



**TOWN OF LOS GATOS
PLANNING COMMISSION
REPORT**

MEETING DATE: 01/14/2026

ITEM NO: 5

DATE: January 9, 2026
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Joel Paulson, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Consider a Request for Approval to Construct a New Second-Story Addition to an Existing Single-Family Residence on Property Zoned R-1:8. **Located at 140 Oakmont Way.** APN 424-18-023. Architecture and Site Application S-25-052. Categorically Exempt pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 15301: Existing Facilities. Property Owners: Marc and Marie Tagne. Applicant: Salar Safaei. Project Planner: Suray Nathan.

RECOMMENDATION:

Denial.

PROJECT DATA:

General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential
Zoning Designation: R-1:8 – Single-Family Residential (8,000 square feet minimum)
Applicable Plans & Standards: General Plan, Residential Design Guidelines
Parcel Size: 8,466 square feet
Surrounding Area:

	Existing Land Use	General Plan	Zoning
North	Residential	Low Density Residential	R-1:8
South	Residential	Low Density Residential	R-1:8
East	Residential	Low Density Residential	R-1:8
West	Residential and Highway 17 right-of-way	Low Density Residential	R-1:8

CEQA:

The project is Categorically Exempt pursuant to the adopted Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 15301: Existing Facilities.

PREPARED BY: Suray Nathan
Assistant Planner

Reviewed by: Planning Manager and Community Development Director

FINDINGS:

- The project is Categorically Exempt pursuant to the adopted Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 15301: Existing Facilities.
- The project meets the objective standards of Chapter 29 of the Town Code (Zoning Regulations).
- The project is in compliance with the Residential Design Guidelines for single-family residences not located in the hillside area.

CONSIDERATIONS:

- As required by Section 29.20.150 of the Town Code, the considerations in review of an Architecture and Site application were all made in reviewing this project.

ACTION:

The decision of the Planning Commission is final unless appealed within ten days.

BACKGROUND:

The subject property is located in a cul-de-sac on the north side of Oakmont Way, approximately 100 feet west of Highland Oaks Drive (Exhibit 1). The 8,466-square foot property is developed with an existing 1,731-square foot single-story residence and a 740-square foot accessory dwelling unit (ADU) (Exhibit 9). Surrounding properties are developed with predominantly one-story single-family residences and a single two-story residence.

On January 14, 2025, the applicant submitted a Minor Residential Development application to construct a new second-story addition to an existing single-story residence. During the application review process, staff encouraged the applicant to reduce the floor area to avoid being the largest residence in the immediate neighborhood and to modify the exterior bulk and mass to better align with the Ranch-style residences in the cul-de-sac. In response, the applicant states in the letter of justification (Exhibit 4) that they are unable to reduce the floor area as they need the proposed square footage for their growing family.

The project meets all technical requirements of the Town Code, including height, floor area, building coverage, parking, and setbacks.

Pursuant to Section of the Town Code 29.20.480 (f) if the Planning Director determines that the application cannot be approved because it does not comply with the Town's Development Standards and the applicant is unwilling to revise the plans further, then the applicant may file an Architecture and Site application (including the required fee) and the application shall be considered by the Planning Commission. The project is being referred to the Planning Commission as an Architecture and Site application, as staff is unable to approve the proposed

residence due to concerns related to compatibility of the proposed size, bulk, and mass.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A. Location and Surrounding Neighborhood

The subject property is located in a cul-de-sac on the north side of Oakmont Way, approximately 100 feet west of Highland Oaks Drive (Exhibit 1). There is one existing two-story residence within the immediate neighborhood.

B. Project Summary

The applicant is proposing additions to the existing 1,731-square foot single-story residence: a 625-square foot second-story addition and a 279.6-square foot first-story addition to an existing 1,731-square foot single-story residence (Exhibit 9).

C. Zoning Compliance

A single-family residence is permitted in the R-1:8 zone. The project meets the objective standards of the zoning code for height, floor area, building coverage, parking, and setbacks.

DISCUSSION:

A. Architecture and Site Analysis

The applicant proposes to construct a new 625-square foot second-story addition to an existing one-story single-family residence. The project also includes a 279.6-square foot first-story addition to an existing 1,731-square foot single-story residence. The resulting two-story residence would be 2,636 square feet (Exhibit 9). The proposed project would comply with the Town's demolition calculation and would not be considered a new residence. Prior to this application, a 411-square foot garage was demolished and converted into a 740-square foot ADU, approved under a ministerial permit. A summary of the floor area for the proposed residence is included in the table below.

Floor Area Summary				
	Existing SF	Addition SF	Proposed SF	Max Allowed SF
First Floor	1,731.36	279.60	2,010.96	
Second Floor	--	625.03	625.03	
Total	1,731.36	904.63	2,635.99	2,726

The request is being considered by the Planning Commission due to concerns related to the proposed residence being the largest in the immediate neighborhood in terms of floor area and FAR, exceeding those of the next-largest residence by 327 square feet and FAR by 0.02. Additionally, while the proposed residence would not be the first two-story residence in the

immediate neighborhood, its bulk and mass is not consistent with those of the surrounding residences, as noted by the Town's Consulting Architect.

B. Neighborhood Compatibility

The immediate neighborhood consists predominantly of one-story single-family Ranch style residences. Based on Town and County records, the residences in the immediate area range in size from 1,136 to 2,309 square feet. The FAR ranges from 0.16 to 0.29. The proposed residence would be 2,636 square feet with a FAR of 0.31, making it the largest residence in the immediate neighborhood in both square footage and FAR. Pursuant to Town Code, the maximum allowable square footage for the 8,466-square foot lot is 2,726 square feet with a maximum FAR of 0.32. The table below reflects the current conditions of the immediate neighborhood:

Address	Zoning	Residence Floor Area	Garage Floor Area	Total Floor Area	Lot Size	Residence FAR	No. of Stories
140 Oakmont Way (E)	R-1:8	1,731	0	1731	8,466	0.20	1
140 Oakmont Way (P)	R-1:8	2,636	0	2,636	8,466	0.31	2
126 Highland Oak Way	R-1:8	1,695	455	445	10,800	0.16	1
130 Highland Oak Way	R-1:8	2,309	472	2,781	8,000	0.29	2
136 Oakmont Way	R-1:8	2,060	252	2,312	7,128	0.29	1
144 Oakmont Way	R-1:8	1,730	473	2,203	8,658	0.20	1
148 Oakmont Way	R-1:8	2,297	462	2,759	9,408	0.24	1
152 Oakmont Way	R-1:8	1,694	484	2,178	8,170	0.21	1
147 Highland Oak Way	R-1:8	1,136	462	1,598	6,120	0.19	1
143 Highland Oak Way	R-1:8	1,232	462	1,694	5,940	0.21	1
139 Highland Oak Way	R-1:8	1,136	462	1,598	5,940	0.19	1

The property owner's justification states that they require a larger residence for their family (Exhibit 4).

C. Building Design

The proposed residence is designed in a Spanish Modern architectural style, with an "S"-shaped Spanish-style tile roof, stucco siding, recessed windows, an arched entryway, and a wrought-iron railing at the second-story front balcony (Exhibit 9).

The Town's Consulting Architect initially reviewed the proposed residence on January 29, 2025, and was not generally supportive of the original design, stating that it did not meet many of the adopted design guidelines for neighborhood compatibility (Exhibit 5). The Consulting Architect recommended that the applicant reduce the plate and ridge height, eliminate the entry tower, and simplify the windows to meet Residential Design Guidelines 1.4, 2.1, and 2.3.

Following this review and discussion with staff, the applicant engaged a new design team and significantly redesigned the proposed residence.

The Consulting Architect provided a review of the redesigned residence on September 18, 2025 (Exhibit 6). The Consulting Architect noted that the applicant made several positive changes; however, the revised design conflicts with other residences in the immediate neighborhood.

The Consulting Architect made four recommendations to increase compatibility with the Residential Design Guidelines and the immediate neighborhood. The applicant implemented recommendations one and four; partially implemented recommendation three by recessing the window by two-inches, rather than the recommended six-inches or by applying wood trim; and did not implement recommendation two. The Consulting Architect's recommendations are provided below, followed by the applicant's response in *italics* (Exhibit 7).

1. Elimination of the two-story-tall entry form by changing the second-floor covered balcony to an open, uncovered space.

We have modified the design of the balcony and have completely removed the roof of the balcony at the front of the residence – this will help reduce the mass. Please note we have added the Juliette Style balcony at the non-operable window above the stairs to add consistency to the style, break the mass, and ensure this wall does not appear as a two-story wall, along with the roof eaves shown below. At the proposed functional balcony as well as the Juliette balcony, we have also added curved wrought iron railings to break the mass.

2. Simplification and unification of the window forms with the addition of detail in the form of true or simulated divided panes on all windows.

We have consulted our clients, and they prefer not to have windows that are simulated with separate windows. In order to have windows to qualify egress, we need to have separate windows that are casement style for the sleeping areas – grid lines are not added in order not to have the difficulty of cleaning these windows and maintaining a clean, seamless window installation.

3. A deep recess of all window frames from the outside face of the walls to be consistent with Residential Design Guideline 3.7.4.

We have added recessed windows to comply. Owners do not wish to put trim around the windows.

4. Refinement and clarification of the eave details. They currently appear appropriate on the included front facade sketch, but overly bulky on the elevation drawings.

We will be installing the gutters and eaves per the design of the front façade provided – please note that there are software limitations of which we prepare the elevations with – which makes it look boxier than the intended design however, materials and installations are going to occur per the design provided in the rendering which is prepared in a more accurate aesthetic software with more accurate material representations.

D. Tree Impacts

The subject property does not contain any protected trees, and the proposed project does not impact any trees on adjacent properties.

E. Parking

Pursuant to Section 29.10.150(c)(1) of the Town Code, a single-family residence requires two on-site parking spaces. Prior to this application, the applicant converted an existing two-car garage into a 740-square-foot ADU, approved as a ministerial permit (Exhibit 9, Sheet A1.00). Pursuant to Section 29.10.320.(f)(1)(h) of the Town Code, when a garage is demolished in conjunction with the construction of an ADU or conversion to an ADU, any lost off-street parking spaces required for the primary dwelling shall not be required to be replaced. Additionally, there is no requirement to add the two required parking spaces because the proposed project complies with the Town's demolition calculation and is not considered a new residence.

F. Neighbor Outreach

The applicant has been in communication with the surrounding neighbors regarding the proposed project. A summary of their outreach efforts is included as Exhibit 8. At the time of preparation of this report, no public comment has been received.

G. CEQA Determination

The project is Categorically Exempt pursuant to the adopted Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 15301: Existing Facilities.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Story poles are not required for this project pursuant to the Town's Story Pole Policy (Resolution 2024-017), and project signage was installed on the subject property prior to the mailing of notices for the public hearing. Written notice was sent to property owners and residents within 300 feet of the subject property. At the time of preparation of this report, no public comment has been received.

CONCLUSION:

A. Summary

The applicant is requesting approval of an Architecture and Site application for a new 625-square foot second-story addition and a 279.6-square foot first-story addition to an existing 1,731-square foot single-story residence (Exhibit 9). The project is consistent with the property's zoning and General Plan Land Use designation. The project complies with the objective standards of the Town Code related to allowable floor area, setbacks, building coverage, parking, and height. The proposed residence would be the largest residence in the immediate neighborhood in terms of floor area and FAR. The project was reviewed by the Town's Consulting Architect, who provided four recommendations to improve its consistency with the Residential Design Guidelines. The applicant responded to the Consulting Architect's feedback by implementing most of the recommendations, except for adding true or simulated divided lites and providing only two-inches of recess for all windows rather than six-inches or greater, as recommended. The project is referred to the Planning Commission due to concerns about neighborhood compatibility related to the size, bulk, and mass of the residence.

B. Recommendation

Based on the analysis above, staff recommends denial of the Architecture and Site application based on concerns related to size of the addition, neighborhood compatibility, and consistency with the Residential Design Guidelines, as discussed in this report.

C. Alternatives

Alternatively, the Commission can:

1. Approve the application by taking the following actions:
 - a. 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 15301: Existing Facilities (Exhibit 2);
 - b. Make the finding that the project complies with the objective standards of Chapter 29 of the Town Code (Zoning Regulations) (Exhibit 2);
 - c. Make the finding that the project complies with the Town's Residential Design Guidelines for single-family residences not located in the hillside area (Exhibit 2);
 - d. 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
 - e. Approve Architecture and Site application S-25-052 with the conditions contained in Exhibit 3 and the development plans in Exhibit 9.
2. Approve the application with additional and/or modified conditions; or
3. Continue the matter to a date certain with specific direction.

EXHIBITS:

1. Location Map
2. Required Findings
3. Recommended Conditions of Approval
4. Letter of Justification
5. Consulting Architect's Report, dated January 29, 2025
6. Consulting Architect's Report, dated September 18, 2025
7. Applicant's Response to the Consulting Architect's Report, dated December 4, 2025
8. Summary of Applicant's Neighborhood Outreach
9. Development Plans