



**TOWN OF LOS GATOS
PLANNING COMMISSION
REPORT**

MEETING DATE: 06/24/2026

ITEM NO: 2

DATE: June 18, 2026
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Joel Paulson, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Consider a Request for Approval to Demolish an Existing Single-Family Residence and Construct a New Single-Family Residence on Property Zoned R-1:8. **Located at 16724 Chirco Drive.** APN 424-21-025. Architecture and Site Application S-25-002. Categorically Exempt Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303: New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures. Property Owner/Applicant: Zahra Kassam. Project Planner: Erin M. Walters.

BACKGROUND:

On April 8, 2026, the Planning Commission considered the application, received public testimony, and continued the item to a date certain of June 24, 2026 (Exhibit 17). The continuance provided the applicant with additional time to address the Town Architect's outstanding recommendations, including removing the accent wall and softening the overall design. During the discussion, the Planning Commission noted that it is not the Commission's role to dictate architectural style and emphasized that the Town seeks to avoid repetitive or "cookie-cutter" designs while ensuring consistency with the Residential Design Guidelines. The Commission directed the applicant to avoid a substantial redesign of the project and instead focus on refining the design to address the Consulting Architect's recommendations and improve compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

DISCUSSION:

In response to the Planning Commission's direction, the applicant revised the development plans and provided justification addressing two of the Town's Consulting Architect's three remaining outstanding recommendations (Exhibits 18 and 19). The recommendations identified by the Consulting Architect (Exhibit 9) are provided on the following page, followed by the applicant's revised response in *italics*.

PREPARED BY: Erin M. Walters
Senior Planner

Reviewed by: Planning Manager and Community Development Director

- **Recommendation 1: Unify all roofs with the same roof pitch and consider increasing the slope some to be more complementary to adjacent homes.**

Applicant's revised response: Previously we increased the roof pitch but declined to change the asymmetrical aspect of design. We have now changed the roof pitch to a uniform 2:12 slope, with the right side overhanging the left for clerestory windows. We feel this keeps the modern asymmetrical feel while keeping in closer style to the adjacent houses.

- Staff Response: Recommendation met.

- **Recommendation 3: Eliminate the vertical blade wall at the front elevation.**

Applicant's revised response: In the previous resubmittal, we declined to remove the blade wall. At the Planning Commission hearing, it became evident that despite offering no objections in previous communication, our neighbors disliked this particular feature. We have now removed the wall and squared out the front entry per community feedback.

- Staff Response: Recommendation met.

The applicant has met all of the Consulting Architects recommendations with the exception of the Consulting Architect's following recommendation:

- **Recommendation 4: Strongly consider the addition of a set back atrium with the same roof slope - typical of many Eichler Style homes.**

Applicant's Response: Again, respectfully, we decline to make this addition. While open lighting is indeed important, we plan to provide this through high clerestory windows by using the asymmetrical roofs noted in #1 above.

- Staff Response: Recommendation not met.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

On April 8, 2026, the Planning Commission continued the project to a date certain of June 24, 2026. Accordingly, new public notices were not mailed, and a new newspaper advertisement was not published. Consistent with the Town's Height Pole, Flagging, Netting, and Signage Policy, the project sign at the site was updated to reflect the June 24, 2026, public hearing date.

Public comments received prior to the April 8, 2026, Planning Commission hearing were included in the April 8, 2026, Staff Report, Addendum, Addendum 2, and Desk Item Reports

(Attachments 1 through 16). No additional public comments have been received since the Planning Commission's consideration of the project.

CONCLUSION:

A. Summary

In response to the Planning Commission's direction, the applicant revised the proposed one-story single-family residence to address two of the three outstanding recommendations of the Town Consulting Architect. The applicant submitted a response letter addressing the Commission's comments (Exhibit 18) and updated development plans incorporating the proposed revisions (Exhibit 19). As revised, the proposed residence complies with all applicable development standards for the property, including floor area, building coverage, setbacks, parking, and height requirements. No exceptions to the Town Code are requested.

B. Recommendation

Should the Planning Commission determine that the revised project meets the direction provided by the Planning Commission and find merit with the proposed project, 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 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-25-002 with the conditions contained in Exhibit 3 and the revised development plans in Exhibit 19.

A. Alternatives

Alternatively, the Commission can:

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

PAGE 4 OF 4

SUBJECT: 16724 Chirco Drive/S-25-002

DATE: June 18, 2026

EXHIBITS:

Previously Received with the April 8, 2026, Staff Report:

1. Location Map
2. Required Findings and Considerations
3. Recommended Conditions of Approval
4. Project Description
5. Letter of Justification
6. Photographs
7. Consulting Architect Report, February 6, 2025
8. Applicant Response to Consulting Architect, December 9, 2025
9. Consulting Architect Report, January 14, 2026
10. Applicant Response to Consulting Architect Report, January 23, 2026
11. Consulting Arborist Report
12. Applicant's Neighborhood Outreach
13. Development Plans

Previously Received with the April 6, 2026, Addendum Report:

14. Public Comments Received Between 3:01 p.m., Friday, April 3, 2026, and 3:00 p.m., Monday, April 6, 2026

Previously Received with the April 7, 2026, Addendum 2 Report:

15. Public Comments Received Between 3:01 p.m., Monday, April 6, 2026, and 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Previously Received with the April 8, 2026, Desk Item Report:

16. Public Comments Received Between 3:01 p.m., Tuesday, April 7, 2026, and 11:00 a.m., Wednesday, April 8, 2026

Received with the June 24, 2026, Staff Report:

17. April 8, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
18. Revised Letter of Justification and Response to Planning Commission Comments
19. Revised Development Plans