacent and/or are not in immediate neighborhood interior parcels. This group believes neighbors who are adjacent are more significantly impacted than distant neighbors.

We ask that the City require accurate drawings and take into consideration that all mistakes seem to be in favor of the Jhams proposal.

Conclusion, Requests, and Proposals

In summary, the adjacent neighbor group still has significant concerns as described above. The Planning Commission recommended process was not followed, the house still exceeds scale guidelines, it still impacts sky view and privacy, and neighbors have been mis-represented and have privacy concerns. Additionally, many neighbor requests have been disregarded as if they go against design guidelines or building codes, when they are actually design decisions made by the Jhams.

We ask to delay the May 12 hearing due to:

- The inaccurate data is so extensive that we feel the hearing should be delayed until the drawings are changed. We do not believe good decisions can be made without accurate data. We would also like the City or an objective 3rd party to verify the drawing dimensions and the storyboards.
- Lack of following the request by the city to have an integrative process to discuss interests and needs with the architect present to find solutions for the issues for all concerned parties. We also request the City provide or require an objective arbitrator for joint discussion(s) who can work to find creative solutions that support all parties

If the Commission decides to continue forward, a common solution all adjacent neighbors believe would significantly help is aligning the proposed floor height with neighboring homes. Specifically, we are requesting a floor height of 4 inches above finish grade, matching adjacent properties and reducing proposed window, eave, and roof height one foot. This would help three key concerns:

- Sky views, eaves, and roof height
- Privacy and window/floor height
- Home size, bulk, mass, and scale

This mitigation would make the changes more tolerable to the adjacent neighbors every day. Sean already verified the proposed floor height is a design decision, not required by building codes. A common floor height is also recommended by the Guidelines to be aligned with neighboring homes.

Thank you for your diligent work on this project as well as your time and consideration.

The Adjacent Neighbors of 140 Arroyo Grande Way

From: Charlene Land <csland@garlic.com>
Sent: Monday, May 3, 2021 9:43 PM
To: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>
Cc: IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>; Hema Jhamb <hemajhamb@gmail.com>; Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Re: Update Plan - 140 Arroyo Grande Way

Hello Yogi and Hema,

Attached is our response to the below email.

Sincerely,
Charlene and Ian

On Apr 25, 2021, at 11:01 AM, Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com> wrote:

Charlene / Ian:

We have reviewed the document attached to your email and our response is given below. We have also spent many hours trying to address your concerns by working with the architect and communicating with you. In addition to that, we are also in correspondence with the other neighbors, with the city for plan review and approval, with the story pole contractor and surveyor to coordinate the story pole adjustments and certification. We have already expressed our requirements for living space and certain architectural elements in our new home. Moving forward, we would like to focus our communication on just your sky-view and privacy concerns as this is both mentally and physically exhausting for us.

1. It doesn't seem to us that you have acquiesced to our expansion as you keep asking for more setback towards your home. As we stated, we are providing a setback of 8'-3", which is 3" more than what is required by the city.
2. The town's consultant architect had initially reported an increase of 9' in height for the new home. Since we have made a 6' reduction in height, the new home will be 3' taller than the current home, and not 4' as you stated. As depicted in the side elevation, 90% or more of the roof is at or below the 14' height that you have asked. It is unfortunate that you are not willing to compromise with only a very small portion of the roof being above 14'.
3. We also want to point out that a 100% increase of a 1,150 s.f. home is 2,300 s.f., not 2,123 s.f. Therefore, we don't have a 100% square footage increase as you stated, and we are disappointed at the way you continue to exaggerate your claims and concerns.
4. As we previously stated in our email, there is only 1 bedroom window on the side elevation towards your home. This is the same as the existing bedroom window that we currently have. The remaining two windows in the new home are bathroom windows that would have no visibility. We can mitigate this issue by having a screening tree or other landscape option.
5. As far as privacy is concerned, we have heard two different contradictory statements from you. We fail to understand the logic of conveniently choosing to supersede one over another. Again, we are talking about a single bedroom window, and we can mitigate this issue by having a screening tree or other landscape option. We have already reduced the top of the windows by 1'.

6. We have also explained that all new homes have either 9' or 10' exterior walls, which results in 10'-4" or 11'-4" roof eaves. We have already lowered the roof eaves from 11'-4" to 10'-4" and you are not willing to compromise.
7. We have already expressed our desire to keep certain architectural elements in our new home, which have been approved by the town's consultant architect. Therefore, we wish to retain the bay window structure with the conical roof.
8. We are repeating ourselves that all changes for additions and expansions will be done following the city's permit process.
9. As far as the recommendations on reducing the height are concerned:
 - a. We already have coffered ceilings, which raise the ceiling height to 10' inside the house. As we stated earlier, all new homes (even in Los Gatos), are being built with 9' or 10' exterior walls.
 - b. The floor level of 1'-4" is to provide for crawl space, which is required by the building code for all new homes. This guideline may not have been there in the 1950s when these homes were originally built.
 - c. The roof pitch of 4"-12" has been selected to maintain the appropriate house-to-roof proportion. As we stated before, lowering the roof any further impacts this ratio and increases the prominence of the garage.

We understand that the city wants us to work together; however, this entails accommodations on both sides. If we have decreased the height of the new home by 6', then you should be willing to accept an increase of 3' from the existing home on only a small portion of the roof. The same way, lowering the exterior walls and windows from the proposed 2' increase to 1' is a reasonable compromise for both sides.

Thank you,
Hema and Yogi

Attachment to the May 3, 2021 Land email above:

Yogi,

While our interests are outlined in previous emails, the note below is replying to your last email regarding accommodations, detrimental character remarks, and a few specifics in the line items.

We want to clarify our accommodations offered from our side:

- **Up to 50% of our existing sky view from five windows** due to your wider home and higher roof. This is an accommodation as we would prefer to keep the present sky view.
- Reducing our priority for you **to move your side wall almost eight feet closer to ours**. This is a **major accommodation**. A key reason why we chose this home was the 32' spacing opposite the garage side. This impacts view, sky view, privacy, and our solitude in the Japanese-style garden adjacent to your home. We prefer the wall moves at most 4 feet closer.
- Discontinuing discussion of your proposal to have **the largest FAR** in the immediate neighborhood and among 30 nearby homes. **The design's FAR is 33%, the average FAR is 22%**. Your design also is at or near setbacks on every side. Our concerns remain about the precedence this sets. We have recognized your family's desire for more space.
- **Raising the fence to 7'** so you can have higher windows while maintaining privacy. We have offered to split the cost of this fence.
- Limiting discussion regarding the design's well-beyond-neighborhood norms for **bulk, mass, and scale**, including oversized elements.

We offered all of the above without seeing our concerns addressed. We are actually worried that we have provided too many accommodations and may no longer feel comfortable in our home. Charlene continues to lose sleep worrying about your proposed home's detrimental effects on our life, her gardening, and the neighborhood character.

The City asked you to work with the neighbors to address our concerns. We have yet to see design changes that meet our overarching concerns of 50% or more of sky view and designed-in privacy even with the many accommodations we are offering. You can choose to meet key requests today and still have an excellent, valuable, brand-new house in a great neighborhood and town.

We find your accusations of lying and exaggerating to be offensive and distracting. We strive to work with integrity and honesty. We are accurate given available data and we use standard rules of rounding and significant digits. We feel you are attacking our character rather than addressing our concerns. In response to specific accusatory items:

- Your 15 feet 11 ½ inch roof is 4 feet ½ inch taller than what was shown on the 11'11" peak from finished grade on the existing elevations of our design drawings (124 Arroyo Grande Way | drawing A1.2 | you have a copy sent as an act of kindness last summer). Joe Feng's roofline also measures 12' at peak and Ian measured at 12'3" peak at the back of our home this week. Thus, an estimate of 4 feet is accurate. I am not sure where you get your 3' number.
- Your accusation that I said "100%" misquotes my "nearly 100%". I wrote my last email without the exact numbers at hand, so I rounded. With your provided data: 2123/1150 is an 85% increase in floor size. Yes, it is not 100%, but 85% is very significant.

We respond to a few items below in **BLUE**.

Regards,
Ian and Charlene

From: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>
Date: 4/25/2021
To: IAN LAND <iland8@icloud.com>
Cc: Charlene Land <csland@garlic.com>, Hema Jhamb <hemajhamb@gmail.com>, "smullin@losgatosca.gov" <smullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Re: Update Plan - 140 Arroyo Grande Way

Charlene / Ian:

We have reviewed the document attached to your email and our response is given below. We have also spent many hours trying to address your concerns by working with the architect and communicating with you. In addition to that, we are also in correspondence with the other neighbors, with the city for plan review and approval, with the story pole contractor and surveyor to coordinate the story pole adjustments and certification. We have already expressed our requirements for living space and certain architectural elements in our new home. Moving forward, we would like to focus our communication on just your sky-view and privacy concerns as this is both mentally and physically exhausting for us.

1. It doesn't seem to us that you have acquiesced to our expansion as you keep asking for more setback towards your home. As we stated, we are providing a setback of 8'-3", which is 3" more than what is required by the city.

Please see partial list of accommodations above.

2. The town's consultant architect had initially reported an increase of 9' in height for the new home. Since we have made a 6' reduction in height, the new home will be 3' taller than the current home, and not 4' as you stated. As depicted in the side elevation, 90% or more of the roof is at or below the 14' height that you have asked. It is unfortunate that you are not willing to compromise with only a very small portion of the roof being above 14'.

Our overarching concern is to keep at least 50% of existing sky view, not a roof height of 14 feet. The 50% of sky view request has not been achieved.

3. We also want to point out that a 100% increase of a 1,150 s.f. home is 2,300 s.f., not 2,123 s.f. Therefore, we don't have a 100% square footage increase as you stated, and we are disappointed at the way you continue to exaggerate your claims and concerns.

Please see the response above.

4. As we previously stated in our email, there is only 1 bedroom window on the side elevation towards your home. This is the same as the existing bedroom window that we currently have. The remaining two windows in the new home are bathroom windows that would have no visibility. We can mitigate this issue by having a screening tree or other landscape option.

There are three 5' tall windows facing our home and two 3' tall windows facing our home. These are all large windows. We think the size and height of the window is important and the room type is irrelevant.

5. As far as privacy is concerned, we have heard two different contradictory statements from you. We fail to understand the logic of conveniently choosing to supersede one over another. Again, we are talking about a single bedroom window, and we can mitigate this issue by having a screening tree or other landscape option. We have already reduced the top of the windows by 1’.

It's unfortunate you have waited so long to ask for clarification. Our concerns have been consistent. Details from our efforts to compromise and find joint solutions may seem inconsistent.

Privacy was a high priority in our home purchase 22 years ago and it remains so today. We have lived in multiple situations with low privacy. Last year, we had exactly the situation you are proposing with our neighbors having a raised floor and looking into our rental windows. It was very uncomfortable.

6. We have also explained that all new homes have either 9’ or 10’ exterior walls, which results in 10’-4” or 11’-4” roof eaves. We have already lowered the roof eaves from 11’-4” to 10’-4” and you are not willing to compromise.

You are proposing to raise the roof eaves from approximately 8’ to 10’4”. We offered 9’4” for eaves. This offer *is* a compromise. We would prefer you maintain INIP typical 8’. These features are a design choices you are making.

7. We have already expressed our desire to keep certain architectural elements in our new home, which have been approved by the town’s consultant architect. Therefore, we wish to retain the bay window structure with the conical roof.

A large and tall turret window directly faces our property and our current windows as is clearly seen in the right-side elevation, so this element selection is a privacy concern for us.

8. We are repeating ourselves that all changes for additions and expansions will be done following the city’s permit process.

We are concerned about *modifications* as well as additions and expansions, such as build out of the garage that will be at or beyond FAR limits.

9. As far as the recommendations on reducing the height are concerned:
 - a. We already have coffered ceilings, which raise the ceiling height to 10’ inside the house. As we stated earlier, all new homes (even in Los Gatos), are being built with 9’ or 10’ exterior walls.

The experts we asked do not agree that “*all* new homes have 9’ or 10’ exterior walls”. This is a design decision. Vaulting and coffers are both design features to raise ceilings without eave or roof impact.

- b. The floor level of 1’-4” is to provide for crawl space, which is required by the building code for all new homes. This guideline may not have been there in the 1950s when these homes were originally built.

New homes can be built on slab foundations. Per the City and our architect, the raised floor is a design decision.

- a. The roof pitch of 4"-12" has been selected to maintain the appropriate house-to-roof proportion. As we stated before, lowering the roof any further impacts this ratio and increases the prominence of the garage.

The garage roof pitch and home roof pitch selections can both be reduced to match the INIP. These are design decisions.

We understand that the city wants us to work together; however, this entails accommodations on both sides. If we have decreased the height of the new home by 6', then you should be willing to accept an increase of 3' from the existing home on only a small portion of the roof. The same way, lowering the exterior walls and windows from the proposed 2' increase to 1' is a reasonable compromise for both sides.

For your reference, here are Residential Design Guideline excerpts that can guide you toward making choices that complement the existing neighborhood:

- ...change occur in a manner that is respectful of the scale, texture, and character of the community's individual neighborhoods and unique natural setting. (Introduction)
- These guidelines contain a clear statement of community expectations to assist property owners and their design professionals in meeting the needs of individual families in a manner that is sensitive to and respectful of their respective neighborhoods. (Introduction)
- Homes will respect the scale and character of their immediate neighborhoods. (1.4)
- Homes will be designed with respect for the views, privacy and solar access of their neighbors. (1.4)
- Residential development shall be similar in mass, bulk and scale to the immediate neighborhood. Consideration will be given to the existing FAR's, residential square footages and lot size in the neighborhood. (2.1)
- Avoid structures with height and bulk at front and side setback lines which are significantly greater than those of the adjacent homes. (2.3.2)
- Generally avoid towers and turrets (caption, 2.3.5)
- new houses should be planned with an awareness of the impacts which they will have on the views, sky exposure, sun access and privacy of neighbors (2.5.2)
- ...the self-restraint of residents and the mutual respect of one's neighbors has contributed to neighborhoods with a great deal of visual unity and similarity in scale (Section 3, p. 21)
- When utilizing a cellar or extended foundation wall, avoid setting the first floor height at an elevation above grade that would be significantly different than those of the adjacent houses. (3.3.2)
- Avoid eave lines and roof ridge lines that are substantially taller than the adjacent houses. (3.3.2)
- Give special attention to adapting to the height and massing of adjacent homes. (3.3.2)
- Avoid monumental scaled forms (e.g., towers or turrets) that contrast with the neighborhood architectural forms. (3.3.2)
- Avoid excessive roof form complexity (3.5.2)
- Match window types and proportions to the architectural style and to the surrounding neighborhood (3.7.2)
- Special window shapes and styles should be used sparingly (3.7.5)
- Minimize shadow impacts on adjacent properties (3.11.1)
- Minimize privacy intrusions on adjacent residences. (3.11.2)
- Windows should be placed to minimize views into the living spaces and yard spaces near neighboring homes. (3.11.2)

From: Yogesh Jhamb <jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 6, 2021 9:59 AM
To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Response Letters

Good Morning, Sean!

I have attached the following three documents:

1. 140Arroyo-Adj-Neighbor-Response.pdf: Response to the joint letter sent by our adjacent neighbors.
2. 140Arroyo-Back-Neighbor.pdf: Letter hand-delivered to our neighbors at the back with a copy of the elevations plan. This is referenced in the neighborhood response letter.
3. Jhamb-To-Land-Response-May06.pdf: Response to the email sent by Charlene and Ian Land.

Please add them to our project file for review by the planning commission.

Thank you,
-Yogi

Planning Commission,
Community Development Department,
Planning Division,
110 E. Main Street,
Los Gatos, CA 95030.

Date: May 06, 2021

RE: Response to concerns raised by adjacent neighbors

Dear Planning Commissioners:

This letter is our response to the letter sent by our adjacent neighbors on May 02, 2021. It is unfortunate that our neighbors are not satisfied by the substantial design changes that have been made to address their concerns. However, we would like to clarify our position that we have tried our best to work with them and accommodate their requirements and concerns.

We are not sure what makes our neighbors believe that comments from adjacent neighbors should carry more weight than the other immediate neighbors. It is our understanding that comments from all neighbors carry the same weight. In fact, the two neighbors behind our home (Hellmers and Rasipurams) are not even in the immediate neighborhood; however, we still worked with them to address their concerns. We feel it would be wrong to deprioritize all positive comments for our project and only highlight negative comments.

1. Working Together


We have been respectful to all our neighbors in our communication as we are empathetic towards their concerns and we have done everything we could to address them. We met with all the neighbors in our immediate neighborhood and also with the neighbors behind our home who had expressed concerns about our project. We followed the same approach while dealing with all our neighbors—we hand-delivered a letter to them with a copy of the elevations plan. We emailed the updated plans to the Lands and the Fengs, our neighbors on the side, as we had their email addresses. The letter to our neighbors provided our email and phone number for them to reach out to us for comments and concerns. Most of our neighbors came out to speak to us; however, Anna Hellmer spoke to us from the kitchen window and Ramya Rasipuram through the screen door. Both requested the letter to be put in the mailbox. We started by meeting all our neighbors individually due to COVID concerns. Our intention was to share the initial plan updates with our neighbors and have individual or group discussions with only the neighbors who had comments or concerns. The reasoning behind this approach was to consider our safety as well as the safety of our neighbors.

A copy of the letter that we gave to our neighbors at the back is attached to our project file for reference. We clearly indicated in the letter that we expect them to reach out to us if they had

any comments or concerns. Since the Hellmers and Rasipurams never stepped out to talk to us, we got the impression that they were being cautious due to COVID and we did not want to schedule additional meetings till we heard back from them. However, they never got back to us.

We also met with Joe Feng, our neighbor to the left, as he agreed to meet with us to discuss his concerns. We offered to mitigate his privacy concerns with screen trees or other landscaping options.

The Lands on our right never asked to meet and preferred to communicate via email, and we have been responding promptly to all their emails. Based on our outreach to the neighbors, the following neighbors either supported our project, expressed no concerns, or had concerns. The image below shows our new home as the “site” on the interior parcel.




- Home #1– No concern
- Home #2 – Fengs (who have raised concerns)
- Home #3 – Lands (who have raised concerns)
- Home #4 – Sent email for support
- Home #5 – Sent email for support
- Home #6 – No concern
- Home #7 – Cul-de-sac (No home)
- Home #8 – No Concern
- Home #9 - Sent email for support

2. Sky-views, Eaves and Roof Height

We have lowered the height of the home by 6’ to address the concerns about sky-view. When viewed from both the side elevations, only a small portion of the roof is above 14’. Our neighbors have provided no images to show how their sky-view is impacted.

The Hellmers who are the neighbors at the back had originally expressed sunlight concerns, but they are at a 2’ higher grade level and their concerns should be addressed with the 6’ decrease in the height of the new home. The Hellmers never got back to us after we delivered the updated plans with them.

We have used two homes in the immediate neighborhood for comparison of the height. Both these homes are 16' in height and taller than our new home. Our home is an interior parcel, and these two homes are in the immediate neighborhood even though they are corner lots. The homes in reference are #6 and #8 in the image below; there is no home at #7 as our home faces a cul-de-sac.



3. Privacy

The statement that there are many more windows in our design is incorrect. We have provided limited windows on the side elevations. The top of the windows on the back elevation aligns with the top of the fence due to the 2' difference in grade level and a 6' fence.

We have a 7' fence on one side and 6' fence on the other side. We have repeatedly offered to share the cost to increase the height of the 6' fence to 7'. Our neighbors have claimed significant overlap in the windows, but not a single image has been provided to justify the claim.

It is not possible for us to look over the fence from the floor level. The eye-level of a 6' male is 5'-7", and after adding the 1'-4" floor level, the eye-level would be 6'-11", which is still below the 7' fence. It is impossible to look up and then down from a fence that is 8' away on both sides.

4. Home Size, Bulk, Mass, Scale and Style

We have significantly decreased the mass and scale of our new home. Many of our immediate neighbors believe that our new home will be a great addition to the neighborhood and their comments have been added to our project file for reference.

As far as the garage is concerned, we have already provided a written statement to Charlene and Ian Land that we will not be doing any unpermitted construction. We have two windows in the garage to provide natural light to access the storage cabinets that we intend to have in the

garage. We also like parking our cars in the garage to avoid damage caused by elements of the weather.

5. **Construction Concerns**

We are empathetic towards the health concerns of Ramya Rasipuram, our neighbor at the back. We have attempted to assuage her concerns by noting that we will begin construction during the winter when windows are closed. We have received estimates of 8-9 months from different contractors.

6. **Inaccurate / Misleading Drawing**

The incorrect dimensions of the adjacent properties were an honest mistake made by our architect due to the lack of building plans for these homes, which were built in the 1950s. The plans have been updated with the correct dimensions and sent to the city. These plans have been inspected and verified by the town's consultant architect, who serves as an objective third-party. The story poles have also been certified by an independent surveyor and the report has been sent to the city.

Sincerely,

Hema and Yogesh Jhamb
140 Arroyo Grande Way,
Los Gatos, CA 95032.

Date: 04/20/2021

Dear Neighbor,

We are rebuilding our home at 140 Arroyo Grande Way. We are writing to you as you had expressed some concerns at the planning commission review for our project on March 24, 2021. We have updated the plans to address your concerns and a copy of the elevations plan is attached to this letter. The following updates have been made to address your concerns:

1. Sky-view / Sunlight: We have reduced the overall height of the house by 6 feet. While the new home is still 3 feet taller than the current home, we believe that it should not have any impact on your sunlight or sky-view, as your home is at a grade level that is 2 feet higher than ours.
2. Privacy: We have lowered all windows by 1 foot. The top of the window now aligns with a fence that is effectively 8 feet in height due to the 2 feet grade level difference. It is not possible for us to look over the fence standing at the floor level.
3. Health / Noise / Other Considerations: We are empathetic towards your health concerns. We plan to begin construction during the winter, when windows are generally closed, to mitigate the effect of noise and dust to a large extent. We are getting some initial construction estimates of 8-9 months, but we will keep you updated on the progress and try our best to limit all construction work to business hours on weekdays.

The story poles will be adjusted before the May 12, 2021 hearing. Please contact us via email or phone if you have any comments or suggestions, or if you would like us to email you the complete plan set.

Thank you,
Hema and Yogi
Email: jhamb.yogesh@gmail.com
Phone: 408.806.8553

Charlene and Ian:

We have attempted to address your concerns again. Our answers in red preceded with our initials (HJ/YJ). First off, we would like to clarify the accommodations offered from our side:

- We had initially offered a 3'-4' reduction in height; however, we reduced the height by 6' to be considerate of your sky-views.
- On the privacy front, we have lowered all windows by 1'. In addition to that, we had two 5' windows on the right elevation to your side and we replaced that by a single 5' window (with 2 panes). We also had 3 bathroom windows on the right elevation, which has been reduced to 2. All this has been done to address your privacy concerns.
- We also addressed your concerns about the multiple roof forms that you raised during the last review meeting. We simplified the roof forms and removed the roof dormer.
- Raising the height of the fence is an accommodation from both sides.

Yogi,

While our interests are outlined in previous emails, the note below is replying to your last email regarding accommodations, detrimental character remarks, and a few specifics in the line items.

[HJ/YJ] Please note that we have not made any detrimental character remarks. We only stated that we are disappointed that you exaggerated that we had a nearly 100% expansion, whereas it was actually 85%. In our opinion, rounding off 85 to 100 is an exaggeration.

We want to clarify our accommodations offered from our side:

- **Up to 50% of our existing sky view from five windows** due to your wider home and higher roof. This is an accommodation as we would prefer to keep the present sky view.

[HJ/YJ] We have a substantial decrease of 6' in the height of the new home to address the sky-view concerns. The height of the new roof is around 14' from grade level for a major portion of the roof. It would be great if you can provide some pictures to show the 50% reduction from existing sky-view.

- Reducing our priority for you **to move your side wall almost eight feet closer to ours**. This is a *major accommodation*. A key reason why we chose this home was the 32' spacing opposite the garage side. This impacts view, sky view, privacy, and our solitude in the Japanese-style garden adjacent to your home. We prefer the wall moves at most 4 feet closer.

[HJ/YJ] Living space is extremely important to us. Increasing the setback will reduce our living space. Please note that you will still have a little more than 24' combined space (16' + 8'-3").

- Discontinuing discussion of your proposal to have **the largest FAR** in the immediate neighborhood and among 30 nearby homes. **The design's FAR is 33%, the average FAR is 22%**. Your design also is at or near setbacks on every side. Our concerns remain about the precedence this sets. We have recognized your family's desire for more space.

[HJ/YJ] We appreciate your recognizing our family's need for more space. You mentioned this during earlier communication also, but unfortunately, we continued discussing the issue of setbacks, which reduces our living space.

- **Raising the fence to 7'** so you can have higher windows while maintaining privacy. We have offered to split the cost of this fence.

[HJ/YJ] This has already been decided and we have agreed to it.

- Limiting discussion regarding the design's well-beyond-neighborhood norms for **bulk, mass, and scale**, including oversized elements.

[HJ/YJ] This is entirely a subjective opinion. We feel that our home doesn't include oversized elements and it fits in well into the neighborhood. We are sure that you feel the same way about your home. The important thing is that an independent third-party, the town's consultant architect, feels that our home fits in the neighborhood, provided that we incorporate the architect's recommendation. We have incorporated all the recommendations provided by the town's architect.

We offered all of the above without seeing our concerns addressed. We are actually worried that we have provided too many accommodations and may no longer feel comfortable in our home. Charlene continues to lose sleep worrying about your proposed home's detrimental effects on our life, her gardening, and the neighborhood character.

[HJ/YJ] I believe that we mentioned previously that this situation is having an adverse effect on us also. Hema is not keeping good health and we are suffering too. Please also note that many neighbors in the immediate neighborhood don't share your opinion and are supportive of our project.

The City asked you to work with the neighbors to address our concerns. We have yet to see design changes that meet our overarching concerns of 50% or more of sky view and designed-in privacy even with the many accommodations we are offering. You can choose to meet key requests today and still have an excellent, valuable, brand-new house in a great neighborhood and town.

[HJ/YJ] The 50% sky-view is a metric that you decided. We would need to see photos before we discuss this any further.

We find your accusations of lying and exaggerating to be offensive and distracting. We strive to work with integrity and honesty. We are accurate given available data and we use standard rules of **rounding and significant digits**. We feel you are attacking our character rather than addressing our concerns. In response to specific accusatory items:

[HJ/YJ] Again, we would again stress the fact that we felt you were exaggerating; we never used the word "lying".

- Your 15 feet 11 ½ inch roof is 4 feet ½ inch taller than what was shown on the 11'11" peak from finished grade on the existing elevations of our design drawings (124 Arroyo Grande Way | drawing A1.2 | you have a copy sent as an act of kindness last summer). Joe Feng's roofline also measures 12' at peak and Ian measured at 12'3" peak at the back of our home this week. Thus, an estimate of 4 feet is accurate. I am not sure where you get your 3' number.

[HJ/YJ] We admit that these numbers are a honest mistake on our architect's part due to lack of building plans for homes built in the 1950s. We have corrected all the numbers and the new plans have been submitted to the city.

- Your accusation that I said "100%" misquotes my "nearly 100%". I wrote my last email without the exact numbers at hand, so I rounded. With your provided data: 2123/1150 is an 85% increase in floor size. Yes, it is not 100%, but 85% is very significant.

[HJ/YJ] We have already replied to this that we felt you were exaggerating. We believe that it is better to be accurate while making assertions.

Charlene / Ian:

We have reviewed the document attached to your email and our response is given below. We have also spent many hours trying to address your concerns by working with the architect and communicating with you. In addition to that, we are also in correspondence with the other neighbors, with the city for plan review and approval, with the story pole contractor and surveyor to coordinate the story pole adjustments and certification. We have already expressed our requirements for living space and certain architectural elements in our new home. Moving forward, we would like to focus our communication on just your sky-view and privacy concerns as this is both mentally and physically exhausting for us.

[HJ/YJ] 1. It doesn't seem to us that you have acquiesced to our expansion as you keep asking for more setback towards your home. As we stated, we are providing a setback of 8'-3", which is 3" more than what is required by the city.

[Lands] Please see partial list of accommodations above.

[HJ/YJ] We will keep the existing 8'-3" setback.

[HJ/YJ] 2. The town's consultant architect had initially reported an increase of 9' in height for the new home. Since we have made a 6' reduction in height, the new home will be 3' taller than the current home, and not 4' as you stated. As depicted in the side elevation, 90% or more of the roof is at or below the 14' height that you have asked. It is unfortunate that you are not willing to compromise with only a very small portion of the roof being above 14'.

[Lands] Our overarching concern is to keep at least 50% of existing sky view, not a roof height of 14 feet. The 50% of sky view request has not been achieved.

[HJ/YJ] Again, the 50% sky-view is a metric that you decided. We would like to see photos before we discuss this further.

[HJ/YJ] 3. We also want to point out that a 100% increase of a 1,150 s.f. home is 2,300 s.f., not 2,123 s.f. Therefore, we don't have a 100% square footage increase as you stated, and we are disappointed at the way you continue to exaggerate your claims and concerns.


[Lands] Please see the response above.

[HJ/YJ] As you can see above, we never accused you of lying.

[HJ/YJ] 4. As we previously stated in our email, there is only 1 bedroom window on the side elevation towards your home. This is the same as the existing bedroom window that we currently have. The remaining two windows in the new home are bathroom windows that would have no visibility. we can mitigate this issue by having a screening tree or other landscape option.

[Lands] There are three 5' tall windows facing our home and two 3' tall windows facing our home. These are all large windows. We think the size and height of the window is important and the room type is irrelevant.

[HJ/YJ] We have attached an image of the side elevation that show only a single 5' window. The window you are referring to is a single window with 2 panes. The turret window in the front is at a 45-degree angle and it faces the street, not your home. The two 3' windows are bathroom windows with no visibility. Again, the privacy aspect related to this one window can be mitigated by screen trees (you already have trees in your side-yard), but we can add more on our side also.



[HJ/YJ] 5. As far as privacy is concerned, we have heard two different contradictory statements from you. We fail to understand the logic of conveniently choosing to supersede one over another. Again, we are talking about a single bedroom window, and we can mitigate this issue by having a screening tree or other landscape option. We have already reduced the top of the windows by 1'.

[Lands] It's unfortunate you have waited so long to ask for clarification. Our concerns have been consistent. Details from our efforts to compromise and find joint solutions may seem inconsistent. Privacy was a high priority in our home purchase 22 years ago and it remains so today. We have lived in multiple situations with low privacy. Last year, we had exactly the situation you are proposing with our neighbors having a raised floor and looking into our rental windows. It was very uncomfortable.

[HJ/YJ] We feel that we have discussed this topic enough. But just to let you know, if the situation was reversed and we had committed to mitigating a problem at our end, we would have never raised this issue again with you. We also want to clarify that the eye-level for a 6' male is 5'-7". Even if you add 1'-4" of floor level, it adds up to 6'-11", which is lower than a 7' fence. It will be impossible for us to look over the fence and look down standing more than 8' away from the fence.

[HJ/YJ] 6. We have also explained that all new homes have either 9' or 10' exterior walls, which results in 10'-4" or 11'-4" roof eaves. We have already lowered the roof eaves from 11'-4" to 10'-4" and you are not willing to compromise.

[Lands] You are proposing to raise the roof eaves from approximately 8' to 10'-4". We offered 9'-4" for eaves. This offer is a compromise. We would prefer you maintain INIP typical 8'. These features are a design choices you are making.

[HJ/YJ] Our current roof eaves are 8'-4". If you believe that INIP typical is 8', then you are measuring to the bottom of the eave, not the top. By that logic, our current roof eave is 8' and the new home will have 10'. Again, we have followed the recommendation of the town's consultant architect in this regard.

[HJ/YJ] 7. We have already expressed our desire to keep certain architectural elements in our new home, which have been approved by the town's consultant architect. Therefore, we wish to retain the bay window structure with the conical roof.

[Lands] A large and tall turret window directly faces our property and our current windows as is clearly seen in the right-side elevation, so this element selection is a privacy concern for us.

[HJ/YJ] The turret has one window towards your side that is at a 45-degree angle. There is no way for us to look into your house from this window. Since the story poles are setup, you should feel free to stand at that section in our front-yard and try to visualize how the view would look from that window. This portion of our new home will also be closer to the sidewalk compared to the front portion of your house as you have additional setback in the front. We are willing to mitigate this concern by using suitable landscape options.

[HJ/YJ] 8. We are repeating ourselves that all changes for additions and expansions will be done following the city's permit process.

[Lands] We are concerned about *modifications* as well as additions and expansions, such as build out of the garage that will be at or beyond FAR limits.

[HJ/YJ] We don't intend to build out the garage or do any other additions or expansions. We assure you that any change will follow the city permit process. We don't know what else to say to address this concern of yours.

[[HJ/YJ]] 9. As far as the recommendations on reducing the height are concerned:

a. We already have coffered ceilings, which raise the ceiling height to 10' inside the house. As we stated earlier, all new homes (even in Los Gatos), are being built with 9' or 10' exterior walls.

[Lands] The experts we asked do not agree that "all new homes have 9' or 10' exterior walls". This is a design decision. Vaulting and coffers are both design features to raise ceilings without eave or roof impact.

[HJ/YJ] When we talk about "new" homes, we mean homes that are rebuilt, not remodeled. We have spoken to many licensed architects and contractors, and we have even toured multiple new constructions in Los Gatos and the South Bay. All newly constructed homes have either 9' or 10' exterior walls.

[HJ/YJ] b. The floor level of 1'-4" is to provide for crawl space, which is required by the building code for all new homes. This guideline may not have been there in the 1950s when these homes were originally built.

[Lands] New homes can be built on slab foundations. Per the City and our architect, the raised floor is a design decision.

[HJ/YJ] All new homes (not remodels) are choosing to have a crawl space for the installation and easy maintenance of plumbing, sewage and electrical lines. Since we intend to make a multi-generational home, we would like it to be easily maintainable.

[HJ/YJ] a. The roof pitch of 4"-12" has been selected to maintain the appropriate house-to-roof proportion. As we stated before, lowering the roof any further impacts this ratio and increases the prominence of the garage.

[Lands] The garage roof pitch and home roof pitch selections can both be reduced to match the INIP. These are design decisions.

[HJ/YJ] These design decisions have been taken to maintain a good curb appeal of the home. Homes with 8'-4" walls have 3:12 roof pitch as it maintains a good proportion between the walls and the roof. Having a 3:12 roof pitch with 10'-4" walls (9' wall + 1'-4" crawl space) makes the walls-to-roof ratio look disproportionate. Having a home with a flat roof increases the prominence of the garage, which is undesirable per the city design guidelines. This is why we used a 4:12 pitch for the roof.

[HJ/YJ] We understand that the city wants us to work together; however, this entails accommodations on both sides. If we have decreased the height of the new home by 6', then you should be willing to accept an increase of 3' from the existing home on only a small portion of the roof. The same way, lowering the exterior walls and windows from the proposed 2' increase to 1' is a reasonable compromise for both sides.

[Lands] For your reference, here are Residential Design Guideline excerpts that can guide you toward making choices that complement the existing neighborhood:

[HJ/YJ] We have reviewed these guidelines with our architect. These guidelines are subjective and the town's consulting architect assessed our design based on these guidelines and provided some recommendations. We have incorporated all his recommendations into the design.

We would also point out a guideline that may be most suitable to address the privacy concerns:

- *Landscaping may be used to mitigate privacy concerns so long as the landscaping does not deny solar access to living spaces and actively used yard areas of neighboring homes. (Page 37)*
- *Landscaping used for privacy screening purposes, should be of sufficient size and of an appropriate species to provide such privacy within a two year time frame. (Page 37)*

- ...change occur in a manner that is respectful of the scale, texture, and character of the community's individual neighborhoods and unique natural setting. (Introduction)
- These guidelines contain a clear statement of community expectations to assist property owners and their design professionals in meeting the needs of individual families in a manner that is sensitive to and respectful of their respective neighborhoods. (Introduction)
- Homes will respect the scale and character of their immediate neighborhoods. (1.4)
- Homes will be designed with respect for the views, privacy and solar access of their neighbors. (1.4)
- Residential development shall be similar in mass, bulk and scale to the immediate neighborhood. Consideration will be given to the existing FAR's, residential square footages and lot size in the neighborhood. (2.1)
- Avoid structures with height and bulk at front and side setback lines which are significantly greater than those of the adjacent homes. (2.3.2)
- Generally avoid towers and turrets (caption, 2.3.5)
- new houses should be planned with an awareness of the impacts which they will have on the views, sky exposure, sun access and privacy of neighbors (2.5.2)
- ...the self-restraint of residents and the mutual respect of one's neighbors has contributed to neighborhoods with a great deal of visual unity and similarity in scale (Section 3, p. 21)

- When utilizing a cellar or extended foundation wall, avoid setting the first floor height at an elevation above grade that would be significantly different than those of the adjacent houses. (3.3.2)
- Avoid eave lines and roof ridge lines that are substantially taller than the adjacent houses. (3.3.2)
- Give special attention to adapting to the height and massing of adjacent homes. (3.3.2)
- Avoid monumental scaled forms (e.g., towers or turrets) that contrast with the neighborhood architectural forms. (3.3.2)
- Avoid excessive roof form complexity (3.5.2)
- Match window types and proportions to the architectural style and to the surrounding neighborhood (3.7.2)
- Special window shapes and styles should be used sparingly (3.7.5)
- Minimize shadow impacts on adjacent properties (3.11.1)
- Minimize privacy intrusions on adjacent residences. (3.11.2)
- Windows should be placed to minimize views into the living spaces and yard spaces near neighboring homes. (3.11.2)

GOVERNING CODES:

- 2019 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE
- 2019 CALIFORNIA RESIDENTIAL CODE
- 2019 CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE
- 2019 CALIFORNIA GREEN BUILDING CODE
- 2019 CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE
- 2019 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE

THIS PROJECT SHALL COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING:
 CALIFORNIA FIRE (CFC) & BUILDING (CBC) CODE, 2019 EDITION, AS ADOPTED BY THE TOWN OF LOS GATOS TOWN CODE (LGTC), CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS (CCR) AND HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 2019 CALIFORNIA BUILDING STANDARDS CODE . CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS TITLE 24, PARTS 1-12, INCLUDING LOCALLY ADOPTED ENERGY ROACH CODES.

GENERAL NOTES

1. ANY DISCREPANCY DISCOVERED BETWEEN THESE PLANS AND ACTUAL FIELD CONDITIONS SHALL BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE DESIGNER PRIOR TO THE START OF ANY RELATED WORK. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND DIMENSIONS ON SITE PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
2. THE CONTRACTOR ASSUMES RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE JOB SITE CONDITIONS DURING THE COURSE OF CONSTRUCTION, INCLUDING SAFETY OF ALL PERSONS AND PROPERTY. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL DEFEND, INDEMNIFY AND HOLD THE OWNER AND THE DESIGNER HARMLESS FROM ANY LIABILITY IN CONNECTION WITH THE PERFORMANCE OF WORK ON THIS PROJECT, EXCEPT FOR LIABILITY ARISING FROM SOLE NEGLIGENCE OF THE OWNER OR DESIGNER.
3. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REVIEW ALL DETAILS & PLANS AND VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS AND FIELD CONDITIONS AND SHALL CONFIRM THAT WORK IS BUILDABLE AS SHOWN. ANY CONFLICTS OR OMISSIONS SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE DESIGNER FOR CLARIFICATION PRIOR TO THE START OF ANY RELATED WORK.
4. NO PORTION OF THE WORK REQUIRING A SHOP DRAWING OR SAMPLE SUBMISSION SHALL BE COMMENCED UNTIL THE SUBMISSION HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND ACTED UPON BY THE DESIGNER.
5. DO NOT SCALE DRAWINGS. DIMENSIONS NOT GIVEN ARE TO BE CALCULATED IN THE FIELD FROM AVAILABLE DATA ELSEWHERE IN THESE SET OF PLANS OR MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS.
6. THESE DRAWINGS ARE THE SOLE PROPERTY OF THE DESIGNER. ANY REPRODUCTION, COPYING, ALTERATION OR USE OF THESE DRAWINGS WITHOUT THE EXPRESSED WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE DESIGNER IS PROHIBITED.

DEMOLITION, BRACING AND SHORING NOTES


1. DEMOLITION WORK CONSISTS OF FURNISHING ALL MATERIAL, SUPPLIES, EQUIPMENT, TOOLS, TRANSPORTATION, AND PERFORMING ALL LABOR AND SERVICES NECESSARY FOR, REQUIRED IN CONNECTION WITH OR PROPERLY INCIDENTAL TO PERFORMING THE DEMOLITION DRILLING, SAWCUTTING, BRACING AND SHORING, FOR STRUCTURAL MEMBERS TO PREVENT THE STRUCTURE FROM BECOMING UNSAFE DURING DEMOLITION AS SHOWN ON THE ACCOMPANY DRAWINGS.
2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL TAKE THE FOLLOWING PROTECTIVE MEASURES FOR DEMOLITION OF THE STRUCTURE:
 - A. PROVIDE, ERECT AND MAINTAIN LIGHTS, BARRIERS, WEATHER PROTECTION AND OTHER ITEMS AS REQUIRED FOR PROTECTION OF WORKMEN ENGAGE IN DEMOLITION OPERATION AND ADJACENT RESIDENCE OCCUPANTS.
 - B. DO NOT CLOSE OR OBSTRUCT STREETS OR SIDEWALKS WITHOUT PROPER PERMITS
 - C. PROTECT PRIVATE PROPERTY ADJACENT TO OR ON JOBSITE, INCLUDING VENTS, UTILITY LINES, SIDEWALKS, MAIL BOXES.
 - D. PROTECT AND MAINTAIN TEMPORARY PROTECTION OF EXISTING STRUCTURE DESIGNATED TO REMAIN WHERE DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL WORK IS BEING DONE.
3. CONDUCT DEMOLITION TO MINIMIZE INTERFERENCE WITH ADJACENT STRUCTURE AND THE SURROUNDING AREAS TO REMAIN.
4. SPECIAL CARE SHALL BE EXERCISED TO PREVENT DAMAGE TO EXISTING UNDERGROUND UTILITIES WHICH ARE TO REMAIN DURING EXECUTION OF THIS WORK. ANY DAMAGE SHALL BE REPAIRED TO NEW CONDITION BY THE CONTRACTOR AT NO COST TO THE OWNER.
5. REMOVE DEMOLISHED MATERIAL FROM SITE. CLEAN UP ALL WORK RELATED TO DEMOLITION. LEAVING THE PROPERTY AND ADJACENT AREAS IN A CLEAN CONDITION.
6. THE STABILITY AND INTEGRITY OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURE DURING CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE MAINTAINED AT LEVELS GENERALLY ACCEPTABLE WITHIN THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY BY THE USE OF BRACING, SHORING AND UNDERPINNING UNTIL THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE MODIFICATIONS ARE COMPLETED. IN NO CASE SHALL THE EXISTING STRUCTURE BE ALLOWED TO BECOME UNSAFE DURING CONSTRUCTION.
7. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL TEMPORARY LOADING CONDITIONS DURING CONSTRUCTION AND SHALL DESIGN AND PROVIDE TEMPORARY BRACING AND SHORING AS REQUIRED DURING CONSTRUCTION.

FIRE DEPARTMENT NOTES:Water Supply Requirements:Potable water supplies shall be protected from contamination caused by fire protection water supplies. It is the responsibility of the applicant and any contractors and subcontractors to contact the water purveyor supplying the site of such project, and to comply with the requirements of that purveyor. Such requirements shall be incorporated into the design of any water-based fire protection systems, and/or fire suppression water supply systems or storage containers that may be physically connected in any manner to an appliance capable of causing contamination of the potable water supply of the purveyor of record. Final approval of the system(s) under consideration will not be granted by this office until compliance with the requirements of the water purveyor of record are documented by that purveyor as having been met by the applicant(s). 2019 CFC Sec. 903.3.5 and Health and Safety Code 13114.7. Address identification: New and existing buildings shall have approved address numbers, building numbers or approved building identification placed in a position that is plainly legible and visible from the street or road fronting the property. These numbers shall contrast with their background. Address numbers shall be Arabic numbers or alphabetical letters. Numbers shall be a minimum of 4 inches (101.6 mm) high with a minimum stroke width of 0.5 inch (12.7 mm). Construction Site Fire Safety: All construction sites must comply with applicable provisions of the CFC Chapter 33 and our Standard Detail and Specification SI-7. CFC Chp. 33.

PUBLIC WORKS NOTES:1. Contractor shall relocate the existing water meter outside of the Arroyo Grande Way right-of-way per Public Works Department requirements. 2. Contractor shall relocate the existing sanitary sewer cleanout or install a new sanitary sewer lateral clean-out (if one does not already exist) to a location on or within one foot of the property line per West Valley Sanitation District Standard Drawing 3, or at a location specified by the Town of Los Gatos. 3. Per Los Gatos' Underground Requirements, all new, relocated, or temporarily removed utility services, including telephone, electric power and all other communications lines shall be installed underground. 4. See Utility Plan on sheet A8.4 for more information.

YOGESH JHAMB RESIDENCE

140 Arroyo Grande Way, Los Gatos, CA 95032



SITE PLAN

1/8" = 1'-0"

SCOPE OF WORK

DEMO EXISTING ONE-STORY HOME AND BUILD A NEW ONE-STORY HOME WITH 4 BEDROOMS & 4 BATHS

PROJECT INFORMATION

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.:
 ZONING: R-1-B
 ONE-STORY WOOD-FRAMED HOUSE WITH STONE & STUCCO FINISH AND COMP. SHINGLE ROOF
 OCCUPANCY GROUP: R3 & U
 TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION: VB
 BUILDING CODES: 2019 CBC & 2019 CRC
 BUILDING HEIGHT: 23'-10.5" ABOVE GRADE
 FIRE SPRINKLER: YES
 YEAR BUILT: 1958
 FIRE SPRINKLERS WILL BE PROVIDED UNDER A DEFERRED SUBMITTAL

FLOOR AREA BREAKDOWN

LOT SIZE = 6425 SF.
 EXISTING HOME
 1ST FLOOR AREA = 1150 SF
 GARAGE = 428 SF
 NEW HOME
 1ST FLOOR AREA = 2123 SF
 GARAGE = 428 SF
 (SEE FLOOR AREA CALCULATIONS ON SHEET A4)
 FLOOR AREA RATIO CALCULATION (INCLUDING GARAGE):
 FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR) = 0.35 - (6,425-5)/25)0.20 = 0.3386
 ALLOWABLE FAR = 0.3386 x 6425 = 2176 SF
 ACTUAL FAR = 2128 SF (LIVING SPACE, EXCLUDING GARAGE)
 GARAGE FLOOR AREA RATIO CALCULATIONS:
 FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR) = 0.10 - (6,425-5)/25)0.70 = 0.09601
 ALLOWABLE FAR = 0.09601 x 6425 = 616.9 SF
 ACTUAL FAR = 428 SF
 LOT COVERAGE CALCULATIONS:
 LIVING SPACE FLOOR AREA: 2123 SF.
 GARAGE FLOOR AREA: 428 SF.
 PORCH AREA: 15 SF.
 LOT COVERAGE: (2123 + 428 + 15) / 6425 = 0.3993 OR 39.93%

PROJECT CONTACTS

OWNER
 YOGESH JHAMB
 (408) 806-8553
DESIGNER & STRUCTURAL ENGINEER
 KET LE
 793 KYLE STREET, SAN JOSE, CA 95127
 CELL : (408) 209 - 8775
 EMAIL: KETLE1@YAHOO.COM

SHEET INDEX

- A1 - SITE PLAN & PROJECT INFO
- A2 - EXISTING SITE PLAN & SITE PHOTOS
- A3.1 - EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD SITE PLAN
- A3.2 - NEW NEIGHBORHOOD SITE PLAN
- A3.3 - STREETScape FRONT ELEVATIONS
- A3.4 - FRONT ELEVATION WITH COLOR & EXTERIOR MATERIALS
- A4 - NEW 1ST FLOOR PLAN
- A5 - NEW ELEVATIONS
- A6 - NEW ROOF PLAN
- A7 - DRAINAGE PLAN
- A8 - SECTIONS
- A8.1 - EROSION CONTROL PLAN
- A8.2 - GRADING PLAN
- A8.3 - BUILD IT GREEN CHECKLIST
- A8.4 - UTILITY PLAN
- A8.5 - GROUND COVER PLAN
- S1 - SURVEY PLAN

REVISIONS	BY

KQ Design & Engineering
 793 KYLE STREET
 SAN JOSE, CA 95127
 PHONE: (408) 209 - 8775

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
 No. C57404
 Exp. 03/31
 CIVIL
 STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 793 Kyle Street
 San Jose, CA, 95127
 Tel.: 408-209-8775
 Email: kette1@yahoo.com

New home for:
YOGESH JHAMB
 140 Arroyo Grande Way
 Los Gatos, CA 95032
SITE PLAN

DRAWN
CHECKED
DATE
SCALE
JOB NO.
SHEET
A1
OF SHEETS



VIEW #4



VIEW #1




VIEW #5



VIEW #2




VIEW #3



(E) SITE PLAN

1/8" = 1'-0"



REVISIONS	BY


KQ Design & Engineering
 793 KYLE STREET
 SAN JOSE, CA 95127
 PHONE: (408) 209-8775

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
 No. C57404
 Exp. 12/31/2020
 CIVIL
 STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 793 Kyle Street
 San Jose, CA 95127
 Tel.: 408-209-8775
 Email: kette1@yahoo.com



New home for:
YOGESH JHAMB
 140 Arroyo Grande Way
 Los Gatos, CA 95032
EXISTING SITE PLAN & SITE PHOTOS

DRAWN
CHECKED
DATE
SCALE
JOB NO.
SHEET

A2
 OF SHEETS




EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD SITE PLAN
 1/8" = 1'-0"



EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD STREETSCAPE ELEVATION
 1/8" = 1'-0"


REVISIONS	BY





New home for:
YOGESH JHAMB
 140 Arroyo Grande Way
 Los Gatos, CA 95032
 (E) NEIGHBORHOOD SITE PLAN

DRAWN
CHECKED
DATE
SCALE
JOB NO.
SHEET

A3.1
 OF SHEETS



NEW NEIGHBORHOOD SITE PLAN
 1/8" = 1'-0"



NEW NEIGHBORHOOD STREETSCAPE ELEVATION
 1/8" = 1'-0"

REVISIONS	BY

KQ Design & Engineering
 793 KYLE STREET
 SAN JOSE, CA 95127
 PHONE: (408) 209-8775



793 Kyle Street
 San Jose, CA, 95127
 Tel.: 408-209-8775
 Email: kettel1@yahoo.com

New home for:
YOGESH JHAMB
 140 Arroyo Grande Way
 Los Gatos, CA 95032
NEW NEIGHBORHOOD SITE PLAN



DRAWN
CHECKED
DATE
SCALE
JOB NO.
SHEET

A3.2

OF SHEETS




EXISTING STREET VIEW
1/8" = 1'-0"



NEW STREET VIEW
1/8" = 1'-0"

REVISIONS	BY



793 Kyle Street
San Jose, CA, 95127
Tel: 408-209-8775
Email: kette1@yahoo.com

New home for:
YOGESH JHAMB
140 Arroyo Grande Way
Los Gatos, CA 95032
STREETSCAPE FRONT ELEVATIONS

DRAWN
CHECKED
DATE
SCALE
JOB NO.
SHEET

A3.3
OF SHEETS

REVISIONS	BY




FRONT ELEVATION

1/4" = 1'-0"

Gray Look Front Elevation

- Roofing: GAF Shingles – Antique Slate (GAF-antique-slate.jpg)
- Smooth stucco finish, Paint Color: Behr Weathered Moss (<https://www.behr.com/consumer/ColorDetailView/N380-3>)
- Front Door – Wood front door by Anderson Windows & Doors with Dark Gray Color, rear door and side garage door similar
Front door link: <https://www.andersenwindows.com/windows-and-doors/doors/entry-doors/residential-entry-door/>
- Garage Door – Wood, garage door by Overhead Door Company with same Dark Gray color as front door
Garage door link: <https://www.overheaddoor.com/traditional-wood-garage-doors>
- Windows – Wood windows by Anderson Windows with dark gray frame, wood trim with matching dark gray color
Anderson wood window link: <https://www.andersenwindows.com/windows-and-doors/materials/wood-windows-doors/>

NOTE: wood trim shall be installed around all windows and trim width shall not be less than 3-1/2 inches wide



793 KYLE STREET
SAN JOSE, CA 95127




793 Kyle Street
San Jose, CA, 95127
Tel: 408-209-8775
Email: kettle1@yahoo.com

New home for:
 YOGESH JHAMB
 140 Arroyo Grande Way
 Los Gatos, CA 95032
 FRONT ELEV. W/ COLOR & EXTERIOR MATERIALS

DRAWN
CHECKED
DATE
SCALE
JOB NO.
SHEET

A3.4

OF SHEETS



FLOOR AREA CALCULATIONS:

- A1= (35'-06" X 32'-10") = 1165.58 SF
- A2= (09'-02" X 19'-00") = 174.17 SF
- A3= (05'-00" X 16'-00") = 80.00 SF
- A4= (13'-00" X 19'-00") = 247.00 SF
- A5= (09'-00" X 03'-02") = 28.41 SF
- A6= (01'-08" X 04'-02") = 6.94 SF
- A7= (12'-06" X 33'-08") = 420.83 SF

TOTAL= 2122.93 SF

GARAGE AREA CALCULATIONS:

- G1= (12'-06" X 20'-00") = 250.00 SF
- G2= (08'-04" X 20'-10") = 173.61 SF
- G3= (00'-10" X 02'-05") = 2.01 SF
- G4= (00'-10" X 02'-05") = 2.01 SF


TOTAL= 427.63 SF

PORCH AREA CALCULATIONS:

P= (03'-00" X 05'-00") = 15.00 SF

OVERALL FOOTPRINT: 2122.93 + 427.63 + 15.00 = 2565.52 SF

LOT COVERAGE: 2565.52 / 6425 = 0.3993 OR 39.93%



FLOOR PLAN

1/4" = 1'-0"

FLOOR PLAN KEYNOTES

1. Bedroom window shall be an egress window to have a minimum net clear opening of 5.7 square feet; and 5.0 sq ft for grade floor openings minimum net clear opening height of 24 inches and minimum net clear opening width of 20 inches, sill height not more than 44 inches above the floor. See detail 18/A9
2. All window shall be sliding windows unless noted otherwise on plan. Style of window shall be selected by owner.
3. Tempered safety glass required at these glazing locations per CBC 2406.3: ingress doors, panels in sliding or swinging doors, doors and enclosure for hot tub, showers, glazing in walls within 5'-0" of standing surface, glazing that is within 2'-0" of vertical edge of door and within 5'-0" of standing surface.
4. Stair treads to be 10 inches minimum. Treads less than 11 inches require nosing. Nosing to be minimum 0.75 inches and maximum 1.25 inches. Stair risers to be 7.75 inches maximum. All stairs to be uniform in dimensions within 3/8 inch. Per section.
5. 18 inch x 24 inch under-floor crawl space access opening, per CRC section 408.4 if under floor plumbing cleanout is installed. It must be located within 20'-0" of the access opening
6. A readily accessible attic access, minimum 22 inch by 30 inch, located where at least 30 inches of clear headroom occurs and at attic space exceeding 30 sq. ft. per CRC R807.1.
7. Width of landing at exterior door shall not be less than door opening width per R311.3
8. Minimum 36 inch deep landing required at all exterior doors (landing shall not be more than 7.75 inches lower than threshold for in-swinging doors. R311.3.1. See detail 2/A9
9. For the exterior entry door, maximum threshold shall be 1.5 inches from the finished floor to the landing, per section R311.3.1.
10. All skylights shall be Velux skylights (ICC Evaluation Report # NER-216) or equal. Provide ICC report to inspector prior to installation.
11. Heat-n-glo directed vent electric fireplace heater to be selected by owner. Electric fireplace shall UL listed or ICC approved. Provide manuf. specs to city inspector.
13. Shower and tub/shower walls shall have a smooth, hard, non-absorbent surface over cement, fiber-cement or glass mat gypsum backer in compliance with ASTM C 1178, C 1288 or C1325 installed per manufacturer recommendations to a height not less than 6 feet above the floor per R307.2
14. Water heater shall be seismically strapped to a wall, provide with 18" high platform, combustion air to outside, pressure relief valve to outside with drain. See detail 16/A9.
15. F.A.U.: furnace in attic, see detail 2/A10. Combustion air from outside, vent to outside and provide setback thermostat.
16. Dishwasher with drain to garbage disposal.
17. Sink with garbage disposal.
18. Cook top to be selected by owner. Vent to outside with backdraft damper.
19. Washer space, provide cold & hot water supply, waste line and if on second floor, a pan with drain to exterior.
20. Dryer space, provide vent to outside with smooth metal duct with backdraft damper.
21. Provide 1/2 inch gypboard type 'X' on the garage side wall next to all living areas. Provide 5/8 type 'X' gypboard at ceiling if gypboard does not extend to roofing through the attic space. Table R302.6
22. Toilet shall have 15 inches minimum from centerline of fixture to the adjacent wall or obstruction on each side. Minimum 30 inches is required for any similar fixtures such as a bidet. Per section 407.5 of 2019 CPC.
23. Door from garage to kitchen area shall be a 1-3/8" thick solid wood door, solid or honeycomb core steel door, or 20 minute rated fire door. Doors shall be a self-latching and self-closing door per R302.5.1.
24. Elements appliances which generate a glow, spark, or flame (such as water heater and furnace) shall be located a minimum of 18 inches above garage floor per CMC 307.1 and CPC 508.14.
25. Ducts penetrating the walls or ceilings separating the dwelling unit from the garage shall be constructed of a minimum 26 gage sheet metal steel or other approved material and shall have no openings into the garage per R302.5.2.
26. The maximum hot water temperature discharging from the bathtub, shower and whirlpool bathtub filler shall be limited to 120 degrees Fahrenheit. The water heater thermostat shall not be considered a control for meeting this provision. CPC 414.5 and 418.0.
27. Control valves and showerheads shall be located on the sidewall of shower compartments or be otherwise arranged so that the showerhead does not discharge directly at the entrance to the compartment and the bather can adjust the valves prior to stepping into the shower spray per section 408.9 of 2019 CPC
28. shower shall have a minimum area of 1024 sq. inches and a minimum finish dimension of 30 inches in any directions. an outward swinging 22 inch minimum clear door shall be provided.

GENERAL NOTES FOR CONTRACTOR.

REVISIONS	BY

KQ Design & Engineering
 793 KYLE STREET
 SAN JOSE, CA 95127

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECT
 No. C57404
 Exp. 02/20
 CIVIL
 STATE OF CALIFORNIA


793 Kyle Street
 San Jose, CA. 95127
 Tel: 408-209-8775
 Email: ketel1@yahoo.com

New home for:
YOGESH JHAMB
 140 Arroyo Grande Way
 Los Gatos, CA 95032
FLOOR PLAN

DRAWN
CHECKED
DATE
SCALE
JOB NO.
SHEET


A4

OF SHEETS




RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION

1/4" = 1'-0"




FRONT ELEVATION

1/4" = 1'-0"



LEFT SIDE ELEVATION


1/4" = 1'-0"



REAR ELEVATION

1/4" = 1'-0"

REVISIONS	BY




793 Kyle Street
San Jose, CA, 95127
Tel: 408-209-8775
Email: kette1@yahoo.com

New home for:
YOGESH JHAMB
140 Arroyo Grande Way
Los Gatos, CA 95032
ELEVATIONS (option 2)

DRAWN
CHECKED
DATE
SCALE
JOB NO.
SHEET


A5

OF SHEETS



ROOF PLAN
 1/4" = 1'-0"

REVISIONS	BY



793 Kyle Street
 San Jose, CA, 95127
 Tel: 408-209-8775
 Email: kette1@yahoo.com

New home for:
YOGESH JHAMB
 140 Arroyo Grande Way
 Los Gatos, CA 95032
ROOF PLAN

DRAWN
CHECKED
DATE
SCALE
JOB NO.
SHEET

A6
 OF SHEETS

REVISIONS	BY

KQ Design & Engineering
 793 KYLE STREET
 SAN JOSE, CA 95127
 PHONE: (408) 209-8775



793 Kyle Street
 San Jose, CA 95127
 Tel.: 408-209-8775
 Email: kettel@yahoo.com

New home for:
YOGESH JHAMB
 140 Arroyo Grande Way
 Los Gatos, CA 95032
DRAINAGE PLAN

DRAWN
CHECKED
DATE
SCALE
JOB NO.
SHEET

A7

OF SHEETS

LANDSCAPE LEGEND:

- DENOTES LAWN AREA
- DENOTES CONCRETE PAVERS
- DENOTES 6'-0" TALL REDWOOD FENCE
- DENOTES CONCRETE AREA
- DENOTES LANDSCAPED AREA WITH BARK MULCH
- DENOTES LANDSCAPED AREA WITH GRAVEL

SYMBOL LEGEND:

- DENOTES A DOWNSPOUT DOWN TO A SPLASH BLOCK


SPLASH BLOCK TO DIRECT WATER AWAY FROM HOUSE

GRADE


HOUSE

SITE DRAINAGE NOTE:


1. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOT ALTER PRE-EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERNS EXISTING FROM ADJACENT PROPERTIES IN A MANNER THAT NEGATIVELY IMPACTS THOSE PROPERTIES.
2. ROOF WATER DOWN SPOUTS DISCHARGING TO SPLASH BLOCKS MUST BE PROVIDED TO CARRY RAIN WATER AWAY FROM FOUNDATION. DRAINAGE CAN NOT DRAIN INTO ADJACENT PROPERTIES.
3. THE SITE SHALL BE FINE GRADED TO PROVIDED A MINIMUM OF 5% SLOPE AWAY FROM HOUSE FOR THE FIRST 10 FT., FOR PERVIOUS SURFACE.
4. FOR IMPERVIOUS SURFACE, GRADE TO BE 2% MINIMUM AWAY FROM HOUSE FOR THE FIRST 10 FT.



(E) DRAINAGE PLAN
 1/8" = 1'-0"




(N) DRAINAGE PLAN
 1/8" = 1'-0"





SECTION A-A

1/4" = 1'-0"



SECTION B-B

1/4" = 1'-0"



793 Kyle Street
San Jose, CA, 95127
Tel: 408-209-8775
Email: kette1@yahoo.com

New home for:
YOGESH JHAMB
140 Arroyo Grande Way
Los Gatos, CA 95032
SECTIONS

DRAWN

CHECKED

DATE


SCALE

JOB NO.

SHEET

A8

OF SHEETS



FIBER ROLL
N.T.S.

FIBER ROLL NOTES

1. Place fiber roll in key trench 3" deep and place excavated soil on uphill or flow side of the roll.
2. On slopes and hillsides, fiber rolls shall be abutted at the ends and not overlapped. Place alternate stakes on both sides of the roll, every 6'.
3. Install fiber roll 12" from limit of grading

EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL NOTES AND MEASURES

1. The facilities shown on this Plan are designed to control Erosion and sediment during the rainy season, October 1st to April 30. Facilities are to be operable prior to October 1 of any year. Grading operations during the rainy season, which leave denuded slopes shall be protected with erosion control measures immediately following grading on the slopes.
2. This plan covers only the first winter following grading with assumed site conditions as shown on the Erosion Control Plan. Prior to September 15, the completion of site improvement shall be evaluated and revisions made to this plan as necessary with the approval of the city engineer. Plans are to be resubmitted for city approval prior to September 1 of each subsequent year until site improvements are accepted by the city.
3. Construction entrances shall be installed prior to commencement of grading. All construction traffic entering onto the paved roads must cross the stabilized construction entranceways.
4. Contractor shall maintain stabilized entrance at each vehicle access point to existing paved streets. Any mud or debris tracked onto public streets shall be removed daily and as required by the city.
5. If hydroseeding is not used or is not effectively 10/10, then other immediate methods shall be implemented, such as Erosion control blankets, or a three-step application of: 1) seed, mulch, fertilizer 2) blown straw 3) tackifier and mulch.
6. Inlet protection shall be installed at open inlets to prevent sediment from entering the storm drain system. Inlets not used in conjunction with erosion control are to be blocked to prevent entry of sediment.
7. Lots with houses under construction will not be hydroseeded. Erosion protection for each lot with a house under construction shall confirm to the Typical Lot Erosion Control Detail shown on this sheet.
8. This erosion and sediment control plan may not cover all the situations that may arise during construction due to unanticipated field conditions. Variations and additions may be made to this plan in the field. Notify the city representative of any field changes.
9. This plan is intended to be used for interim erosion and sediment control only and is not to be used for final elevations or permanent improvements.
10. Contractor shall be responsible for monitoring erosion and sediment control prior, during, and after storm events.

11. Reasonable care shall be taken when hauling any earth, sand, gravel, stone, debris, paper or any other substance over any public street, alley or other public place. Should any blow, spill, or track over and upon said public or adjacent private property, immediately remedy shall occur.
12. Sanitary facilities shall be maintained on the site.
10. During the rainy season, all paved areas shall be kept clear of earth material and debris. The site shall be maintained so as to minimize sediment laden runoff to any storm drainage systems, including existing drainage swales and water courses.
13. Construction operations shall be carried out in such a manner that erosion and water pollution will be minimized. State and local laws concerning pollution abatement shall be complied with.
14. Contractors shall provide dust control as required by the appropriate federal, state, and local agency requirements.
13. With the approval of the city inspector, erosion and sediment controls maybe removed after areas above them have been stabilized.


MAINTENANCE NOTES

1. Maintenance is to be performed as follows:
 - A. Repair damages caused by soil erosion or construction at the end of each working day.
 - B. Swales shall be inspected periodically and maintained as needed.
 - C. Sediment traps, berms, and swales are to be inspected after each storm and repairs made as needed.
 - D. Sediment shall be removed and sediment traps restored to its original dimensions when sediment has accumulated to a depth of one foot.
 - E. Sediment removed from trap shall be deposited in a suitable area and in such a manner that it will not erode.
 - F. Rills and gullies must be repaired.
2. All existing drainage inlets on St. George Lane within the limit of the project, shall be protected with sand bags during construction. See detail. Sand bag inlet protection shall be cleaned out whenever sediment depth is one half the height of one sand bag.
3. Existing concrete ditch sediment trap shall be cleaned out routinely during construction.

Maintenance


- The entrance shall be maintained in a condition that will prevent tracking or flowing sediment onto public rights-of-way. This may require periodic top dressing with additional stone as conditions demand, and repair and/or clean out any measures used to trap sediment.
- All sediment spilled, dropped, washed, or tracked onto public rights-of-way shall be removed immediately.
- When necessary, wheels shall be cleaned to remove sediment prior to entrance onto public rights-of-way. This shall be done at an area stabilized with crushed stone, which drains into an approved sediment trap or sediment basin.

**STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE
(TO BE MAINTAINED)**




EROSION CONTROL PLAN

1/8" = 1'-0"



REVISIONS	BY



793 Kyle Street
San Jose, CA, 95127
Tel: 408-209-8775
Email: kettel@yahoo.com


New home for:
YOGESH JHAMB
140 Arroyo Grande Way
Los Gatos, CA 95032
EROSION CONTROL PLAN

DRAWN
CHECKED
DATE
SCALE
JOB NO.
SHEET

A8.1

OF SHEETS

REVISIONS	BY




793 Kyle Street
San Jose, CA. 95127
Tel.: 408-209-8775
Email: kette1@yahoo.com

New home for:
YOGESH JHAMB
140 Arroyo Grande Way
Los Gatos, CA 95032
GRADING PLAN

DRAWN
CHECKED
DATE
SCALE
JOB NO.
SHEET


A8.2


OF SHEETS





GRADING PLAN

1/8" = 1'-0"







(E) UTILITY PLAN
1/8" = 1'-0"



(N) UTILITY PLAN
1/8" = 1'-0"



REVISIONS	BY




New home for:
YOGESH JHAMB
140 Arroyo Grande Way
Los Gatos, CA 95032
UTILITY PLAN

DRAWN
CHECKED
DATE
SCALE
JOB NO.
SHEET

A8.4
OF SHEETS

REVISIONS	BY



New home for:
YOGESH JHAMB
140 Arroyo Grande Way
Los Gatos, CA 95032
GROUND COVER PLAN


DRAWN
CHECKED
DATE
SCALE
JOB NO.
SHEET

A8.5
OF SHEETS

LEGEND:


PERVIOUS AREA

IMPERVIOUS AREA




LOT SIZE = 6425 SF
EXISTING IMPERVIOUS LOT COVERAGE = $3527 / 6425 = 0.549$ OR 54.9%
EXISTING PERVIOUS LOT COVERAGE = $2898 / 6425 = 0.451$ OR 45.1%

(E) GROUND COVER PLAN
1/8" = 1'-0"



LOT SIZE = 6425 SF
NEW IMPERVIOUS LOT COVERAGE = $3995 / 6425 = 0.622$ OR 62.2%
NEW PERVIOUS LOT COVERAGE = $2430 / 6425 = 0.378$ OR 37.8%
CHANGE IN IMPERVIOUS LOT COVERAGE FROM 54.9% TO 62.2%, INCREASE OF 7.3%

(N) GROUND COVER PLAN
1/8" = 1'-0"





LEGEND

---	PROPERTY BOUNDARY
---	LOT LINE
---	CENTER LINE
---	EASEMENT LINE
---	PAVEMENT
---	CONCRETE/LIP OF GUTTER
-x-	FENCE
---	FLOW LINE
---	TIELINE

ABBREVIATIONS

AC	AIR CONDITIONER UNIT
CH	CHIMNEY
CP	COVERED PORCH
DI	DRAIN INLET
DL	DRIP LINE
DW	DRY WELL
E	ELECTRICAL METER
FF	FINISH FLOOR
FH	FIRE HYDRANT
G	GAS METER
ICV	IRRIGATION CONTROL VALVE
PP	POWER POLE
R.O.W.	RIGHT OF WAY
SSCO	SANITARY SEWER CLEAN OUT
SDMH	STORM DRAIN MANHOLE
SSMH	SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE
TP	TELEPHONE POLE
WM	WATER METER
WV	WATER VALVE
PUE	PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT

- NOTES**
- (1) A CURRENT TITLE REPORT FOR THE SUBJECT PROPERTY HAS NOT BEEN EXAMINED BY GARY D. CARNES, LAND SURVEYOR, EASEMENTS OF RECORD MAY EXIST THAT ARE NOT SHOWN ON THIS MAP.
 - (2) TREE SPECIES AND DRIP LINES ARE APPROXIMATE AND SHOULD BE VERIFIED BY A CERTIFIED ARBORIST.
 - (3) ALL DISTANCES & DIMENSIONS ARE IN FEET AND DECIMALS THEREOF.
 - (4) THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN ON THIS MAP, IF SHOWN, ARE APPROXIMATE AND BASED ON EVIDENCE AT THE SURFACE.
 - (5) BUILDING DIMENSIONS SHOWN ON THIS MAP, IF SHOWN, ARE MEASURED FROM THE TRIM, STUCCO OR SIDING AT RIGHT ANGLES TO THE PROPERTY LINES.



CARNES & ASSOCIATES
9505 SUGAR BABE DRIVE
GILROY, CALIFORNIA 95020
408-847-2013

REVISION	DATE	No.

**TOPOGRAPHIC MAP
FOR YOGESH JHAMB
140 ARROYO GRANDE WAY
TOWN OF LOS GATOS, CALIF.**

SHEET	DATE :	11-06-19
1	SCALE :	1"=10'
OF	DRAWN BY :	T.W.
1	PROJ. MANAGER :	D.E.
Job No. 19107		
DWG: JHAMB TP		

*This Page
Intentionally
Left Blank*



**TOWN OF LOS GATOS
PLANNING COMMISSION
REPORT**

MEETING DATE: 05/12/2021

ITEM NO: 2

ADDENDUM

DATE: May 11, 2021
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Joel Paulson, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Requesting Approval for Demolition of an Existing Single-Family Residence and Construction of a New Single-Family Residence on Property Zoned R-1:8 Located at 140 Arroyo Grande Way. APN 424-23-048. Architecture and Site Application S-20-013. Property Owner/Applicant: Yogesh Jhamb. Project Planner: Sean Mullin.

REMARKS:

Exhibit 16 includes public comment received between 11:01 a.m., Friday, May 7, 2021 and 11:00 a.m., Tuesday, May 11, 2021.

EXHIBITS:

Previously received with the March 24, 2021 Staff Report:

1. Location Map
2. Required Findings and Considerations
3. Recommended Conditions of Approval
4. Project Description
5. Letter of Justification
6. Consulting Architect's Report, dated June 29, 2020
7. Applicant's response to the recommendations of the Consulting Architect
8. Neighborhood exhibit by staff
9. Town Arborist's Report, dated November 2, 2020
10. Public comments received by 11:00 a.m., Friday, March 19, 2021
11. Applicant's response to public comments
12. Development Plans

PREPARED BY: SEAN MULLIN, AICP
Associate Planner

Reviewed by: Planning Manager and Community Development Director

PAGE 2 OF 2

SUBJECT: 140 Arroyo Grande Way/S-20-013

DATE: May 11, 2021

Previously received with the May 12, 2021 Staff Report:

13. Applicant Response Letter

14. Public comments received between 11:01 a.m., Friday, March 19, 2021 and 11:00 a.m.,
Friday, May 7, 2021

15. Revised Development Plans, received May 5, 2021

Received with this Addendum:

16. Public comments received between 11:01 a.m., Friday, May 7, 2021 and 11:00 a.m.,
Tuesday, May 11, 2021

From: Jiuhua Feng <joe_feng@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 10:19 AM
To: Sean Mullin <SMullin@losgatosca.gov>
Subject: Re: My Neighbor's Remodel

Sean,

I haven't received the notice of May 12 hearing. Please let me know if it is still on schedule.


Except the common concerns expressed in the joint letter of adjacent neighbors, I also like to show additional details of my concerns by these attached images. The interpretations of the images are following:

1. Figure 1: The plan has five windows facing to my side. All windows are higher than the fence 1'-2' (Blue area).
2. Figure 2: The media room has a huge double window. It's almost as large as a backyard slide door (Blue area).
3. Calculations: The total window area facing to my side is $4 \times 3' \times 5' + 3' \times 3' = 69$ square feet. It's more than double of my total window area (32 square feet). In addition, $3' + 6' + 2 \times (3' \times 2') = 21$ square feet is higher than the fence;
4. Figure 3 shows the view from my family room. The media room window and a bathroom window is planned to install around the blue area.
5. Figure 4: One window opposites to my garage window as shown blue area. The neighbor at 140 keeps ignoring this window and said that there is no window on my garage.
6. Figure 5 shows that two windows facing to my walkway near the yard door. I'm about 6' tall almost same as the 6' height solid fence. It's very uncomfortable with windows 2' higher than the fence.

Thanks.

Joe

Figure 1:



LEFT SIDE ELEVATION

1/4" = 1'-0"

Figure 2:



Figure 3:



Figure 4:



Figure 5:

