




60-9



7 TAX CODE AREA



- 1 ARROWHEAD SUB. RSM 27/3
- 2 FAIR OAKS ACRES PTN. OF RSM 6/12
- 3 NORTH FAIR OAKS NO. 2 PTN. OF RSM 6/34

11-72


28 CITY OF SAN MATEO CALIF.


# Board Meeting

Attachment:




# ATTACHMENT D





BUILDING B




BUILDING A

3<sup>rd</sup> FLOOR


ors Meeting

Attachment:



BUILDING B


(TYP)




BUILDING A

ors Meeting

Attachment:



BUILDING B




BUILDING A

ors Meeting


Attachment:

KIDDE BLDG A  
54'-11"



BUILDING A - FRONT/6TH AVE.


KIDDE BLDG A  
54'-11"




REAR ELEVATION OF BUILDING A - REAR

Board of Directors Meeting

Attachment:



FRONT




REAR


**Board Meeting**

Attachment:





BUILDING A B - SIDE



BUILDING B A - SIDE

ors Meeting

Attachment:



1 PERSPECTIVE 1



**San Mateo County Environmental Services Agency**

**Planning and Building Division**

County Government Center • 590 Hamilton St. • Redwood City CA 94063  
Mail Drop PLN 122 • 415 • 363 • 4161

**Application for Appeal**

- To the Planning Commission
- To the Board of Supervisors

**1. Appellant Information**

Name: Abdel Ismail

Address: 1121-B Hopkins Avenue

Redwood City, CA

Phone, W: 650-888-5961 H: \_\_\_\_\_

Zip: 94062

*317 6th Ave. RW*

**2. Appeal Information**

Permit Numbers involved: PLN 2004-00579

I have read and understood the attached information regarding appeal process and alternatives.

yes

no

I hereby appeal the decision of the:

- Staff or Planning Director
- Zoning Hearing Officer
- Design Review Committee
- Planning Commission

Appellant's Signature:

Michael D. McCracken, Attorney for Applicant/Appellant

Date: 9/28/05

## **Attachment A**

In failing to approve Applicant's/Appellant's application for zoning text amendment and major subdivision, which application was recommended for approval by Planning staff, the Planning Commission prejudicially abused the discretion vested in it in that: (1) it did not proceed in a manner required by law: namely, it misinterpreted and misapplied the governing State law and implementing County ordinances and regulations; (2) it did not render legally valid findings of fact; and (3) such findings as it did render were not supported by the evidence. Accordingly, the decision of the Planning Commission is contrary to law and must be set aside, and the application of Applicant/Appellant approved.