

**FINAL MINUTES  
HOUSING ELEMENT WORKSHOP  
AND  
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
FEBRUARY 09, 2010  
CORTE MADERA TOWN HALL  
CORTE MADERA**

**7:00 P.M. HOUSING ELEMENT WORKSHOP**

Bob Pendoley explained that he had prepared the Draft Housing Element of the General Plan as Planning Director for the Town, and that upon his retirement, had continued with the process as a Planning Consultant. He provided an overview of the Draft Housing Element. The Town Council appointed a Citizen's Advisory Committee in August of 2009, which met eight times to review the Draft Housing Element. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend that this Draft be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review in the form of workshops. Councilmember Carla Condon introduced the Citizen Advisory Committee members present, and acknowledged that members have spent five months reviewing the material. She said the Town has been recognized federally for the previous Housing Element, and that they are trying to exceed those standards with this draft. She said that the committee had nearly 100 percent attendance at each meeting.

Bob Pendoley explained that each town is required to have a housing element and follow its' policies. State law guides what must be included within the document, which upon completion is circulated for comments and certified by the State. Most communities try to make requested corrections and, once adopted, send back to the State for certification. The preparation of an appropriate housing element has important financial implications. If a town has a certified housing element, and is sued regarding a development decision, the judge is required to uphold that town's position. The document describes how a town intends to meet its allotted housing needs, and is updated every 5-8 years.

A housing element is required to contain an assessment of housing needs, pertinent housing market constraints and government or permit requirements. The document accordingly sets goals, objectives and policies, provides an action plan and identifies potential sites.

Corte Madera constructed 202 units during the last housing element cycle including construction at Aegis of 118 new senior housing units, and another 79 family housing units at the San Clemente project. Construction of these units is important as the State has a mandated allotment of units that the Town must plan for. The Town's Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) in 1999 was 179 units. The Town exceeded that

requirement with 216 units, which is a notable accomplishment. Affordable Housing can be controversial as the development review process reveals concerns over how the development will affect the community. Both the Aegis and San Clemente projects bettered their respective properties.

For the current RHNA, the County of Marin must plan for 4,800 units. The Town of Corte Madera has been allocated 244 units to plan for, but can receive credit for 79 of those housing units previously built as the State allows a window for RHNA allocation. The net allocation the Town must plan for is 165 units.

Corte Madera is a slow growth community. The population contains a high percentage (25 percent) of residents under 18 years old. Countywide, this number is 20%. Corte Madera is a town of families--over 30% with kids, another 30% with kids not living at home. Median income was almost \$100,000. This is a town of homeowners, with a higher percentage than for greater Marin County, and consists mostly of conventional single-family detached housing. The Town is built-out in terms of vacant land.

Housing needs are assessed in categories including affordability, jobs/housing balance, and special needs housing. It is difficult for the average Corte Madera household to afford the average rent of \$2200/month. In terms of affordability for those who live and work here, most jobs generate less income than the average household would need to afford to live here. Those households with moderate income could typically afford a market rate rental.

An audience member noted that median house price is central in its distribution, while individual house price doesn't go to very low, but income does, thus a graph like this underestimates the need for affordable housing.

Bob Pendoley continued that extremely low-income renters are paying more than 30% of their income on housing, and that 70% of very low-income owners are paying more than they can afford.

The Town has a rapidly growing senior community with special affordability problems. If everyone here now stayed into their senior years, more than 3,500 of the 9,500 population would be over 60 years old by 2030. Typically as a group 63% of all seniors are paying more than they can afford.

There are 1, 400 disabled persons most under age 65 years old living in Corte Madera, and this group has inherent special housing needs. There are also single parent

households that require that rental units do not discriminate against children, and that there are play and day care facilities.

One of the more urgent problems in the community is housing for the locally employed. The jobs/housing balance is 1.8/1 (1.8 jobs for every household). This suggests an affordability problem. It is thus difficult for employers to find employees locally, which results in increased commuter traffic congestion that contributes to greenhouse warming. Corte Madera has the most pronounced jobs/housing imbalance in the County, due in part to the shopping centers.

The Draft Housing Element reflects many existing policies, but some are proposed for change. The major changes in the new housing element include: (1) promote the opportunity for workforce housing, needs of seniors and disabled and promoting equal opportunity. (2) Use land sustainably and efficiently by encouraging mixed-use development and identifying properties ready for redevelopment. Both Aegis and San Clemente projects are an example of mixed-use development. The new General Plan contains many policies that would do just this. Also encourage infill development such as granny flats. Since 1999, the Town has approved eighteen second units, which help provide good housing and good neighbors. Most are occupied rent-free. Other land use policies include provision of incentives for density. If an owner proposes to provide affordable housing units, they will likely be allowed additional units above allowed base density. (3) Promote new housing close to jobs, most of which would be along the Highway 101 corridor. (4) Continue to maintain open space.

An audience member asked about the goal of locating housing close to transit and jobs.

Bob Pendoley said this is a policy of the new General plan adopted in April, 2009 with such policies carried into the Housing Element, which identifies four community plan areas: The San Clemente corridor, Tamalpais and Tamal Vista corridors, and to a lesser extent Old Corte Madera Square, though this corridor would be more about historic preservation.

The new Housing Element identifies mixed-use development at the WinCup property with 180 units, and the Village Shopping Center, though if that occurs it is likely many years away, and not within the timeframe of this housing element. The document also identifies the property on Robin Drive with the potential for single-family homes with 2<sup>nd</sup> units, and property at 1421 Casa Buena Drive. The new Housing Element re-designates the Wornum Drive site owned by the Town back to open space.

He concluded that the remainder of the Element is unchanged from the previous document, which encourages good design, code enforcement, and policies to encourage good planning. Regarding the draft review schedule, the Planning Commission will decide on completion of the workshops, and staff's target date to forward the draft to the Town Council in March 2010. Later in March, the draft will be sent to the State for review, and adoption by the Town Council in May 2010.

An audience member asked about illegal second units.

Bob Pendoley said the Housing Element's policy encourages owners to apply for permits to legalize these. The City of Mill Valley participated in such an amnesty program, which legalized 80 units. This improves building safety issues, and the County gets credit against RHNA.

Chair Mace asked for public comment.

An audience member asked about permit fast tracking for the development of housing units and open hearings for changes in zoning.

Chair Mace said all zoning changes and density bonuses considerations would be publicly noticed hearings. He thanked staff and the Committee for their hard work. He reiterated that seniors and very low-income needs are our greatest challenge, and that the way equal opportunity is defined will be important.

Bob Pendoley said this draft treats equal opportunity differently than the previous element, which was focused on discrimination. The Town has a discrimination ordinance, and the Committee felt that equal opportunity is also about promoting opportunity, so such policies are included as equal opportunity policies.

Chair Mace said with overlay districts, there is a differential between development proposals and town goals, and that this is where public input is so important.

An audience member asked the location of the opportunity property on Casa Buena Drive.

Bob Pendoley said it is in the vicinity of Marin Joes, and that the Town held public hearings a couple of years ago for the development of 9 units there. Story poles were erected at that time, and the project was approved, but the approval has lapsed.

An audience member asked about RHNA credits for low income and very low-income units, and whether development of a property to meet ADA requirements would translate into incentives.

Bob Pendoley said the property must be zoned for multi-family units. For example, the San Clemente property was developed by AEH who said they would exceed the required units of affordable housing, and would set their price range to accommodate 39 extremely low income units, 28 very low income units and 18 low income units, in exchange for a density bonus. This is negotiable, and up to the Town Council to decide, and they got one. There was an incentive to maximize the density bonus in that the Town demonstrated the success of its' programs and became eligible for additional grants.

An audience member asked whether there were an incentive to make a granny flat ADA accessible.

Bob Pendoley said there was not, but that the Town has made it easy to get a granny flat approved.

Mr. Helfich (owner of the WinCup property) said he had sent a letter to staff and that he hoped to meet next week to discuss language to be added to the document to provide incentives to develop these goals.

Interim Planning Director Bell said the element contains goals and plans to facilitate development, and that staff's meeting with Mr. Helfich will likely not result in the use of specific numbers or language incentives. It need not be exact language in the element, rather ways to flush the policies and programs, perhaps such as the waiving of certain fees.

Bob Pendoley asked the Commission whether they would feel comfortable forwarding the Draft Housing Element.

Commissioner Bailey asked about the consequences of the Town failing to comply with RHNA to plan for 165 units.

Bob Pendoley said if the Town had an element not certified by the State, and the Planning Commission were to deny a project, the applicant could hypothetically sue the Town for having no policy basis for denying the application. Lacking a certified housing element, the judge would have the Town prove it has a housing element, with the

State's position being that the Town does not. The Town's legal basis to regulate housing is subject to challenge. A Judge can suspend the right.

An audience member asked about the allocated 92 units of "above moderate income housing".

Bob Pendoley said that could be the hardest category to comply with, as the Town lacks vacant, buildable land.

An audience member asked if a granny flat would fall into the low or very low-income unit category.

Bob Pendoley referred to the housing element, which does not provide income criteria, but lists a spit proportion.

An audience member asked whether the State would not approve the Housing Element for not having planned for enough above moderate-income units.

Bob Pendoley said the State is most concerned about low, very low, and extremely low income units, and that this category requires the lowest number units of our allocation. The State will likely request evidence of a plan that will make this possible.

Commissioner Esteb asked whether RHNA makes a distinction between housing units and condo units.

Bob Pendoley said for RHNA, there is no distinction.

An audience member asked about the Madera Vista condo conversion.

Interim Planning Director Bell said that proposal still needs CUP approval and tract map filing. He said the Commission denied these applications, and the owner appealed the decision to the Town Council. The Council overturned the Commission's decision, thus the owners could proceed, provided they make 25% of total units affordable to low income households. The owners are instead requesting a Zoning Ordinance Amendment to allow payment of an in-lieu fee.

An audience member suggested that the complex could provide the needed 92 units.

Interim Planning Director Bell said the conversion from apartments to condominiums does not generate new units, thus would not be considered for credit under the Town's RHNA requirement.

Chair Mace said the in-lieu fees issue calls for discussion about where the funds would go.

An audience member said that this is a carrot to adhere to the adopted plan, and that as other sources open up, the resources as part of the workforce housing trust will be available.

An audience member asked whether it was the goal of the in-lieu fee to provide adequate resources to construct the affordable 25% of units, or just provide some money.

Interim Planning Director Bell said that research shows that throughout the County the in-lieu fees do not provide 100% of the funds to build the required number of units, and that if higher fees were required to do so, they could be high enough to kill a project. The in-lieu fees serve to leverage other funds for affordable housing projects.

An audience member said an affordable unit not built may mean an in-lieu fee to provide half of a unit elsewhere, especially in a built-out community.

Chair Mace asked if Robin Drive could generate affordable units counting toward RHNA.

Interim Planning Director Bell said the Madera Vista owners have said that the project does not pencil out if they have to put affordable units in the complex.

An audience member said that the in-lieu fee works out to less than \$100,000 per unit, which will not render sufficient funds to pay for the construction of all the required affordable units.

Interim Planning Director Bell said the theory for in-lieu payments is to provide sufficient funds to pay for the gap between what the owner can afford to pay versus what the actual construction costs are. Full gap capture is not found in these projects. The funds are used as seed money to leverage other funds. Corte Madera has a higher percentage requirement for affordable units at 25% of project units.

An audience member said that there hasn't been a project approved under those circumstances in the County.

Councilmember Carla Condon said the Town's housing fund a few years ago was modest, yet it was the key seed money for the San Clemente project, qualifying them for additional financing. So, the in-lieu fee at Madera Vista could be important.

**MOTION:** Moved by Commissioner Bailey, seconded by Commissioner Esteb to forward the Draft Housing Element to the Town Council.

Ayes: Commissioners Mace, Bailey and Esteb.

Noes:

Abstain:

Absent: Commissioners Schwartz and Pagnillo.

### **8:00 P.M. REGULAR MEETING**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Chair Bruce Mace  
Commissioner Richard Esteb  
Commissioner Sloan Bailey

**STAFF PRESENT:** Dan Bell, Interim Planning Director  
Larisa Roznowski, Associate Planner  
Nancy Salcedo, Minute Recorder

#### **1. OPENING**

**A. Call to Order**

**B. Pledge of Allegiance**

**C. Roll Call**

All commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioners Schwartz and Pagnillo.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

### **3. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

A. None

### **4. CONTINUED HEARINGS:**

A. None

### **5. NEW HEARINGS**

**A. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 09-003, ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT NO. 09-004, DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT NO. 09-012, AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 09-005** – (1) to approve the Environmental Assessment to construct a 1,190 sq. ft. ADA-accessible dock and to recommend that the Town Council approve the Environmental Assessment for the proposed rezoning; (2) to recommend approval to the Town Council to rezone the property from R-2 (Low-Density Multiple Dwelling District) to POS (Parks, Open Space, and Natural Habitat) to make the zoning consistent with the General Plan land use designation of “Park” that was assigned to the property by the 2009 General Plan; and (3) to approve Design Review and Conditional Use Permit to replace the pre-existing 718.5 sq. ft. Higgins Landing Dock with a 1,190 sq. ft. ADA-accessible dock.

Associate Planner Roznowski presented the staff report for which she used a slide presentation. The application is for a Zoning Ordinance Amendment to rezone the property from R-2 to POS so that the zoning is consistent with the General Plan “Park” designation. The application includes a Design Review and Conditional Use Permit for the replacement of the pre-existing 718.5 sq. ft. Higgins Landing Dock with a 1,190 sq. ft. ADA-accessible dock and two ADA-compliant parking spaces. Operational Conditions of Approval have been included to ensure that the proposed use will not be detrimental to public health, safety and welfare. The Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) identify mitigation measures that have been incorporated as Conditions of Approval for the Design Review and Conditional Use Permit to bring potential impacts from the proposed rezoning and dock construction to a “less than significant” level.

The Planning Commission’s decisions on Design Review and Conditional Use Permit applications are conditioned upon approval by the Town Council of the rezoning of the property from R-2 to POS. If the condition is met, the decision is final unless appealed to the Town Council within 10 calendar days of Commission’s action. The Commission will make a recommendation to the Town Council on the rezoning and the Initial Study

and MND for the proposed rezoning and proposed dock construction. Approval of the Design Review and Conditional Use Permit are conditional upon the approval of the MND for the proposed dock and for the rezoning of the subject property.

Higgins Landing is a public park owned and operated by the Town. The first dock on the water parcel was installed in the 1970's. A more substantial dock was built in 1983, which was demolished in 2005. There is a boathouse on the property and condos adjacent. The new dock and gangway will be in the same location and will be attached to the shore-side bulkhead and in-water dolphin that supported the original dock.

The proposed dock components include a fixed aluminum walkway, aluminum gangway, floating dock, and concrete piles. Existing components to remain include the existing abutment and the concrete dolphin. The four piles will be relocated to new locations and will be reused if they are found to be in good condition. The gangway slope would be 1.8% at Mean Higher High Water and 7.6% at Mean Lower Low Water.

The existing bus pad would be reconfigured to create one ADA-restricted parking space and one ADA-accessible loading space parallel to Lucky Drive. As part of this work, the slope of the driveway to the existing boathouse would be adjusted to meet ADA standards. The Marin County Transit District will be relocating the existing bus stop.

An Environmental Assessment was prepared, and the resulting MND identified several items as "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" in the areas of Biological Resources, Noise and Mandatory Findings of Significance as listed in Attachment 5. In particular, there were 3 special status wildlife (bird) species found and 2 special status (fish) species found present or observed within the project area. A mitigation has been included requiring that pre-construction surveys be conducted if construction is to occur during the nesting season. If a nest is found, buffer zones are to be established. To protect fish, mitigation has been included regarding restricted driving of pile activities to when special status species, particularly steelhead, are not present. Also the increased shadow affect created by the proposed dock could affect tidal habitat, and a mitigation has been included requiring an interpretive sign explaining the importance of protecting water quality to maintain productivity in tidal waters.

As construction will create higher noise levels, mitigation has been included to require mufflers on motorized equipment and acoustical shields installed on impact equipment per equipment manufacturer recommendation. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan in Appendix A of Attachment 5 will reduce the project's potential impacts from a "potentially significant" to a "less than significant impact" level.

The Planning Commission is required to take public comments on the Draft Initial Study and MND before recommending approval of the document to the Town Council. The Draft Initial Study and MND were publicly noticed and circulated, and responses were received. A document has been prepared entitled *Analysis and Conclusions Regarding Comments* in response to comments received. Changes made in response to comments received has been incorporated into the Final Initial Study and MND.

In order to recommend approval of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment, the Commission must make a General Plan consistency Finding. Associate Planner Roznowski reviewed staff's arguments for this Finding, noting that the site has been used a park for last 38 years, and that the General Plan designates the property as Parks.

In order to grant Design Review approval, the Commission must make eight Findings required by section 18.30.070 of the Corte Madera Municipal Code. She reviewed the arguments in favor of the findings, noting that the existing zoning is R-2 and the purpose of the proposed to change if that the zoning be consistent with property's land use designation as "Park". The Code emphasizes maintenance and upgrading of existing community parks and facilities. The proposed dock will not result in the removal of trees or grading of hillsides. The proposed dock is sited away from condos to the east. The proposed replacement dock continues to be in scale and harmonious with the area.

In order to grant a Conditional Use Permit, the Commission must make three Findings as required by section 18.26.050 of the Corte Madera Municipal Code. A public facility in the POS Zoning District requires a Conditional Use Permit, and proposed dock is consistent with POS Zoning District.

To ensure the project will not be detrimental to public health, safety or welfare, the project has been conditioned to require an operational conditions sign specifying that the dock be used for fishing and non-motorized boating; commercial uses are not allowed; hours of operation are from sunrise to one hour after sunset; no nighttime activity allowed; use of life jackets is required; no nighttime lighting; all use is at own risk; and no use of the facility if hazardous conditions exist.

Additional components of the project proposal during construction include that the contractor shall not allow construction equipment engines powered by fuels to idle for more than 5 minutes. If a cultural artifact is found, work shall be stopped and an approved archeologist called. If a cultural artifact is found, it is to be properly recorded and reported. The contractor shall carry an oil spill prevention kit as required by the Office of Oil Spill Prevention and Response.

The Town Public Works Department added the requirement of warning safety signs describing the location of inlet pipes and of the concrete discharge unit for High Canal.

She concluded that the Initial Study and MND with incorporated Mitigation Measures bring potential impact of the project to a “less than significant” level. Staff believes that rezoning from R-2 to POS is internally consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation of “Parks”.

Staff also believes that the supportive findings for Design Review and Conditional Use Permit can be made with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan adopted as a Condition of Approval.

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the Final Initial Study and MND prepared for the Zoning Ordinance Amendment and dock project. Staff also recommends that the Commission recommend that the Town Council approve the Final Initial Study and MND for the Zoning Ordinance Amendment by adopting Resolution No. 10-001.

Staff recommends that the Commission recommend approval to the Town Council of Zoning Ordinance Amendment to rezone the property by adopting Resolution No. 10-002. Staff recommends that the Commission conditionally approve the Design Review and Conditional Use Permit by adopting Resolution No. 10-003.

Since the Town is the applicant, there will not be an applicant’s presentation, but the preparer MND is present for questions and the Town Attorney is available for counsel if needed.

Chair Mace asked for public input.

Larry Chin explained that there had been much public support for the project, and that he had collected 250 signatures on a petition in support of the project in 2006, but the Town budget issues set the project back. He noted that the project is an incredible opportunity funded at no cost to the Town. He said this is the only Town-owned dock and that the access to the Bay is a great resource for kids. He said that there has been a dock here since 1971, named to honor local environmentalists Mr. and Mrs. Higgins. The proposed dock has been expanded only per ADA requirement, is centrally located between 3 schools, and is one of the few ADA-compliant docks in the Bay Area.

Kevin Hackman said he was having difficulty reconciling the shape and area of the proposed dock in relation to other docks in the area in terms of context, contour and

periphery of the area. He said his concern is the extent that it goes out into the space and whether the project had been designed to maximize the area's open water space.

Commissioner Esteb said that the orientation and length of dock are determined almost solely by ADA requirements.

Associate Planner Roznowski referred Mr. Hackman to the aerial photo in the environmental document to provide an understanding of the area.

Mr. Hackman asked if the dock could be oriented closer to shore to generate more open water for sailing.

Chair Mace said during periods of low water, the dock will be sitting on mud, and that placing it closer to shore would create additional time that the dock would rest on mud.

Mr. Hackman asked about the Larkspur Marina's 5 and 10-year dredging schedule.

Veronica Nebb, Town Attorney, said the subject area is not on a dredge program and has not been dredged historically. She added that dredging would be a completely different project subject to separate environmental review.

Barbara Becker of 16 Council Crest and chairman of the Accessibility Advisory Committee said that the committee had been concerned to get the dock's slope just right, and that at the time, Planning Director Pendoley had provided a schematic of the dock's slope in relationship to the adjacent condos. She said the proposed dock doesn't extend as far as their dock, and that it is on the south side of their dock.

Kevin Jensen of 36 Mariner Green Drive said he had been involved in the dock's design. Using the scale of the aerial photo he was able to superimpose the length of dock onto the aerial photo, and noted that the dock does not extend beyond the length of the parcel. The float is out in the deepest water possible, so that even at low tide when the dock sits on mud there would still be enough water for a kayak. He said the area has never been anticipated for dredging, and that it is too shallow for a sailboat with a keel. He said he had been the Port Architect for the Port of San Francisco.

Jim Robinson of 25 Ash said it is time for interested parties and the Town to think about forming a *Friends of the Dock* organization for ongoing maintenance of this asset.

Penny Wells, a local kayaker with Bay Access, said she has been involved with project since its beginning, and that everyone seems now to be satisfied. She said this is a

unique, low-float dock with a gentle ramp so children and older people can use it. She said that it is one of the only ADA-accessible places to get in the water in Marin County.

Larry Chin added that Penny Wells is the Founder of Bay Area Sea Kayakers and founder of Bay Area Water Trails. This project would be part of these trails.

Chair Mace added that Larry Chin was a founder of the dock replacement project.

Commissioner Bailey asked about the parking situation.

Associate Planner Roznowski said there is the new ADA-restricted parking space and one new 10-minute loading zone is ADA-accessible but not ADA-restricted, and that the remaining parking is not a change from prior conditions. She said dock users have used on street parking elsewhere and that some may have parked unofficially at Redwood High School.

Commissioner Esteb said if dock users park at Redwood High School during the school day without a permit they may be towed, and that there is additional on-street parking along Lucky Drive. He asked about the dock's shading on the water, and whether 11" thick lexan or open web aluminum could be used for mitigation.

Douglas Spicher, with WRA Environmental Consultants said the shading problem is limited to the dock's floating portion, and that there is enough light coming in from the side for the elevated portion including the walkway and gangway.

**MOTION:** Moved by Commissioner Esteb, seconded by Commissioner Bailey to approve Resolutions Numbers 10-001, 10-002 and 10-003.

Ayes: Commissioners Mace, Esteb and Bailey

Noes:

Abstain:

Absent: Commissioners Schwartz and Pagnillo

## **6. ROUTINE AND OTHER MATTERS**

### **A. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**i. Commissioners:** None.

**ii. Director:** Planning Director Bell provided an update on Town Council appeal of the Planning Commission's denial of the CUP and Zoning Ordinance Amendment portion of the condo conversion for Madera Vista. The Town Council overturned the Commission's denial and will next address the Zoning Ordinance Amendment regarding in-lieu fees, which the Town Council has the opportunity to approve or deny. If the Council decides to amend the Zoning Ordinance substantially, the law requires that the Ordinance then come back to the Planning Commission for review for consistency with the General Plan. The Town Council asked about methodologies used in other jurisdictions to determine the dollar figure and methodology for in-lieu fee calculation.

Another appeal of interest is 113 Willow which the Commission upheld Planning Director's position and the owner has appealed that decision.

**B. MINUTES:** Planning Commission meeting draft minutes of January 26, 2010.

**MOTION:** Moved by Commissioner Esteb, seconded by Commissioner Bailey to approve Planning Commission minutes of January 26, 2010.

Ayes: Commissioners Mace, Esteb and Bailey

Noes:

Abstain:

Absent: Commissioners Schwartz and Pagnillo

**7. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 P.M. The next regular Planning Commission Meeting is February 23, 2009 at 7:30 p.m. in the Corte Madera Council Chambers, 300 Tamalpais Drive.