

**FINAL MINUTES
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 10, 2009
CORTE MADERA TOWN HALL
CORTE MADERA**

COMMISSIONERS

PRESENT:

Chair Bruce Mace
Commissioner Richard Esteb
Commissioner Sloan Bailey
Commissioner Patrick Pagnillo

STAFF

PRESENT:

Bob Pendoley, Planning Director
Dan Bell, Senior Planner
Larisa Roznowski, Associate Planner
Nancy Salcedo, Minute Recorder

1. OPENING

A. Call to Order

B. Pledge of Allegiance

C. Roll Call

All the Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Schwartz.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE

3. CONSENT CALENDAR: NONE

4. CONTINUED HEARINGS:

- A. 300-700 ROBIN DRIVE; 100-200 UPLAND CIRCLE, GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT, TENTATIVE MAP, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION NO 09-006, AND VARIANCE APPLICATION NO. 09-005, STELLAR CORTE MADERA, L.L.C. (PROPERTY OWNERS)-To convert the Madera Vista Apartment Complex to condominium ownership. (Zoning: R-2 Low-Density Multiple Dwelling District) (Planner: Dan Bell)**

This item is continued to the November 24, 2009 hearing at the request of the applicant

5. NEW HEARINGS

A. 113 WILLOW AVENUE, DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 09-014 AND VARIANCE APPLICATION NO. 09-006, SCOTT AND NICOLE SILVER (PROPERTY OWNERS) WAGSTAFF ARCHITECTS (ARCHITECTS)- To construct a 393 sq. ft. first-story addition and a 1,023 sq. ft. second-story addition to a one-story, single-family residence and one-and-one-half car garage, and a request to waive a second, independently accessible off-street parking space. (Zoning: R-2 Multiple-Dwelling Residential district) (Planner: Larisa Roznowski)

Associate Planner Roznowski presented the staff report for which she used a slide presentation. She explained that the applicant is seeking Design Review approval to construct a 393 sq. ft. first-story addition and a 1,023 sq. ft. second-story addition to a one-story, single-family residence and one-and-one half car garage. The closest setbacks for the front and both sides of the house will remain the same. The rear setback would decrease from 54.67' to 33.8' where a 25' setback is the minimum required. The lot coverage would increase from 23% to 24% where 30% is the maximum allowed. The maximum height of the house would increase from 14'-9" to 27' where 30' is the maximum allowed. The one-and-a-half-car garage would remain unchanged.

She reviewed slides depicting the story poles of the proposed project as seen from front. She explained that the proposed colors and materials would be earth-toned, and the exterior design would be modified to a California Craftsman style. The proposed additions are consistent with the eclectic character and varying intensity of development in the neighborhood.

Views, sunlight and privacy impacts on adjacent neighbors are not significant or adverse. The massing of the proposed second story is stepped back from the front and sides to reduce apparent massing and reduce potential shadowing. Windows proposed on south and north elevations closest to the neighboring properties are proposed to be located not in direct alignment with the neighbor's windows to preserve privacy. There is a net addition of two new, smaller windows on the first floor south elevation facing the existing line of tall oleander shrubs. Two proposed windows on each side of the First Floor Family Room Addition at the rear of the house are screened with existing fencing.

The proposed second story is recessed on most sides from the outside walls of the first story and the building has articulated facades, which minimize apparent massing and add architectural interest.

The applicant is also requesting a Variance to waive a second, off-street parking space. The property was designed with a one-car garage before two-car garages became the standard. The proposed addition does not affect the existing garage area. One vehicle can be comfortably parked in the garage. The special circumstances is that the R-2 Zoning District has an 8,000 sq. ft. minimum lot area and the subject lot is substandard at 5,500 sq. ft. minimum lot area, making it difficult to provide a second off-site parking space located outside the required front yard setback. The subject lot also has the constraint of a 55' lot width, which is below required standard minimum width of 70'. Further, the existing garage is non-conforming in that the first 7.5' in depth is located in the required 20' Front Yard Setback.

The applicant is proposing to widen the existing driveway on the right side. The provision of second parking space within the Front Yard Setback is an improvement over existing conditions and would not create any additional safety hazard.

In conclusion, the proposal is compatible with intensity of development in the neighborhood. The proposed location of the additions and the earth-toned colors and materials compliment and upgrade the existing home. The sub-standard lot area and width at the Front Yard Setback and non-conforming location of the garage within the Front Yard Setback justify the granting of Parking Variance. Staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve the Design Review Application and Parking Variance by hearing public testimony and adopting the attached Resolution with Findings and conditions.

Hearing no questions from the Commission, Chair Mace asked for a presentation from the applicant.

Brock Wagstaff, project architect, said he would answer any questions. He said the intent had been to keep the front of the house where it is and create a house that would fit in with the neighborhoods of older Corte Madera, yet fit a modern lifestyle with people living on the same floor upstairs and still have room downstairs.

Commissioner Bailey asked if there were a plan to remove or replace the existing front yard shrubs near parking.

For the applicant, Brant Fetter explained that there is landscaping on both properties, and that they would remove only those box shrubs that are necessary.

Commissioner Esteb asked about the roof pitch.

The applicant explained that it is different in different places, with a 5' in 12' pitch on lower story and a 7' in 12' pitch on the upper story.

Chair Mace noted that the plan had some conflicting information with the relationship to adjacent structures diagram on the first sheet of the plans, and asked if there had been a different configuration in an earlier plan.

The applicant said that the proposal is the same overall form, but with 3 dormers in front.

Chair Mace said his interest was on the south facing elevation.

The applicant explained that their original intention was to stay within the footprint, but that staff had suggested they reconsider this to improve the design.

Barbara Solomon of 109 Willow Avenue said she loves her neighbor, and feels this an appropriate proposal. She said that because the proposed second story is added, she would lose most of the direct sunlight to the side window of her house. She said she wanted to protect her interest by stating she would like to be able to add new windows on the rear of her home.

Hearing no further comments, Chair Mace closed public hearing.

Commissioner Pagnillo said the proposed remodel is a major improvement. He said he had no problem with the parking situation, but that he would prefer to see the top story moved in a bit.

Commissioner Bailey agreed, adding that as the neighbors have no problem with the proposal, he could make Findings for the Parking Variance.

Commissioner Esteb agreed, adding that if someone did park in the spot, they would hang out into sidewalk, so likely no one will park there. He said the height of the neighboring house to the south is much lower, and that if the upper floor roof pitch was changed to match that of the lower floor, it may improve the design. Overall he said he thought it is a great project and an improvement.

Commissioner Bailey said regarding Barbara Solomon's comments that the Commission does not want her to take what the Commission does tonight as any implicit approval

for anything she can do on her property in the future. He said her comments were taken tonight only in relation to the project before them.

Chair Mace said, as did Commissioner Pagnillo, that more setback on the upper floor would be helpful, and that the roof pitches seem to be very high.

Commissioner Pagnillo added that the upper rooms are not large, and that the house would need useful space.

Commissioner Esteb agreed, adding that a roof pitch change would have a miniscule effect. The Craftsman look typically incorporates lower pitched roofs more like 4' in 12' or 3' in 12'. He added that this would help the neighbors on south side.

The applicant argued that taller roofs on the second floor are important to the character of the building. He said that the plate heights are at same level as other plates would be. He said changing the pitch really does change the character and that this would result in 7' in 12' pitch dormer going into a 5' in 12' pitch roof, which is not a good situation.

Chair Mace said he still feels it needs to be dropped for the neighbor to the south side.

Commissioner Esteb said he could go either way. Lowering by a foot may help the neighbors.

Chair Mace said there was potential for dropping the plate height from 8' on the second story. He acknowledged that the house next to it is taller than this, and that these are small lots.

MOTION: Moved by Commissioner Esteb, seconded by Commissioner Bailey to approve Design Review Application No. 09-014 and Variance Application No. 09-006 at 113 Willow Avenue, to construct a 393 sq. ft. first-story addition and a 1,023 sq. ft. second-story addition to a one-story, single-family residence and one-and-one-half car garage, and to waive a second, independently accessible off-street parking space.

Passed by the following vote: Ayes: Bailey, Esteb, Pagnillo
Noes: Mace
Abstain: None
Absent: Schwartz

Planning Director Pendoley read the appeal rights.

- B. 5090 PARADISE DRIVE, DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 09-011 AND VARIANCE NO. 09-002, STACY CAHILL, BRETT ALO, VANESSA ALO (PROPERTY OWNERS), RANDOLPH P. COHN (DESIGNER)-** To allow a second story expansion of a non-conforming accessory building with a reduced side yard setback. (Zoning: R-1-A Low-Density Residential District) (Planner: Dan Bell)

Senior Planner Bell presented the staff report for which he used a slide presentation. The applicants are requesting Design Review and Variance approvals to sanction construction of a 419 sq. ft. second story addition over an 817 sq. ft. detached accessory building (pool house). The second story is partially completed and has not received the required Planning and Building Permits. The Building Official issued a Stop Work Order in November 2008 for any additional work. The applicants stated that the addition is intended to enlarge the pool house, and not to convert the building into a single-family home.

The original, 817 sq. ft. one-story building was a multi-purpose accessory building. It is considered non-conforming since it is located 0.1' from the easterly property line where a 10' setback is required in the R-1-A District. The 419 sq. ft. second story addition is located likewise 0.1' from the easterly side property line, thus a side yard setback Variance is necessary.

There is also an in-ground swimming pool, pier and boathouse on the property. The original residence at 5090 Paradise Drive was located just uphill from the pool house and was removed 20 years ago. The owner of the next-door residence at 5094 Paradise Drive previously owned the property, and has since deeded the property to her children.

The subject property is located on Paradise Drive, the last property in Corte Madera before the Tiburon Town Limit. There is dense vegetation along front and right (easterly) side property lines. The property slopes steeply down from Paradise Drive. The relatively flat area of the lot includes the pool house and pool. The property has a driveway easement over the adjacent property at 5094 Paradise Drive. There is a narrow 11'-wide parcel that runs along the right (easterly) property line. This pedestrian access parcel provides water access for a property on the inland side of Paradise Drive. The closest waterside residence is in Tiburon at 5080 Paradise Drive.

The original 817 sq. ft. one-story, legal non-conforming building is a simple, straight-line design and is located 0.1' from easterly side yard property line. The design of the 417 sq. ft. addition utilizes the same straight-line design with the same reduced side

yard setback. There are no proposed window openings along the easterly side property line that could cause any privacy impacts to the closest neighbor in Tiburon. The nearest adjacent residences are not aligned with the subject two-story building. The juxtaposition avoids any significant impacts for sunlight or views. Prominent views for all properties along Paradise Drive are water-oriented and would not be impacted by the location of the subject building.

The original one-story building is legal non-conforming since it is located closer than 10' to a side property line. The Zoning Ordinance states that a legal non-conforming building may be maintained but may not be altered or expanded to increase non-conformity. Adding a second story addition within the 10' side yard setback does increase the non-conformity, thus approval of a Variance is necessary to sanction the second story construction.

There are five required Findings that must be made to grant a Variance, based on 1) special circumstances of property, 2) deprivation of property privileges, 3) special privileges, 4) public welfare and 5) consistency with General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Typically the most difficult Variance Finding is citing special circumstances applicable to the property. The applicant's response to this Finding is threefold, and includes the built location of the original accessory structure 0.1 ft from the property line, the lot's topography, and the presence of the adjacent water access parcel.

The built location of the original one-story structure does not meet this Finding. The original one-story building could be expanded with a one-story addition not located in the side yard setback. This alternative one-story design would be less efficient and consume more of the flat buildable area of the lot, and is not preferred by the applicants. A potential Finding is that the net area of the subject property is an undersized property at just more than 12,000 sq. ft.

The Planning Commission will need to discuss whether the property's topography, lot size and the adjacent 11'-wide, water access parcel are valid circumstances applicable to the property as defined under Finding 1). Findings 2) and 3) are closely tied to arguments for Finding 1). Staff finds that Findings 4) and 5) can also be made.

The building is not intended as a single-family residence. Should the Commission decide that affirmative Design Review and Variance Findings could be made for this project, conditions of construction should be addressed. No kitchen may be allowed on this property. It is the presence of a kitchen that would define this structure as a single-family dwelling. Any plumbing lines not associated with a bathroom, laundry or pool equipment should be removed completely. The area shown on first floor Floor Plan as

“Dining Room” currently has new rough plumbing in the westerly wall. All such plumbing must be removed as a Condition of project Approval.

In conclusion, while staff feels Design Review findings can be made, the required Variance Findings are not so evident. The Commission must decide whether all five Findings can be made, in particular whether there are special circumstances applicable to the property. Attachment 4 contains support letters from neighbors. Staff has since received a letter from the adjacent neighbor at 5080 Paradise Drive expressing opposition, which was forwarded to Commissioners via email last Friday.

Staff recommends that the Commission discuss merits of Design Review and Variance Findings. If the Commission favors approval it would be appropriate to articulate the necessary approval Findings and direct staff to draft a resolution for adoption at a subsequent hearing. If the Commission favors denial it would be appropriate to articulate the denial Findings and direct staff to draft a resolution for denial to be adopted at a subsequent hearing.

Chair Mace asked whether the subject property fell under the jurisdiction of (BCDC) the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission. Staff was unsure and will investigate.

Stacy Cahill, one of the legal owners and applicant said they had owned the property since 1983. She provided a brief history of the property and said there used to be a two-story single family home at 5090 Paradise Drive owned separately. This was raised in 1984. She said their plans are to keep it that way, and to maybe rebuild the structure at 5090 Paradise Drive. She said the alternative sink should be allowed in the pool house for hosting parties so that duties associated with parties were not restricted to the bathroom.

She said the 1983 survey had been seen by staff. There was some confusion on architectural drawings A-102 and A-101. She said that the border on the downstairs is the same. She said the staff report shows one parking spot, but there are two shown on drawing A-100.

Sue Duryee of 5094 Paradise Drive said her attempt to repair a rundown building (pool house) went beyond her wildest dreams, and for this she apologized. She said they are now trying to get all required permits. She outlined the project chronology, beginning with the survey done in 1983 showing the existing structure. Senior Planner Bell asked for a certificate of compliance to show two legal lots. For Design Review, he requested architectural plans and a new survey, which she provided. The survey was required to show FEMA elevation points, but the new FEMA regulations were in the works, but not

yet known. Bell also required a document filed by the County stating that the structure would never be used as a primary structure. Bell also requested documentation of the easement on the property, which was supplied. She said she was told that she could have a dwelling unit with a kitchen if it is documented for a low income resident, but that she does not want a rental unit. Note: Duryee is confusing "low income residence" with a Secondary Unit. She said she wants a sink. Bell asked that she remove eaves, windows and a firewall, so she hired Mr. Harlock. Note: The Building Official required these changes to comply with the Building Code. By the time the survey came back, the new FEMA regulations required her to obtain a new survey, which she submitted at the end of July. The structure complies with FEMA's new designated flood zone, requiring that the floor elevation of an accessory structure had to be 12' above the water line. The accessory building is 16'7" above the required mark. She had the easement added to the survey and sent out letters to her closest neighbors explaining her plans. She said she got unsolicited letters from all neighbors in favor of the project. Bell asked her to write a history of the property as known to her, which she did. She concluded that the building is bigger than she intended it to be, but that she hoped that the Commission could approve the building with a sink in the dining area.

Joel Josehart, consultant to the applicant, said that the heart of the project is making the first three required Findings. He handed out an expanded version of what Mr. Harlock had presented in the application for Variance requirements. He said the special circumstances include the project's steep hillside adjacent to the accessory building. He said that with parking, pool, water, and the hillside, there is little flat, buildable land remaining at 5090 Paradise Drive, and that this project does not constitute a special privilege.

Commissioner Bailey asked about the statement in the staff report that the original accessory building could be expanded elsewhere than in the required 10' side setback, but that this would consume more land. He asked if this would also consume off-street parking.

Mr. Josehart said the off-street parking is right in that area.

Commissioner Bailey asked whether an addition could also fit.

Mr. Josehart said this would block access between parking and the structure.

Ben Davoren of 5080 Paradise Drive in Tiburon said he had owned his property since 1968. He said that, though the staff report states that there are no windows proposed along the property line, there are three windows existing. Dense vegetation referred to

in the staff report is actually a low-growing blackberry vine. He said the unsolicited letters were solicited. He said project views are of his property, and that there is no view to anything else. He said he hadn't before heard of two-story pool house, and that it is imposing, with nothing else like it. He said he had been deliberately misled at the time of his letter of support of what had and had not been approved at time letter was written.

Stephanie Brown of 5100 Paradise Drive said she has great concerns regarding the proposal. She is concerned it will be a rental unit with construction on evenings and weekends. She said she was not aware that the 5090 and 5094 properties had been divided. Now, access would be through her driveway, adding cars, traffic and noise. She said she does not understand the special circumstances of why a pool house needs a second story or the undo hardship of not having a second story.

Eric Crandall, of 4093 Paradise Drive, the uphill neighbor and owner of the 11 foot-wide water access parcel, said the parcel is unbuildable, except perhaps for steps down to the water. He said he has no issue with the expanded pool house.

Chair Mace asked for rebuttals from the applicant.

Mr. Josehart said there are presently windows along the easterly property line, but these are not part of proposed design as corrective work includes their removal as well as reduction in roof pitch and eaves. He said there are many pool and guesthouses in this area, including the three-story guesthouse at 5080 Paradise Drive. Regarding the additional traffic at 5100 Paradise drive, 5090 Paradise Drive has always been a separate property with the same access point through 5094 Paradise Drive.

Commissioner Bailey asked Mr. Davoren whether he were aware that the proposal included removing the property line windows, which Mr. Davoren said no. Commissioner Bailey asked whether privacy had been Mr. Davoren's primary concern with the windows, which Mr. Davoren confirmed.

Chair Mace brought the discussion back to the Commission level.

Commissioner Esteb said that he had difficulty with required Finding 2, as the project was not consistent with the Zoning Ordinance. This is a non-conforming structure, and the proposed project would increase the discrepancy between the existing and required setbacks. He said that in the past, the applicant has taken out permits for other things and is therefore not unfamiliar with building permit process. All new wood exists at the site, suggesting that the whole pool house structure was torn down and replaced. He said he couldn't make Findings for the project.

Commissioner Bailey acknowledged Commissioner Esteb's concern. He said that after-the-fact requests for permits happen, but that this is not something the Commission is supposed to be considering.

Commissioner Esteb said the project could set a precedent with the backdoor approach of building before obtaining Permits.

Commissioner Bailey acknowledged an unfair feeling, but said that at this point, the applicant is supposed to approach the project this way.

Chair Mace said that his objective had been to address this moral issue by hypothetically considering the project as a new application.

Commissioner Pagnillo said that the changes are nice, but that the project retains the feeling of a house.

Chair Mace said the project boils down to a Variance Finding of special circumstance, and that he is not able to make that Finding. He said he agreed with Commissioner Esteb in that if this were a new application and blank lot, he would not make all required Findings.

Commissioner Pagnillo added that there is a 11' access parcel which is the only saving grace to lessen the impact of the placement of the building addition in the side yard setback.

Commissioner Esteb said if there is no alternative place to put this building, he could possibly consider it. But, there is room elsewhere on the lot, and the addition could be moved closer to the parking area, or reduced in size.

Commissioner Bailey said he sensed the applicant's frustration, and could sympathize with this. He said that staff works hard and that the repeated comments were well intentioned and correct. He emphasized that staff's deeming the package complete was in no way an entitlement that the Variance and Design Review project is approved. It also doesn't change things that the applicant had to come back with additional information. He said he would like to see the neighbor issues be worked out.

Chair Mace said the setback issue is the heart of the point.

Commissioner Bailey said the rights of the immediate property owner are not being infringed upon, as there is already a structure there. The issue is that the Town imposes setbacks now.

Chair Mace said the Zoning Ordinance has provisions for evaluating proposed development, the Commission does not have a right to circumnavigate the codified provisions.

Commissioner Bailey said he understood that it is the Commission's function to provide the exception through the variance proceedings.

Chair Mace said the Variance Findings are what guides and allows us to make an exception only if the Findings can be made.

Planning Director Pendoley said Chair Mace was correct in that the Commission may grant a Variance IF the Commission can make the Findings, the first one being special circumstances. All Findings must be based on fact. The Commission must provide facts used to make a Finding of special circumstance.

Commissioner Bailey said he presumed that by making an exception here, the Commission can only look at what's here now in front of the Commission.

Commissioner Esteb said if this came before us before it had been built, the Commission would likely allow the applicant to improve the building, but not to make it bigger. If this new building were proposed on a vacant lot, the Commission would likely not allow it 0.1' from the property line.

Commissioner Bailey said this proposal is not for a different footprint.

Commissioner Esteb said this is not a repair of an existing building, which is allowed; it's a new building. He said he doesn't think it needs to be this close to the property line.

Commissioner Bailey said with the question presented in this way, he agreed.

Chair Mace said the Commission must be careful of what it does. Once it circumnavigates what it believes to be true, why not do so for anyone else.

Commissioner Bailey asked whether the Commission's response could be crafted in some specific way that would deter a similar application in the future.

Commissioner Pagnillo said he did not understand that this was a new building, and that if it is, the Commission wouldn't approve it as proposed.

Chair Mace asked how the Commission would list Findings for Variance.

Commissioner Bailey asked about project review if this were the exact same application with the original footprint and no second story, and demolishing the original structure.

Senior Planner Bell said that if the original building were torn down, it could not have been rebuilt in its footprint without a variance.

Planning Director Pendoley suggested Commissioner Esteb's analysis: What's before the Commission tonight is an application to put an additional 400' addition in the side yard setback. Commissioner Esteb's question is would Commissioners make findings to approve this variance application to put 400 sq. ft. within this setback.

Chair Mace said he couldn't make the Findings unless perhaps the applicants come back with a revised proposal to slide the second story out of the setback or remove it, as it cannot be built in setback.

Commissioner Pagnillo said he could agree. The second story is not acceptable.

Chair Mace said the decision comes down to the required Findings for Variance.

Commissioner Esteb said that he did not want to offend good people, but that the Commission is obligated to uphold what the Town has crafted over the years in requirements.

Planning Director Pendoley said options include denial of the project to allow the applicant to appeal to the Town Council, or direct the applicant to submit a second application of Design Review not in conjunction with the Variance request. He suggested the Commission ask the applicant which they would prefer.

Mr. Josehart said he appreciated the Commission's discussion. He added that his client would have a problem if this were considered a new building.

Planning Director Pendoley said the Town would conclude the building is and was non-conforming, because it is difficult to prove whether or not a building has been torn down and rebuilt.

Senior Planner Bell said that a non-conforming building can be maintained and in theory every stick can be replaced over time.

Chair Mace asked about other needs such as plumbing, the proposal is not compounding the side yard setback with plumbing.

Senior Planner Bell said the building could include a wet bar which must meet the Town's definition, and added that the Town must know whether it is a single family home with a kitchen or not.

Commissioner Esteb said he has no problem with what the applicant is trying to do.

Chair Mace he appreciated the ability to leave project's legal non-conforming status.

Mr. Josehart asked whether moving the second story out of the side yard setback would be appropriate.

Senior Planner Bell said there is a 10' setback requirement, and there wouldn't be much of a second story if it were setback 10 feet.

Commissioner Esteb said the second story could be moved by the parking with parking underneath.

Planning Director Pendoley said a different option would be to request a continuance for the item to be heard in the presence of all five commissioners, because there could be a tie vote tonight, which would be an unclear resolve.

Chair Mace said he would like to pole fellow commissioners to see if it might come to a tie vote. He asked if the Commission crafted the option that the first floor stayed as is, and that the new application remove the need for a Variance, how many Commissioners would be in favor, of which all commissioners approved.

Mr. Josehart said that the applicant would prefer the continuance to come back with a new design.

MOTION: Motioned by Commissioner Bailey, seconded by Commissioner Pagnillo and approved unanimously to continue the hearing to a date uncertain.

Planning Director Pendoley noted that if and when the application comes back before the Commission it will be re-advertised.

Commissioner Bailey encouraged the applicant to reach out to neighbors.

6. ROUTINE AND OTHER MATTERS

A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

i. Commissioners: Commissioner Esteb said that BERST willing to send representatives to a Commission meeting for a workshop either of the next two meetings.

ii. Director: None

B. MINUTES: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of October 27, 2009. Motioned, seconded and unanimously approved.

7. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 pm. The next Planning Commission Regular Meeting is to be November 24, 2009 at 7:30 p.m. in the Corte Madera Council Chambers, 300 Tamalpais Drive.