

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER
4080 Lemon St., Board Room (14th Floor)
Riverside, California

THURSDAY, September 19, 2002
9:00 A.M.

MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on September 19, 2002 at Riverside County Administration Center, Board Room (14th Floor).

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: William Cobb, Chairman
Allen Graff, Vice-Chairman
Marge Tandy
Paul Bell
B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel
Walter Snyder
Sam Pratt

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Ric Stephens

OTHERS PRESENT: Greg Shannon
Dan Mc Kinney
Alison Whitecavage
Jeff Chambers
J. Thomson, MDMG
David Sawyer
Greg R. Luching
Ron Vergilio
Robert Klotz, Attorney
Steve Berzansky

STAFF PRESENT: Keith Downs, A.L.U.C. Executive Director
Beverly Coleman, Development Specialist III
Bernadette Cruz, Secretary
Jackeline Gonzalez, Office Assistant II

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. by Chairman Cobb.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

ALUC Meeting Minutes for June 20, 2002.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Bell made a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Graff indicated modifications need to be done. The motion to approve the minutes was withdrawn due a quorum not being reached, and was carried over to the next scheduled meeting. For the record, the following Commissioner's accepted the minutes: Vice Chairman Allen Graff, Marge Tandy and Paul Bell.

V. OLD BUSINESS

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

- A. BD-02-104 – Warner Engineering. Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY: *Continued from previous meeting on August 15, 2002.*

CASE NUMBER: BD-02-104 – Warner Engineering.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: CZ 6679, TRM 30483

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a proposal for a new 94-lot residential tract housing.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated 650 feet southeast of the runway northeast of Adams Street and 42 Avenue in the County of Riverside, south of the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport
a. Airport Influence Area: Area III
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area
c. Noise Levels: 60 dB CNEL (February 1996 future forecasts)

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located approximately, 500 feet south of the center of the runway and is within Area III of the Airport Influence Area. Land use within Area III that produce glare, direct illumination, vapor, smoke and dust which may affect airport operations shall be discouraged. Likewise, uses which would conflict or potentially conflict with the airport in terms of noise sensitivity and safety hazards are discouraged.*

NOISE: *The project is partially within the 60 CNEL as indicated in the 1996 Noise Report for the airports. The residential use is acceptable in that noise category if noise reduction measures are incorporated into the construction in order to achieve an interior annual noise level attributed to exterior sources, not to exceed 45 CNEL. That will likely require more than normal construction, which only attenuates up to 20dB.*

HEIGHT: *The elevation on the site ranges from 72 to 83 MSL, and the structures are not expected to exceed 35 feet. The runway ground elevation is from 49-73 feet. The Part 77 horizontal surface is overlying this area at 219 MSL, and no portion of the project intrudes upon that airspace. Any homes on this project will need an FAA 7460.*

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

The conditions of approval will be continued pending receipt of the amendment response letter from Commissioner Snyder. This item was continued at the request of the applicant.

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff would recommend a finding of inconsistency of this project subject to the conditions of approval of the amendment to the letter.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case, and after hearing no reply from audience, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Greg Shannon came forward and made him self-available for any questions from the Commissioner's.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners for the applicant. Hearing no response Chairman Cobb asked for clarification on page 2 of staff report under the Conditions of Override. Keith Downs replied that the word override should be deleted. Vice Chairman Graff asked for clarification on deleting override and replacing it with approval. Keith Downs replied yes as long as the action is being approved. Chairman Cobb asked for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's, and upon hearing no reply or respond from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's and Conditions of Approval and recommendations. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Commissioner Pratt abstained. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Cobb presented the consent items for 9:15 A.M. under old business V.B. FV-02-103, and under new business VI.A. RI-02-146, VI.B. RI-02-148, VI.C. RI-02-149. Staff recommends a finding of consistency on all four items unless any of the Commissioners has a question or any one in the audience has a particular question on any of these items it will be pulled out and discussed separately. Keith Downs clarified that item V.B. FV-02-103 staff recommends a continuance.

Chairman Cobb opened the floor for questions from the audience on the four items, upon hearing no response from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners, and upon hearing no reply, he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion to continue V.B. FV-02-103 to the next schedule meeting of October 17, 2002 and approve the three consent items. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

B. FV-02-103 – Riverside County – Continuance to October 17, 2002.

CASE SUMMARY Continued from August 15, 2002 ALUC meeting.

CASE NUMBER: FV-02-103 – Riverside County
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: PP17666

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: *The project is a request for PP 17666 for the construction of a*

240,000 square foot business park with multiple buildings for offices, restaurants, health and exercise center, mini-warehouse, nursery, trailer, boat storage, and blueprinting and duplicating services on approximately 61.75 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated approximately 61.75 acres northeast of Briggs Road and Auld Road, southerly of Benton Road within the County of Riverside, 460 – 2600 feet north end of Runway 18/36 at the French Valley Airport.

Adjacent Airport: French Valley Airport
a. Airport Influence Area: Inner Safety Zone (ISZ), Emergency Touchdown Zone (ETZ), Outer Safety Zone (OSA and Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
b. Noise Levels: Inside 55 and 60 CNEL for year 2013.

MAJOR ISSUES:

NOISE: The current CLUP analysis was based upon flight tracks in the 1992-93 period of time. Newer contours indicate that a portion of the property is currently inside of the 55db CNEL, with a smaller portion inside of the 60 CNEL. The CLUP indicates that noise sensitive commercial uses in the 60 CNEL are compatible with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

LAND USE: The site is located 460 – 2,600 ft. north of the north end of Runway 18/36, and 1200 ft. north of the north end of the proposed runway, to be located 600 ft. east of Runway 18/36. The proposed land use is commercial, and consists of a 240,000 sq. ft. business park with multiple buildings for offices, restaurants, health and exercise center, mini-warehouse, nursery, trailer, boat storage, blueprinting and duplicating services on approximately 61.75 acres.

The site consists of six Planning Areas, zoned Manufacturing Service Commercial (M-SC), as shown on the attached exhibit. Planning Area 1 (4.93 ac.) is located within the Inner Safety Zone (ISZ) and Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ). Planning Area 2 (15 ac.) is within the ISZ for Runway 18/36 and is also within the ETZ and Outer Safety Zone (OSZ) for the proposed runway. Planning Area 3 (8.59 ac.) is primarily within the OSZ of the proposed runway, although the southeast corner is within the TPZ. Planning Area 4 (7.86 ac.) is within the ISZ of Runway 18/36, and is also within the ETZ and OSZ for the proposed runway. Planning Areas 5 (9.4 ac.) and 6 (13.4 ac.) are within the ISZ and ETZ for Runway 18/36. The proposed buildings on the site or a portion of the proposed buildings are either within the ISZ for Runway 18/36, the ETZ for the proposed runway, or the OSZ for the proposed runway.

A portion of the building within Planning Area 1 is in the TPZ, with the remaining portion in the ISZ.

Prohibited and Discouraged Uses

Structures and land uses involving petroleum, explosives or above-grade power lines are prohibited within the ISZ. Structures, land uses involving concentrations of people, and significant obstructions are prohibited within the ETZ. Prohibited land uses within the OSZ include residences, public assembly uses, hotels, restaurants, bars, schools, hospitals, government services, public utility stations, plants, public communication facilities and uses involving, as the primary activity, manufacture, storage or distribution of explosives or flammable materials. Discouraged uses within the TPZ include schools, auditoriums, amphitheatres, stadiums, churches, and uses involving, as the primary activity, manufacture, storage or distribution of explosives or flammable materials.

Building coverage for Planning Areas 2, 3 and 4 is less than 25% (net), which is below the OSZ standard of 25% (net). The maximum population density within the OSZ is 25 persons per acre for uses in structures.

There is a GPS approach over the site (non-precision). A 34:1 approach would typically place an approaching aircraft 200 feet ± over the proposed site.

Height: The highest elevation on the site is 1354 MSL. The building, signs and lighting at the proposed site are not expected to exceed 35 feet. The proposed site is located within the Part 77 approach surface overlying this area at 1,350 – 1,410MSL. The runway elevation is 1,347MSL. The distance from Runway 18/36 to the closest building on the proposed site is approximately 950 ft.

Planning Areas 5 and 6, and the western portion of Planning Area 4 lie to the west of the Building Restriction Line (BRL) established in accordance with FAR Part 77 criteria. Buildings to be constructed within Planning Areas 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 on the proposed site are restricted to those portions of the site east of the BRL. The BRL does not extend into or lie adjacent to Planning Area 1.

The applicant received the Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation from the FAA with the condition that the structure be marked and/or lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1K. As of the date of this staff report (8/06), no comments from Cal Trans Aeronautics have been received.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends continuance of the item until October in order to obtain comments from Cal Trans Aeronautics.

ACTION TAKEN: Continued with the group of consent items.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

A. RI-02-146 – Magnon Co. / Carter Redish – Consent item for approval

CASE NUMBER: RI-02-146 – Magnon Co. / Carter Redish
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: DRO 17023

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A proposal for 29,920 sq. ft. office building covering 16,290 sq. ft. on approximately 1.46 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The proposed site is situated east of Adams St. and south of Magnolia Avenue within the City of Riverside, and approximately 3,400 ft. southeast of Runway 9/27 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area: TPZ
b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The site is located approximately 3,400 ft. southeast of Runway 9/27 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE (TPZ) of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for an office building 16,290 sq. ft. on approximately 1.46 acres. The TPZ has no population density assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot. The lot coverage is less than 26% of the gross area. The present proposal would be consistent with that density and the plan.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 803 MSL feet and the maximum building height is 32 feet. The site is within the horizontal surface at this location, and is well below the horizontal surface elevation of 966 MSL.

Noise: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report.

ACTION TAKEN: Approved as a group of consent items.

B. RI-02-148 MAPCO – Consent item for approval

CASE NUMBER:	RI-02-148 MAPCO
APPROVING JURISDICTION:	City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.:	Parcel Map 30663

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A two lot residential Parcel Map on a .53-acre lot.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The proposed site is situated north of Arlington Ave at 6442 Lake Street within the City of Riverside, and approximately 3,200 ft. southwest of Runway 16/24 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area: TPZ
b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The site is located approximately 3,200 ft. southwest of Runway 16/24 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE (TPZ) of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is a two lot residential Parcel Map on .53-acre parcel. The TPZ has no population density assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot. The proposed structures are approximately 25% of the gross area. The present proposal would be consistent with that density and the plan.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 735 MSL. The site is within the horizontal surface at this location, and is well below the horizontal surface elevation of 966 MSL.

Noise: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the proposed use with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report.

ACTION TAKEN: Approved as a group of consent items.

C. RI-02-149 – Nadel Architects – Consent item for approval

CASE NUMBER: RI-02-149 – Nadel Architects
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Conditional Use Permit

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Conditional Use Permit for a self-service fuel station of approximately 4,900 sq. ft. at an existing retail center.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The proposed site is located at the northwest corner of Van Buren Blvd and California Avenue within the City of Riverside, approximately 7,800 ft. southwest of Runway 16/34 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area: TPZ
b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The site is located approximately 7,800 ft. southwest of Runway 16/34 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE (TPZ) of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for a fuel station consisting of approximately 4,900 sq. ft. at an existing retail center. The present proposal would be consistent with the land use provisions outlined in the CLUP.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 757 MSL feet and the maximum height of the existing structure is approximately 18 feet. The site is within the horizontal surface at this location, and is well below the horizontal surface elevation of 966 MSL.

Noise: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.
2. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report.

ACTION TAKEN: Approved as a group of consent items.

Due to the meeting running ahead of schedule the Administrative Items were covered.

Chairman Cobb presented the consent items for 9:30 A.M. under March Air Reserve Base VI.D. MA-02-166, VI.F. MA-02-169, VI.G. MA-02-170, VI.H. MA-02-171, VI.I. MA-02-172, VI.J. MA-02-

173, French Valley Airport VI.L. FV-02-111, VI.M. FV-02-112, and Hemet Ryan Airport VI.O. HR-02-104. Staff recommends a finding of consistency on all items unless any of the Commissioners has a question or any one in the audience has a particular question on any of these items it will be pulled out and discussed separately.

Chairman Cobb asked for questions from the commissioners. Commissioner Tandy indicated item VI.D. MA-02-166 be pulled and handled separately. Counsel Miller indicated item VI.M. FV-02-112 be pulled and handled separately. Chairman Cobb then opened the floor for questions from the audience, upon hearing no response; he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to approve the consent items. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE

- D. MA-02-166-Steve Berzansky – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: MA-02-166-Steve Berzansky
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: PM 30783

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Parcel Map and proposal to subdivide approximately one acre into two parcels.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 1517 Jessamyn Court, east of Washington Street and north of Bradley Street, within the City of Riverside, approximately 34,000 ft. northwest of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base.

*Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area III
c. Noise Levels: See Below*

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC has been active in protecting the airport from intrusion since the inception of the Commission in the early 1970's. The first AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY USES ZONE (AICUZ) protection was initiated by a Board of Supervisors request in November of 1971. The original Interim Influence Area was designated in February of 1972 and was redrawn in 1975 based upon a 1972 AICUZ.

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. In April of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignments; however, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone created in 1986.

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The current 98/99 Draft CLUP

effort was prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

Since we have not adopted the CLUP for MARB, we will utilize five resources for our review:

1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
4. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is for a parcel map to subdivide approximately one acres into two 1/2-acre parcels. The existing site is vacant and zoned for residential uses. The proposal is near a major flight track and within the outer horizontal surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, the type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III, which allows residential land use. In The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property outside of the 60 CNEL. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The proposal is to subdivide the lot into two 1/2- acre parcels. No structures are proposed at this time.

Noise: The 1998 AICUZ indicated the noise level at the property to be less 55 CNEL. The site is zoned for residential use, which is an acceptable use with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 1170 MSL feet. An FAA 7460 review would be required for any structure exceeding 1,875 MSL. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)
2. Subsequent permits for the development of the proposed site shall be submitted to the ALUC for review.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project subject to the conditions outlined above.

Commissioner Tandy inquired if there is a possibility that it could be changed to commercial after the division is made. Beverly Coleman replied that one of the conditions of approval is that subsequent permit for the development should be submitted to the ALUC for review. Commissioner Tandy's concerned was if the project is changed to commercial what kind of effect would it have on the zone layer. Beverly Coleman requested the applicant to come forward.

Steve Berzansky came forward and clarified Commissioner Tandy's concerned. He indicated that the project site is completely residential and has no intention on making it commercial. Single family

detached homes will be built at the project site.

Keith Downs indicated that almost anything that is put on this particular site will be consistent with the CLUP including commercial, except built a tower over 200 ft.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners for the applicant. Hearing no response from the commissioners, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case, and after hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's and upon hearing no reply or response, he called for a motion to be set

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's and Conditions of Approval and recommendation. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

E. MA-02-168 Trevor Dodson/MDS Consulting/Communities Southwest – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: MA-02-168 Trevor Dodson/MDS Consulting / Communities Southwest
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Tract Map 30718 (Previous case MA-01-168 was Specific Plan Amendment and Change of Zone)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Tract Map of 288 lots on 100.12 acres

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is north of Siegal Ave., east of Barton Road and west of March Air Reserve Base/MIP.

*Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area II
c. Noise Levels: See Below*

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC has been active in protecting the airport from intrusion since the inception of the Commission in the early 1970's. The first AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY USES ZONE (AICUZ) protection was initiated by a Board of Supervisors request in November of 1971. The original Interim Influence Area was designated in February of 1972 and was redrawn in 1975 based upon a 1972 AICUZ.

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. In April of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignment; however, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone created in 1986.

1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land

Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft, which was based upon the 1983 Caltrans Handbook. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The 98/99 Draft CLUP effort was prepared utilizing the 1994 Draft, and the 1998 AICUZ noise data in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook. The current countywide effort we have begun with the balance of the airports will not include an update to the Airport, but we are pursuing separate funding for that portion.

Since we have not adopted the CLUP for MARB, we utilize four resources for our review:
The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993
Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994 and 98/99
Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 4,800- 10,500 feet west of the north end of Runway 14-32. The proposal consists of a change that would allow 288 additional homes on 100.12 acres (2.9/acre). The proposal is underlying two approach tracks and near others within the conical surface. The previous designation of 'Manufacturing Park' was compatible with the CLUP and the Commission found the proposal to change the area to Residential inconsistent.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, and noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, which allows commercial, industrial and agriculture, but allows no residential below lot sizes of two and one half acres. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property inside of the 60 CNEL.

Density and Coverage: The lots are approximately 7,200 to 29,000 sq. ft and overall coverage would likely be less than 50%.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is between 1,775 and 1,638 MSL feet and the maximum allowed building height is 35 feet. All of the area in the shaded portion of Exhibit "C" is an 'obstruction' and any structure within that area or within the added area would be an 'obstruction.' The applicant submitted a 'conceptual' FAA Notice to Construct review to the FAA for a response. Much of the project is within Part 77 obstruction criteria.

Noise: The site has been shown to have noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have from below 55 CNEL to above 60 CNEL. The inclusion of another 288 homes will likely result in 965 new residents (3.35 pph x 288 = 965). The predicted level of noise complaints from the project would likely produce a complaint level of 7% of that population (i.e. 68). Since the setting is a quiet suburban community that level is more likely to be 13-23% (125-222). This project would likely result in new complaints regarding noise from the airport.

Environmental: A preliminary noise report is attached. This report measured existing noise on midday December 21 for ten minutes at each site. The sites were on the eastern portion of the site.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the ALUC find the proposed Single-Family Tract Residential inconsistent with the 1984/86 Airport Land Use Plan.

APPENDIX

1984 RCALUP: The 1984 RCALUP with the 1986 map identifies the entire project as within AREA II.

Area II, Policy #2 states: “Area II shall have a minimum residential lot size of two and one-half acres. Agricultural, industrial and commercial uses are acceptable.” Policy #4 states: “New housing to be constructed within the noise level specified by the ALUC for each airport shall be soundproofed as necessary to achieve interior annual noise levels attributable to exterior sources, not to exceed 46 dB (CNEL of Ldn) in any inhabited room with windows closed.”

Conclusion: The proposed residential density is inconsistent with that proposal. The Matrix Table I identifies all applicable plans and whether the project is consistent with those plans’ criteria. The proposal is at a density ten times that designated in the 84/86 RCALUP.

The 1994 Draft CLUP for MAFB

The Draft 1994 plan defined the Traffic Pattern Zone outer boundary as the outer edge of the Military Part 77 Conical Surface. Most of the project is within that boundary as shown on Exhibit “C.”

The plan places the property within the 55+ CNEL. Section 7.3.1. (Page 7.4 first bullet states): “With the exception of transient lodgings (e.g., hotels and motels) and caretaker residences, all residential uses are considered incompatible with noise levels 60 dB CNEL. However, all residential uses could be conditionally compatible in the noise range between 60 and 65 dB CNEL, if appropriate noise attenuation measures are incorporated into the construction.

Conclusion: The eastern portion of the proposal as submitted would be inconsistent with the 1994 Draft to noise.

1998/99 Draft CLUP:

This DRAFT was an update to the 1994 document with changes proposed for components of the text and graphic illustrations depicting:

1. 1998 AICUZ Noise Contours.
2. 1999 adjusted Area I (APZ II) boundary on the north end, and
3. The addition of the 55 CNEL added to the graphic (1999).
4. Part 77 boundaries are more detailed.

CalTrans completed a “First Draft” of the text for review, but no further text has been completed, but the graphics were completed. The site is within the TPZ and High Risk Uses such as schools, hospitals, nursing homes, churches, auditoriums, and concert halls are discouraged. The text would require an acoustical analysis for all projects within the 60 CNEL.

Conclusion: The project as submitted would be inconsistent with the 98/99 Draft CLUP and would require acoustical analysis.

TABLE 1

<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>SAFETY</u>	<u>NOISE</u>	<u>PART 77</u>
1984 RCA.L.U.P.	Not Consistent	Not Consistent	Obstruction *
1994 Draft CLUP	Consistent	Not Consistent	Obstruction *
1998/99 Draft CLUP	Consistent	Not Consistent	Obstruction *

* Over eastern portion of property

CONDITIONS FOR OVERRIDE

Should the City of Riverside wish to pursue an overrule of the Commission (PUC 21675.1), the following conditions are recommended for inclusion:

1. An acoustical analysis shall be required that includes the following components:
 - a. A description of the components necessary to achieve a noise reduction level (NRL) of 25 for each of the project's components with noise sensitive uses
 - b. Inclusion of all surrounding noise sources (roadway, industrial) at their ultimate design and build out capacity.
 - c. Requiring additional noise insulation in each house to a NLR of 25.
2. Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.
3. Lighting plans for any additional development on the vacant lots shall be reviewed and approved by an Airport Lighting Consultant prior to placement.
4. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted. The following procedure shall be utilized in order to make a determination as to whether a project would result in such obstruction:
 - a. Any proposal for a variance in height limitations of the applicable zone, or for a plot plan or use permit proposing a greater height limit pursuant to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance shall be transmitted to the Riverside County ALUC staff for a determination of whether review by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission is required. The application for such a proposal shall also provide evidence to the Planning Department that the proposal has been submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration for review and comment relative to the provisions of FAR Part 77, or written documentation from the Federal Aviation Administration that such review is not required.
 - b. The Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a Form 7460 review, unless that agency determines in writing that such a review is not required or not applicable.
5. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use, which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft, engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.

- c. *Any use, which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which, may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
6. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*
7. *The environmental and sales information for this available for this project shall include the noise and flight track information.*

Keith Downs indicated that the Tract Map number submitted by the applicant had an error, which was 30718 and should have been 30717 and was advertised this way.

Chairman Cobb asked if the area is zoned other than residential. Keith Downs replied that he assumes the City has changed it from industrial to residential and overrode the Commission for this particular area other wise the tract would not be before the Commission. Counsel Miller indicated that the tract would not be allowed to proceed without companion of prior zoning change.

Vice Chairman Graff voiced his concerned with the mistake made by the applicant and how would the Commission protect them self's on the override with the wrong information. Counsel Miller inquired if the public notices that were sent to the property owners describe the property accurately. Keith Downs got a copy of the public notice and handed it to Counsel Miller. Counsel Miller then indicated that it is clear the tract number was a clerical error, but does identify the property correctly. Counsel Miller suggested the case should be continued for readvertisement, in order to protect the Commission.

Chairman Cobb called for further questions from the commissioner's. Hearing no reply or response from the Commissioner, Chairman Cobb open the floor for comments from the audience on the case, and after hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Graff made a motion to continue and readvertise the project, based on the clerical error made by applicant. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

F. MA-02-169 – La Habra Products – Consent item for approval.

CASE NUMBER: MA-02-169 – City of Riverside
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: SP-001-012 and RZ-003-012

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Specific Plan Amendment and Rezoning on two parcels totaling approximately 22.3 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated west of I-215, north of Alessandro Boulevard, and east of San Gorgonio Drive, within the County of Riverside, northwest of March Air Reserve Base.

*Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
 a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area*

b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area I, AICUZ Zone II
c. Noise Levels: See Below

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC has been active in protecting the airport from intrusion since the inception of the Commission in the early 1970's. The first AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY USES ZONE (AICUZ) protection was initiated by a Board of Supervisors request in November of 1971. The original Interim Influence Area was designated in February of 1972 and was redrawn in 1975 based upon a 1972 AICUZ.

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. In April of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignments: however, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone created in 1986.

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The current 98/99 Draft CLUP effort was prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

Since we have not adopted the CLUP for MARB, we will utilize four resources for our review:
The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993
Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 9,600 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The site consists of two vacant parcels totaling approximately 22.3 acres. The proposed zoning and specific plan amendment will place the site in the MP (Manufacturing Park) and Industrial land use designation. The proposal is underlying the Runway 14-32 PART 77 approach and departure tracks and within the approach surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B. The existing zoning is C-3, which allows many uses with less review.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, the type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area I, and would preclude residential uses. Industrial uses are allowed subject to certain constraints. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property inside of APZ Safety Zone II, and within the approach and departure profiles for Runway 14/32. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The lot is 22.3 acres (net) and there are no structures proposed at this time.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 1560 feet. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1688 to 1738 MSL feet in elevation. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project until a subsequent permit comes for review.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the noise level at the property to be 65 CNEL. Previous AICUZ

indicated that the noise level was as high as 80CNEL. The proposed use is not a noise sensitive use.

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to project development or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.
2. That any subsequent permits on the property be reviewed by the ALUC and the Airport Operator prior to construction.
3. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
4. The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project subject to the conditions outlined above.

ACTION TAKEN: Approved as a group of consent items.

G. MA-02-170 – Riverside County – Consent item for approval

CASE NUMBER: MA-02-170 – Riverside County
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: GP 009-012, RZ 021-012 and PD 004-023

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A General Plan Amendment, Change of Zone and Planned Unit Development for approximately 220 apartment units on 18.58 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 5100 Quail Run Road, east of Canyon Crest Drive, north of Central Avenue in the City of Riverside, approximately 25,000 ft. northwest of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

- | | | |
|----|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. | Airport Influence Area: | Within Area of Influence Study Area |
| b. | Land Use Policy: | Influence Area III |
| c. | Noise Levels: | See Below |

BACKGROUND:

Staff utilizes five resources for our review:

The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986

The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993

Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994

Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 25,000 feet northwest of Runway 14-32.

The proposal is for the development of approximately 220 apartment units on 18.58 acres. The existing site is zoned O (Open Space). The proposal includes a zone change to R-3 (Multifamily Residential). The proposal is under one major track and within the outer horizontal surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III, which allows residential land uses. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The site is 18.58 acres, and the structural coverage of the site is less than 25%.

Part 77: The finished floor elevations at the proposed site range from 1,180 to 1,204 MSL feet, and the maximum building height is 42 feet. Any structures over 1,785 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be outside the 55 CNEL and is near one major flight track. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise level was as high as 65CNEL.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act (Tel.909- 656-7000).
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Additional noise insulation shall be included in all homes within this subdivision to achieve at least an NLR of 25.
4. All prospective tenants shall be given a notice explaining the noise from the airport and overflights, and all tenants shall sign a notice informing them of the annoyance and that traffic will likely increase significantly in the future.

5. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends a finding of consistency of the project subject to the conditions noted above.*

ACTION TAKEN: *Approved as a group of consent items.*

- H. MA-02-171 – Raceway Ford – Consent item for approval

CASE NUMBER: *MA-02-171 – Raceway Ford*
APPROVING JURISDICTION: *City of Riverside*
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: *Specific Plan Amendment*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Construction of a 5,185 sq. ft. sales office and shop.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 5900 Sycamore Canyon Blvd., east of Lochmoor Dr., south of Box Springs Road, within the City of Riverside, approximately 15,800 ft. northwest of March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area II
c. Noise Levels: See Below

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC has been active in protecting the airport from intrusion since the inception of the Commission in the early 1970's. The first AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY USES ZONE (AICUZ) protection was initiated by a Board of Supervisors request in November of 1971. The original Interim Influence Area was designated in February of 1972 and was redrawn in 1975 based upon a 1972 AICUZ.

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. In April of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignments: however, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone created in 1986.

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The current 98/99 Draft CLUP effort was prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

Since we have not adopted the CLUP for MARB, we will utilize five resources for our review:

The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986

The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993

Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994

Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 15,800 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for construction of a 5,185 sq. ft. auto sales office and shop on 1.6 acres. The existing site is vacant and zoned for commercial use. The proposal is under one major track and within the outer horizontal surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, the type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, which allows commercial, industrial and agriculture, but allows no residential below lot sizes of two and one half acres. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property inside of the 60 CNEL. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The proposed site is 1.64 acres, or 71,610 (net). The proposed buildings will cover 5,185 sq. ft. of lot area. The structural coverage at the site will be less than 10%.

Part 77: The elevation at the site is approximately 1,513 MSL feet. The height of the proposed structure is 22 ft. Any structures over 1,693 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the noise level at the property to be 65 CNEL. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise level was as high as 80CNEL. The proposed use is not a noise sensitive use.

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to project development, recordation of the map or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport (Tel.909- 656-7000).
2. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to insure the interior noise level are at or below 45-decibel levels.

4. *Lighting plans for any additional development on the vacant lots shall be reviewed and approved by the airport operator or an airport lighting consultant prior to placement.*
5. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project subject to the conditions outlined above.*

ACTION TAKEN: Approved as a group of consent items.

I. MA-02-172- Riverside Canaan Church – Consent item for approval

CASE NUMBER: MA-02-172- Riverside Canaan Church
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: CUP

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Conditional Use Permit for building addition to a church.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 2962 Madison Street, north of Freda Ave., south of Emerald Street in the City of Riverside, approximately 39,000 ft. northwest of the north end of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
a. *Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Area*
b. *Land Use Policy: Influence Area III*
c. *Noise Levels: See Below*

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC has been active in protecting the airport from intrusion since the inception of the Commission in the early 1970's. The first AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY USE ZONE (AICUZ) protection was initiated by a Board of Supervisors request in November of 1971. The original Interim Influence Area was designated in February of 1972 and was redrawn in 1975 based upon a 1972 AICUZ.

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. On April 26 of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignments; However, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone adjusted in 1986.

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The most current effort was an update of the 1994 Draft utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

*Since we have not adopted the CLUP, we will utilize five resources for our review:
The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base*

The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993
Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
98/99 Draft CLUP

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 39,000 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for expansion of an existing church facility, to include construction of a new 3,955 sq. ft. fellowship hall building and a 238 sq. ft. addition to an existing building. The proposal is within the outer horizontal surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B. The proposed addition would bring the building floor area total to 6,287 sq. ft.

The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft expected to use the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property outside of the Traffic Pattern Zone.

Density and Coverage: The lot area is 50,882 sq. ft. and the total building floor area, including existing and proposed structures is 6,287 sq. ft. The structural coverage of the lot will be less than 15%.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 880 MSL feet and the maximum building height is 45 feet. Any structure exceeding 1,925 MSL would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have less than 55 CNEL.

Other: The Traffic Pattern Zones (TPZ) of other CLUP's define facilities such as churches, amphitheatres, community halls, sports facilities, and outdoor lighting as 'discouraged uses' and require the evaluation of alternative sites.

Conclusion: The proposed project is consistent with all applicable plans. The matrix Table I identifies all the applicable plans and whether the project is consistent with or applicable to those plans' criteria.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the ALUC find the proposal consistent with the RCALUP, and is subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in this staff report.

APPENDIX:

1984 RCALUP: The 1984 RCALUP with the 1986 map identifies the project as within AREA III, which has no land use constraints other than noise and aviation easements.

The 1994 Draft CLUP for MAFB

The Draft 1994 plan defined the Traffic Pattern Zone outer boundary as the outer edge of the military PART 77 conical surface. None of the project is within that boundary. The plan places the property outside of the 60 CNEL.

Conclusion: The proposal would be consistent with or outside of the 1994 Draft for both safety and

noise.

1998/99 Draft CLUP:

This DRAFT is an update the 1994 document with changes proposed for components of the text and graphic illustrations depicting:

1. 1998 AICUZ Noise Contours.
2. 1999 adjusted area I (APZ II) boundary on the north end
3. The addition of the 55 CNEL added to the graphic (1999) and as the outside boundary of the plan
4. PART 77 boundaries.

The site is outside of the Traffic Pattern Zone and 55 CNEL. The text would require an acoustical analysis for all projects within the 60 CNEL.

Conclusion: The project as submitted would be consistent with or outside of the 98/99 Draft CLUP.

TABLE 1

<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>SAFETY</u>	<u>NOISE</u>
1984 RCA.L.U.P.	Consistent	Consistent
1994 Draft CLUP	Consistent*	Consistent*
1998/99 Draft CLUP	Consistent *	Consistent*

- Outside of Planning Boundary

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

3. Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.
4. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.
5. All building portions of the project shall be insulated so that the interior shall be at a 45 CNEL.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.

- d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
- 5. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*

ACTION TAKEN: Approved as a group of consent items.

J. MA-02-173 – KFC of America, Inc. – Consent item for approval

CASE NUMBER: MA-02-173 – KFC of America, Inc.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: DR-001-023 and CU-090-012

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Construction of a 3,370 sq. ft. drive-through restaurant on 14,442 sq. ft.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 5225 Canyon Crest Drive north of Central Ave., within the City of Riverside, approximately 27,500 ft. northwest of March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area III
c. Noise Levels: See Below

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC has been active in protecting the airport from intrusion since the inception of the Commission in the early 1970's. The first AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBILITY USES ZONE (AICUZ) protection was initiated by a Board of Supervisors request in November of 1971. The original Interim Influence Area was designated in February of 1972 and was redrawn in 1975 based upon a 1972 AICUZ.

In 1983 the ALUC redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1979 AICUZ. In April of 1984 the ALUC adopted the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan (RCALUP). In May of 1986 the ALUC again redrew the boundaries to reflect the 1983 AICUZ. In 1992 and again in 1998 the AICUZ reports were redone to reflect the mission changes of the two Base Realignment: however, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone created in 1986.

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The current 98/99 Draft CLUP effort was prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

*Since we have not adopted the CLUP for MARB, we will utilize five resources for our review:
 The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
 The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993
 Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
 Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
 Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 27,500 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for construction of a 3,370 sq. ft. drive-through restaurant on a 14,442 sq. ft. lot. The existing site is vacant and zoned for commercial use. The proposal is within the outer horizontal surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, the type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III, which allows commercial, residential, industrial and agriculture. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property inside of the 60 CNEL. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The proposed site is 14,442 sq. ft. (net). The proposed building will cover 3,370 sq. ft. of lot area. The structural coverage at the site will be less than 25%.

Part 77: The elevation at the site is approximately 1,112 MSL feet. The height of the proposed structure is approximately 25 ft. Any structures over 1,810 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have less than 55 CNEL, but previous AICUZ indicated higher noise levels.

CONDITIONS:

1. Prior to project development or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport (Tel.909-656-7000).
2. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to insure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.

4. The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project subject to the conditions outlined above.

ACTION TAKEN: Approved as a group of consent items.

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

K. FV-02-110 – Regency Centers – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: FV-02-110 – Regency Centers
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: CUP 03385

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Conditional Use Permit for a 142,000 sq. ft. retail shopping center on approximately 16 acres, to include a grocery store, three drive-through restaurants, a service station, car wash, beer and alcohol sales and six pads for business/commercial uses.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located north of Benton Road, east of Winchester Road, within the County of Riverside, from approximately 3,200 ft. to 4,400 ft. north of Runway 18/36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Outer Safety Zone (OSZ), and Emergency Touchdown Zone (ETZ)
b. Noise Levels: Inside 55 CNEL for year 2013

MAJOR ISSUES:

Noise: The current CLUP analysis was based upon flight tracks in the 1992-93 period of time. Newer contours indicate that the property is currently inside of the 55db CNEL. While the site currently is not within the 60 CNEL, it is likely that the airport at ultimate capacity will likely generate a 60 CNEL that will encroach upon some portion of the project. The CLUP indicates that non-noise sensitive commercial uses in the 60 CNEL are compatible.

Land Use: The proposed land use is commercial, and includes a grocery store, three drive-through restaurants, a service station, a car wash, beer and alcohol sales and six pads for business/commercial uses. The site is currently zoned Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S). As shown on Exhibit A, the proposed grocery store, two adjacent shops and a major retail pad (identified as Major 1) on the easterly portion of the site are located within the Outer Safety Zone (OSZ). According to information submitted by the applicant, up to 25% of shops, retail pads, and Major 1 square footage will be dedicated to restaurants engaging in the sale of beer, wine and spirits. Prohibited land uses within the OSZ include residences, public assembly uses, hotels, restaurants, bars, schools, hospitals, government services, public utility stations, plants, public communication facilities and uses involving, as the primary activity, manufacture, storage or distribution of explosives or flammable materials. The proposed service station, car wash, drive-through restaurants and three retail pads are within the Emergency Touchdown Zone (ETZ).

Structures, land uses involving concentrations of people, and significant obstructions are prohibited within the ETZ.

Density: The proposal is for 142,000 sq. ft. of commercial buildings on approximately 16 acres. Building coverage for the site is less than the OSZ standard of 25% (net). The maximum population density within the OSZ is 25 persons per acre for uses in structures. There is no maximum density requirement within the ETZ, since land uses involving concentrations of people are prohibited. The maximum population density for the entire site based on the OSZ standard is 400. However, if the standard is applied to the portion of the site within the OSZ only (approximately 8 acres), the maximum density is limited to 200 for the buildings/uses that fall within the OSZ. The CLUP provides a methodology for estimating the population density using occupancy requirements established by the building code, however this information was not available at the time of this staff report. Based on the proposed number of parking spaces for the project (776), a population density of 970 persons (1.25 persons per space) has been estimated for the entire site. Based on the square footage and proposed uses of the buildings, over half of this density would apply to the buildings/uses within the OSZ.

Height: The finished floor elevations of the proposed buildings range from 1342 to 1347.5 MSL. The proposed height of the tallest structure is 40 feet. The proposed site is located within the Part 77 approach surface overlying this area at 1435 to 1460 MSL. The runway elevation is 1347MSL.

The applicant has submitted an FAA 7460 Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration to the FAA for review. At the time of the staff report writing (9/10/02) the FAA 7460 review had not been received. Comments on the proposal from Cal Trans Aeronautics have also not been received.

Other: There is a GPS approach over the site (non-precision). A 34:1 approach would typically place an approaching aircraft 200+ feet over the proposed site.

The entire proposed site is located within Specific Plan 106 (Dutch Village). Policies described in Section 7.4 of the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), included as Exhibit B to this staff report, provide for the exemption of projects located within adopted specific plans from all requirements of the CLUP pertaining to land use, development density and development intensity. However, Section 7.4.1 through 7.4.3.d require that certain land use restrictions and height standards specified in the CLUP shall be applicable to development approvals within adopted specific plans.

The land use and height standards of the CLUP applicable to the proposed project are shown in the table below:

A	B	C
	LAND USE AND HEIGHT STANDARDS	
SAFETY ZONE	Applicable Standards for Project Located Within Adopted Specific Plan	Applicable Standards if Project Was Not Located Within Adopted Specific Plan (For Comparison Purposes)

ETZ	Exempt from CLUP requirements applicable to land use, development density, and development intensity. However, development approval is subject to certain land use restrictions (Table 7 A, Notes A & B), sound insulation (Section 7.3.1) and height standards (FAR Part 77) set forth in the CLUP.	Structures, Uses Involving Concentrations of People, Significant Obstructions are Prohibited. Max. Density – 0 Max. Structural Coverage – 0 Max. Height – F.A.R. Part 77 standards apply
OSZ	Exempt from CLUP requirements applicable to land use, development density, and development intensity. However, development approval is subject to certain land use restrictions (Table 7 A, Notes A & B) and height standards (FAR Part 77) set forth in the CLUP.	Residences, concert halls, auditoriums, stadiums, arenas, hotels, motels, restaurants, bars, schools, hospitals, government services, public utility stations, plants, public communication facilities and uses involving, as the primary activity, manufacture, storage or distribution of explosives or flammable materials are prohibited. Max. Density- 25 persons/ac. (in structures) 50 persons/ac. (not in structures). Max. Structural Coverage– 25% of net area. Max. Height – F.A.R. Part 77 standards apply

Land Use Restrictions Applicable to Projects Within Approved Specific Plans (Notes From Table 7A of French Valley Airport CLUP):

A. The following uses shall be prohibited in all airport safety zones:

- (1) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
- (2) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
- (3) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
- (4) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
- (5) Avigation easements shall be secured through dedication for all land uses permitted in any safety zone.

Conclusion:

Those portions of the proposal that are within the ETZ are inconsistent with the standards of the French Valley Airport CLUP pertaining to land use, development density and development intensity. Those portions of the proposal that are within the OSZ are inconsistent with the standards of the CLUP pertaining to land use and development density. According to Section 7.4 of the CLUP, projects located within adopted specific plans are exempted from the standards of the CLUP pertaining to land use, development density and development intensity. The entire proposal is within SP 106, and is therefore exempt from the standards of the CLUP pertaining to land use, development density and development intensity that would be otherwise applicable.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends continuance of this item until October in order to obtain comments on the proposal from Cal Trans Aeronautics and the FAA 7460 review.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: For County utilization

Provide Aviation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to development of the project, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.

Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).

1. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
2. The above ground storage of flammable materials shall be prohibited.
5. All structures must comply with F.A.R. Part 77 height standards.
6. Any noise sensitive uses shall be prohibited.
7. Uses which include residences, concert halls, auditoriums, stadiums, arenas, hotels, motels, restaurants, bars, schools, hospitals, government services, public utility stations, plants, public communication facilities shall be prohibited.
8. Any subsequent permit on the property shall be reviewed by the ALUC and the Airport Operator prior to construction.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Graff inquired that if this item is continued to next month's meeting and is found inconsistent they are exempt from the CLUP. Beverly Coleman replied yes it is exempt because it is within the adoption of the specific plan. Commissioner Pratt inquired if the project is found inconsistent by the commission is it possible for another agency to approve it. Keith replied if the project were found inconsistent the local jurisdiction would require doing an override.

A discussion then ensued between Commissioner Bell and Keith Downs regarding Bell's concern of the overriding of the plan and who was responsible for giving the exemption. Keith Downs replied that this project as well as others submitted the exemption clause that was adopted by his predecessors. Keith Downs indicated that this plan is the only one that has an extensive of a clause no others do, Hemet has one that implies something similar but not as clear as this plan. Commissioner Bell then inquired if the plans could be changed. Keith replied the plan can be changed once a year and all plans are being review now, he also suggested this clause should have some examination.

Chairman Cobb called for further questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response from the Commissioners, he requested the applicant to come forward and present the case. Upon hearing no response or reply, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case, and after hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's, and upon hearing no reply or response, he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to continue the project, subject to staff's recommendation for continuance to next schedule meeting of October 17, 2002 in order to obtain comments from Cal Trans Aeronautics and the FAA 7460 review. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

L. FV-02-111 Donahue Schriber Realty – Consent item for approval

CASE NUMBER: *FV-02-111 Donahue Schriber Realty*
APPROVING JURISDICTION: *County of Riverside*
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: *Plot Plan 17984*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A request for a Plot Plan that consists of a retail food shopping center with a supermarket, 2 restaurants and gas station totaling 92,755 sq. ft.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located north of Murrieta Hot Springs Road, east of Winchester Road (SR79), west of Sky Canyon Road approximately 4000 feet to 5300 feet south of the south end of Runway No. 18-36 at French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area
c. Noise Levels: Outside of the current 55CNEL but would get considerable overflight

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: This Master Plan affecting this property (Silver Hawk) was approved in 1987 prior to the adoption of the Interim Airport Influence Area 1989 and the adoption of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan in 1996. This proposal would implement a planning area of 12 acres of commercial. The TPZ does not have any residential density restrictions, but lot coverage is restricted to 50% of the gross or 65% of the net. The coverage indicated on the CUP plan is 92,755 sq. ft. which is 19% of the gross acreage of 11.23 acres. This project would come under the exemption provision of the CLUP.

The maximum allowable occupancy of all of the structures is approximately 3,000 people, which would result in a density of 267 people per acre. The parking lot has 499 spaces, which could produce a maximum normal population of approximately 750 – 1500 people (1.5 – 3 people per car) and produce a population density of 70 – 133 per acre.

Part 77: The highest pad site for any structure is at 1137 MSL and the tallest structure indicated is 36 ft. These elevations are all below the runway elevation of 1347 MSL. Any structures exceeding these heights should be reviewed by the ALUC.

Noise: The site is outside of the current 55 CNEL, but will receive considerable overflight of aircraft departing and landing at the airport, which will cause some annoyance to occupants. This when coupled with future noise levels from the expected increase in operations at the airport may cause the need for additional noise reduction levels (NLR) for any sensitive uses. The exterior noise levels cannot be mitigated for aircraft noise.

Conclusion:

The land uses associated with the Plot Plan are consistent with the French Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) and will not have a significant effect on the Airport subject to the following conditions of approval:

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Prior to the development of the above project, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the French Valley Airport.
2. Schools, amphitheatres, auditoriums, churches and stadiums are prohibited in this area.
3. All poles exceeding eight feet in height should have frangible attachments at the base.
4. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. All outdoor lighting shall be hooded or shielded to prevent either spillage of lumens shall be reflections into the sky (downward facing).
6. Signs for this project should be approved by the planning department and Aviation department prior to any development of the site.
7. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational

signal light or visual approach slope indicator.

- b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
8. The establishment of new land uses involving, as a primary activity, the manufacture, storage, or distribution of explosives or flammable materials are prohibited in this area; however, said prohibition does not apply to service stations involving retail sale of motor vehicle fuel if fuel storage tanks are installed underground. The manufacture, storage, or distribution of explosives or flammable materials in the course of operation of existing businesses, with the above exceptions, is strongly discouraged in this area.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of consistency with the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan on this project subject to the conditions of approval noted above.

ACTION TAKEN: Approved as a group of consent items.

- M. FV-02-112 – Sage Community Group – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: FV-02-112 – Sage Community Group
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Tentative Parcel Map 30629
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Parcel Map for three lots and a remainder parcel for proposed commercial/ industrial/open space use on 71.8 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located east of Tualota south of Borel Road, west of Calistoga Drive, approximately 1,800 to 3,800 ft. southeast of the Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ), Inner Safety Zone (ISZ), Outer Safety Zone (OSZ) and Extended Touchdown Zone (ETZ) of the primary and secondary runways
b. Noise Levels: Within the 55CNEL for 2013 from the Master Plan

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is for a three lot Tentative Parcel Map for a commercial/industrial use

(29 acres gr. 20 acres net) with a remainder parcel (41 acres gr.) in open space. No specific usage is proposed at this time. The lot coverage standard for the TPZ is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross. The TPZ only has restrictions for 'discouraged' uses. Prohibited uses in the OSZ include petroleum, explosives, or above grade power lines, hotels, residential, restaurants, schools, auditoriums and public utility or communication stations. The zoning for the site is restricted light industrial under Specific Plan 213. Subsequent permits would need a further review when they are submitted. The 'exemption' clause in the current CLUP would apply to this property since it is part of a Specific Plan. Most of the parcel is in open space with most of the developed parcel in the outer Safety Zone of the proposed secondary runway as shown on exhibit B. A small portion of the Area is within the ETZ of the secondary runway and within the ISZ of the primary runway.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the property to be developed is 1285 MSL. The horizontal surface is 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 MSL. The remainder of the site is either under the transitional surface, which ranges between 1450 - 1499 MSL, or the horizontal surface at 1500 MSL. The distance from the ultimate end of Runway 18/36 to the northwest corner of the proposed site is approximately 1,800 ft. Any future structures over the height of 1360 MSL proposed on the site may require FAA review.

Conclusion:

The proposal is consistent with the French Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) and will not have a significant effect on the Airport subject to the following conditions of approval:

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, prior to recordation of any map, or issuance of any permit, whichever is first for the entire map including the remainder.
2. Any subsequent use proposed shall be reviewed by the ALUC.
3. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.
4. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).
5. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

6. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*
7. *The uses listed shall not be allowed: hotels, motels, restaurants, schools auditoriums, stadiums, amphitheatres, public utility stations and public communication stations.*
8. *Any Environmental or sales documentation shall include in the text and shall depict in any graphic form the constraints of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends a finding of consistency with the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan on this project subject to the conditions of approval noted above.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Pratt asked for clarification on the secondary runway whether it 's an extension or the existing runway. Keith Downs replied that a current safety extension for the airport is to move the fence and railroad further south and the expected construction of the safety extension would be next year. Hearing no further comments from the Commissioners Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Robert Klotz, Attorney came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation and indicated he represents Pulte Home Corporation the master developer and Sage Community Group who is the manager of this project. Robert Klotz asked if the Commissioners received his correspondence. Counsel B.T. Miller clarified that the correspondence was received.

Robert Klotz stated that the proposed conditions are in direct violation of the terms of the exemption that applies to this property. The conditions are in violation of the CLUP and insist for them to be removed.

Robert Klotz indicated he was Counsel of the Commission for some eight years and wrote the exemption provision. The project specific plan 213 was design and completed accordance with what was in the land use plan that accommodated the airport and was adopted by the commission. The longer term planning process began and the new plan that was ultimately adopted was proposed. In the mean time the property owner had invested sixty million dollars in this project. It was felt unfair to impose different restrictions on the property after the fact, which is the reason why this exemption exists.

Robert Klotz then started examining the Conditions of Approval starting with #7 and stated that it list a set of uses which are prohibited. In the Comprehensive Land Use Plan there are no such uses that are prohibited. This property is specifically exempt from all the land use restrictions everything concerning intensity, density or use. The Conditions of Approval numbers 4,6,7 are all in violation of the CLUP.

Robert Klotz then indicated that the commission has adopted a Land Use Plan. The Commissions role is to formulate a Land Use Plan and submit it to the cities and counties that have land use jurisdictions. Once the Plan has been submitted the commissions review authority terminates entirely, in this situation it hasn't because the county has not incorporated the Land Use Plan into its General Plan. The Commission continues to have limited review authority, which is solely limited to finding consistency or inconsistency with the adopted plan. The commission is not allowed to condition the projects any more than they are allowed to approve them or disapprove them.

The ALUC is determined by statue it cannot be expanded by any conditions imposed or suggested by staff. Mr. Klotz indicated the consequences would be the removal of all review authority from the commission.

Mr. Klotz wrapped up his comments referring to the final condition, which is associated with real estates transactions. Mr. Klotz indicated that the commission has no authority under any circumstances to condition for such a matter and nothing like that is included within the CLUP.

Counsel B.T. Miller indicated that Mr. Klotz letter was received this morning and was unable to analyze it and provide the commission with his input. Counsel stated he would need some time to review Mr. Klotz legal position with regard to the authority of the commission, expressed today and on his letter and be able to advise the commission accordingly.

Chairman Cobb opened the floor for further comments from the audience or staff.

Keith Downs concurred with Counsel having some time to formulate a response.

Commissioner Pratt indicated Temecula imposes on any development that is coached on that particular runway.

Upon hearing no further comments or discussion from the Commissioner's, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion to continue the case for the next schedule meeting of October 17, 2002. Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

HEMET RYAN AIRPORT

- N. HR-02-103 – City of Hemet – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: HR-02-103
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Hemet
JURISDICTION CASE NO: GPA 02-01

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Amend the General Plan, Public Health and Safety Element (8), to incorporate the most recent California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics' 2002 California Airport Land use Planning Handbook guidelines for land use compatibility in areas around airports.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The entire Airport Influence Area which is situated northerly of Simpson Avenue, southerly of Eaton Avenue, west of Palm Avenue and easterly of the section line dividing Sections 2 and 3, 10 and 11, 14 and 15, and 22 and 23 within the City of Hemet for Hemet/Ryan Airport. The attached map of the CLUP boundaries indicate the affected area.

Adjacent Airport: Hemet-Ryan Airport
Land Use Policy: CLUP 1989: Adopted by City of Hemet and County of Riverside

- a. Airport Influence Area: All three areas: Area III, Area of Moderate Risk; Area II, Area of High Risk; and Area I, Area of Extreme Risk
b. Noise Levels: All
c. Height Issues: Not addressed at this time

MAJOR ISSUES: The basis for the ALUC's review of any proposal is whether it is consistent with the Adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan for that airport, assuming one has been adopted. The Hemet/Ryan airport has had Land Use Plans since 1982 and with an update in 1987 and document

reprinted in 1992.

As you know, the ALUC has obtained a state grant to update the land use plan for all of the airports within or affecting the county. Our consultants are in the 'information gathering' stage of the project at this time. A number of the plans will be developed from Master Plans being prepared for the airports at this time and these include: Palm Springs International, Chino Municipal, Desert Resorts, Regional and Hemet/Ryan. Until these Master Plan are adopted by the airport operator the new Airport Land Use Plan cannot move much beyond this stage. All of these Plans are currently being developed, but none are at the draft stage as of this date. The ALUC will review this Master Plan as part of its statutory obligation when they are available. According to the county, the Master Plan for Hemet/Ryan airport is nearing completion, pending resolution with the state and FAA regarding sailplane and runway issues.

The applicant for this case, the City of Hemet, has filed a General Plan Amendment to amend their Public Health and Safety Element to incorporate the tables from the 2002 Handbook into that element. At this time no change to the map is proposed. The current General Plan for the City reflects and incorporates the Adopted Plan Since the proposal is not consistent with the currently adopted plan, it cannot be found consistent.

RECOMMENDATION: *At this time staff recommends a finding of inconsistency for the proposal or a continuance until such time that the updated plan is available.*

Keith Downs indicated that at the request of commissioner Tandy staff recommends a continuance to the next schedule meeting of October 17, 2002 in order to obtain the environmental documentation associated with this case from the staff.

Chairman Cobb asked for the applicant to come forward.

David Sawyer, Principal Planner from the City of Hemet came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation and indicated the purpose of the application. The purpose is to bring the section of the Airport Land Use compatibility section into compliance with the most recent adopted Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. Mr. Sawyer stated that they are ready to move forward with this particular item and a continuance would not do the City any good.

Mr. Sawyer inquired what the continuance was based on. Keith Downs replied that an environmental assessment, negative declaration, and environmental impact whatever environmental information would need to go with this item. Mr. Sawyer then indicated that the city is adopting an addendum to the original plan EIR. Those documents will be available to the public this Friday and is the route Hemet will be taking for the environmental review. Commissioner Tandy interjected that she expects to have that information on her desk by Friday.

Chairman Cobb asked for questions from the Commissioners, hearing no response from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case.

Dan Mc Kinney representing a group of pilots at the airport came forward and indicated public utility code section 21676 is required to be presented to the board for consideration. The amendment to the general plan is not consistent with the Commissions Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The City of Hemet is willing to go forward with the change to their safety element, which is different from the existing Hemet Ryan Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan. They are changing the risk zones and the identifications of what uses will be allowed in those risk zones without waiting for the ALUC to catch up with them. Mr. Mc Kinney opposes to this because the 1992 Comprehensive Land Use Plan was a comprehensive effort where land planner in Hemet, land owners, and pilots got together and decided what land uses where going to be allowed and was adopted. This Comprehensive

Land Use Plan is this committee's land use plan and incorporated word for word into the Hemet general plan. Hemet recognizes these are the uses that are going to be allowed in the region that is influence by the airport. Hemet wants to move forward primarily with commercial development and these are efforts to try and allowed uses encroaching on the airport with or without the commission's considerations of those uses.

The 2002 CALUP Handbook is suppose to be the fundamental tool to be used by the Airport Land Use Commission. It is the Commission's compatibility that dictates these uses not the Cities determination to what it's general and specific plans are going to be that dictate the uses in this area. Chapter 9 of the CALUP Handbook has a very extensive discussion of the uses that are to be considered in this area. Hemet has summarized all the risks by taking the tables of the CALUP Handbook that identifies the risks and incorporated them into their general plan. They assume that the only risks will be single engine planes and don't consider table 9 which was not included in there safety element. Table 9 describes airports with special uses such as firefighting equipment, egg planes and gliders. Hemet is ignoring the special considerations of the safety zones and using the standard table. Hemet's Plan must be consistent with the Commission's Plan in order to make a finding, but it cannot be done until the Commission finishes with their plan.

Commissioner Tandy commented that this has not gone through the City Council yet.

David Sawyer inquired for the projected date of completion for the Hemet Ryan Airport Land Use Plan. Keith replied that there is one of thirteen and will not be individually done there will be a text that applies to all, a draft might be available by spring and completion about the end of 2003.

Chairman Cobb asked for any more questions from the audience on the case, and after hearing no response or reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's, upon hearing no reply or response, he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Graff made a motion to continue the case to the next scheduled meeting of October 17, 2002. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

HR-02-104 VERIZON – Consent item for approval

CASE NUMBER: HR-02-104 VERIZON
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PP17729

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a 69' monopalm Communication Tower.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated northerly of the Florida Avenue and east of Calvert Avenue and 12,000 feet northwesterly of the west end of Runway 5-23 for Hemet/Ryan Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Hemet-Ryan Airport
Land Use Policy: CLUP adopted
a. Airport Influence Area: Area III (Area of Moderate Risk)
b. Noise Levels: Outside 55CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: The proposed site is located on a small hill (40-50') approximately 12,000 feet west of the west end of Runway 5-23. The proposed site is within Area III (Area of Moderate Risk) of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Influence Area. Area III has no population density limits assigned to it, but requires a discretionary review for uses over 35' in height.

NOISE: The site is not near a traffic pattern for Runway 5-23 and is not a noise sensitive use.

PART 77: The height the structure is 62' not including the 'fronds', which will extend another 7 feet from a surface elevation of approximately 1624+MSL for a total height of 1693MSL. The PART 77 conical surface is overlying this area at approximately 1722MSL. Any structure over 1632MSL needs an FAA 7460 review.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: For the county to utilize.

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Hemet-Ryan Airport prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
3. That a FAA 7460 review be completed prior to action on this proposal.
4. The tower shall be lighted in accordance with LAC 70/7460 1K Change 1.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of consistency of the proposal with the Hemet /Ryan Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

ACTION TAKEN: Approved as a group of consent items.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. County of Riverside RCIP

Keith Downs referred to the letter Chairman signed and the group sent to the Board of Supervisors. As of now has not received any response or request to review the new plan, it may be time to designate counsel to send a letter. Counsel Miller indicated that there has been some communication attempted to prompt some action on this matter for him self and Counsel that represent the County. Commissioner Bell then interjected if it would be of any value if they spoke to the people who appointed the commission. Keith replied it would be if they were Board of Supervisors.

B. CLUP Update: Status

Keith Down illustrating the progress being made on a map for Riverside Municipal Airport.

C. FV-02-108 Reconsideration

Keith Down indicated that this items is Commissioner Pratt's request to have FV-02-108 Grace Presbyterian Church be reconsidered. It would need four votes to reconsider it and bring back in October or November.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Pratt made a motion to bring back FV-02-108 Presbyterian church. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Commissioner Bell Opposed on the case. Motion carried unanimously.

VIII. ORAL COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA.

None.

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Counsel Miller suggested that an asterisk could be added next to the consent items on the agenda it self. Keith Downs replied that the asterisk would be put next to the cases that would be consider for consent and at the end of the agenda next to the Consent Item that reads The Commission may act on any item set for its approval as a "Consent Item" if no Commissioner or member(s) of the audience have comment as to the item.

Commissioner Tandy commented that the request to speak forms should be emphasized ahead of time for the audience.

Vice Chairman Graff inquired if there is any time limit on the speakers. Counsel Miller replied that he would have to review the rules because does not recall any time limitations.

- X. ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Cobb asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:49 a.m. Commissioner Tandy motioned to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Pratt seconded the motion. NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: October 17, 2002 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside.