



**TOWN OF LOS GATOS  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
110 E. Main Street  
Los Gatos, CA 95030**

**RECEIVED**

JUN 10 2019

**APPEAL OF THE DECISION OF  
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
OR  
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

TOWN OF LOS GATOS  
PLANNING DIVISION

**PLEASE TYPE or PRINT NEATLY**

I, the undersigned, do hereby appeal a decision of the COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT/DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE as follows:

DATE OF DECISION: 6/4/19  
 PROJECT/APPLICATION: 16100 Greenridge Terrace M-19-004  
 LOCATION: 16100 Greenridge Terrace

**LIST REASONS WHY THE APPEAL SHOULD BE GRANTED:**

SEE Attached

(If more space is needed, attach additional sheets.)

**IMPORTANT:**

1. APPEAL MUST BE FILED WITHIN TEN (10) DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF MAILING OF WRITTEN NOTIFICATION OF THE DECISION.
2. THE APPEAL SHALL BE SET FOR THE FIRST REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION WHICH THE BUSINESS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL PERMIT, MORE THAN FIVE (5) DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF THE FILING OF THE APPEAL. THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAY HEAR THE MATTER ANEW AND RENDER A NEW DECISION IN THE MATTER.
3. YOU WILL BE NOTIFIED, IN WRITING, OF THE APPEAL DATE.
4. CONTACT THE PROJECT PLANNER TO DETERMINE WHAT MATERIAL IS REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING.

**RETURN APPEAL FORM TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

PRINT NAME DAVID WEISSMAN SIGNATURE David Weissman  
 DATE \_\_\_\_\_ ADDRESS 15430 Francis Oaks Way  
 PHONE (408) 358-3556 Los Gatos 95032

\*\*\*\*\*

**OFFICE USE ONLY**

DATE OF PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMISSION ACTION: 1. \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 2. \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 3. \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

PLAPPEAL \$ 192.00 Residential  
 PLAPPEAL \$ 767.00 Commercial  
 PLAPPEAL \$ 78.00 Tree Appeals

RECEIVED

JUN 10 2019

TOWN OF LOS GATOS  
PLANNING DIVISION

My appeal should be granted because:

The proposed scenic easement does not conform with the motion made by Ms. Jensen on 4/2/2019. Specifically, she makes reference to the prior discussion of Mr. Rennie wherein he discussed that the Council could require that “Lots 1 and 8 require a scenic easement along the north edge, that’s completely along the north edge of Lots 1 and 8, and completely along the west edge of Lots 5 and 3. I could say something like that?” Staff agreed that such could be required.

Nowhere does the proposed scenic easement touch any part of Lot 8 nor the north edge of Lot 1. Additionally, the scenic easement comes nowhere near the west edge of Lots 3 and 5.

Additionally, the proposed scenic easement, with its width of 102.4 feet, is capricious and too small. It also completely misses the proposed trail system on Lots 1 and 2, which makes no sense whatsoever.