



Planning Department  
Community Development Department, Town of Los Gatos  
110 E. Main Street  
Los Gatos, CA 95030

July 30, 2025

**Re: The Agahian Residence, 45 Reservoir Road, Los Gatos  
Response to Appellant's Written Comments**

Dear Mr Mullin,

In response to the recent written comments submitted by the appellant dated July 30, 2025, I feel compelled to address some of these points, even though many of these comments veer well away from the stated scope of the appeal (Size, mass and volume of approved home). The Planning Commission considered every one of these comments when granting approval.

The subject property at 45 Reservoir Road is a result of a Lot Line Adjustment (LLA) of 3 existing legal parcels that reapportioned the properties, and was *not* a Subdivision where new lots we “created”. This is a subtle but important difference. Additionally, all LLA’s in the Town are carefully reviewed by staff before being approved. Unfortunately, these three parcels carried the existing R-1:20 zoning instead of being appropriately rezoned to reflect the true lot areas.

Regarding the exception made for parking (#3), it is physically impossible to fit all of the required parking on the available land, once the firetruck turnaround area is deducted. It’s also ironic that the appellant only has a one car garage and two uncovered parking spaces.

I want to make it crystal clear the 15 ft tall retaining walls (#5) required to provide a level fire truck turnaround are necessary even for a 500 SF residence, so this exception is unavoidable for any project to be built.

The Council should understand the revised storm drainage plans (#6), designed by a licensed civil engineering firm with thousands of projects under their belt, have been thoroughly reviewed and approved by PPW. Newly added storm drainage chambers located under the fire truck turnaround allow for infiltration. The trench referred to in the letter is a rock lined swale designed as an energy dissipator to mitigate any emergency overflow from the chambers, which serve as the real workhorse here.

Finally, the earthwork quantities stated in the letter (#7) are erroneous to a fault and are very misleading. First of all, the appellant uses cubic feet as the unit quantities, where the standard is cubic yards. *(The plans show the need for more than 2,000 cubic feet of fill to be brought onto site. Total fill needed is approximately 3,500 cubic feet, with construction generating approximately 1,400 cubic feet of cut.)* By using cubic feet and not the common cubic yards, the numbers appear to be grossly inflated. Perhaps this was simply an error?

Even so, nowhere in the plans is there any indication of the need to *import* Fill material. The “Grading Quantities” table shown on Sheet 1 of 8 of Hanna Brunetti’s drawings indicate a total of 1,138 cubic yards of Cut and 622 combined cubic yards of Fill. The resulting delta is 516 cu. yds of soil to be **exported**. Additionally, the amount of earthwork calculated and listed in the table for “Residence” is technically exempt and should not be considered in the overall “Grading” quantities; this work is deemed as “Excavation” and is covered under the building permit. Grading is reserved for earthwork out side of the footprint of the structure(s). Again, a subtle but important difference to be considered when evaluating projects.

Thank you for the opportunity to address these misleading statements ahead of the hearing so we can use the Council’s time to stay focused on the merits of the appeal.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Gary Kohlsaad', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Gary Kohlsaad  
Architect C19245