

# AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

Housing Authority  
5555 Arlington Avenue (1<sup>st</sup> Floor)  
Riverside, California

**THURSDAY, December 9, 2004**  
**9:00 A.M.**

## MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on December 9, 2004 at the Housing Authority 1<sup>st</sup> Floor.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Ric Stephens, Chairman  
Dave Hogan, Vice Chairman  
Jon Goldenbaum  
Lyle Alberg  
Mark Lightsey  
Simon Housman  
Arthur Butler

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Sam Pratt  
Marge Tandy

STAFF PRESENT: Keith Downs, Executive Director  
Beverly Coleman, Development Specialist III  
B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel  
Ken Brody, (Consultant)  
Jackeline Gonzalez

OTHERS PRESENT: John Lyon  
Harry Tancredi  
Diane Jenkins  
Mark Kranenburg  
Bob Beers  
Pete Dangermond  
Steve Adams  
Tom Mathews  
Gerard Martorano  
Steve Tancredi  
Jack Robson  
Justin Cook  
Doug Evans

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairman Stephens.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR: Due to the minutes not being available they were continued to the next scheduled hearing.

V. OLD BUSINESS

**BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

A. BD-04-107 – Robert H. Ricciardi – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** BD-04-107 – Robert H. Ricciardi

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Plot Plan 19257

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A plot plan for a 8,172 sq. ft. industrial building on .758 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located east of Adams Street, south of Country Club Drive in the County of Riverside, immediately north of the Bermuda Dunes Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport  
Land Use Policy: Area I and II*

- a. Airport Influence Area: Area II*
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area*
- c. Noise Levels: 70 dB CNEL (2003 Noise Data: Mead and Hunt)*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

*Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 100 to 150 feet north of the runway and is within Areas I (Approach Surface) and II (Area of Significant Safety Concern) of the current Airport Influence Area. The Approach Surface shall be kept free of all high-risk land uses, such as places of assembly, high patronage services, large retail outlets, residential uses, critical facilities and flammable products. Agricultural, industrial and commercial uses are acceptable in Area II. The proposed industrial use is an acceptable use subject to certain constraints.*

*NOISE: The proposal is within 70 CNEL as indicated by the 2003 Existing Noise Impacts Data for Bermuda Dunes Airport prepared by Mead and Hunt. The industrial use is acceptable in that noise category if noise reduction measures are utilized for any office portion of the building. That may require more than normal construction, which only attenuates about 20dB.*

*HEIGHT: Part 77 approach profiles are shown on the attached exhibit and overlie the property. The runway elevation is 73 feet. Based on information submitted by the applicant, the highest elevation on the proposed site is 71.54 MSL at the southwest corner. The height of the proposed structure is 24 feet. An application for an FAA 7460 review of the proposed building was submitted by the applicant to the FAA. **Two FAA Determinations of No Hazard to Air Navigation for the proposed structure were received by the owner of the development and are attached. The FAA study concluded that the structure is identified as an obstruction by exceeding the standards in FAR Part 77, but would have no adverse impact on visual flight operations nor would it impact existing or planned minimum instrument flight procedures or altitudes.***

**Draft Plan** : The draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan designates the site to be within Zones A and B2 and within the 55 CNEL contour. The proposed use is a compatible use under the new plan subject to certain constraints.

**Conclusion:** The proposed industrial use is consistent with the land use policies of the 1986 Airport Land Use Plan for Bermuda Dunes Airport. The FAA has determined that the proposed structure would have no adverse impact on visual flight operations, instrument flight procedures or altitudes.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the Conditions listed below.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act and prior to recordation of the map, whichever is first.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portion of any 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 (lights must be downward facing).
4. The following uses are prohibited at this site:
  - A. High Concentration of People
    1. Places of Assembly: Auditoriums; churches; schools, carnivals; drive-in theaters.
    2. High Patronage Services: Bowling alleys; restaurants; theaters; motels; banks; etc.
    3. Large Retail Outlets: Department stores; supermarkets; drug stores; etc.
    4. Residential Uses.
  - B. Critical Facilities: Telephone exchanges; radio/television studios; hospitals; etc.
  - C. Flammable Products: Bulk fuel storage; gasoline and liquid petroleum service stations; manufacture of plastics; breweries; feed and flour mills; etc.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Any subsequent permit shall require an ALUC review.
  8. The building in this project shall have an active FAA 7460 review at the time of construction and shall not exceed obstruction standards. The top of the structure shall not exceed 96 MSL feet.
  9. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.

Beverly Coleman indicated this item being continued for several months due to the FAA review. That review has been received and staff recommends a finding of consistency.

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no response he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Vice Chairman Hogan made a motion of consistency, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendation. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE**

**9:00 A.M.**

- B. MA-04-144 – Pinnacle Real Estate Holdings, Inc. – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-04-144 (revision to MA-02-145) Travel Zone  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** CUP 3370

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**  
*A Conditional Use Permit for a full service travel stop with retail on approximately 11.5 acres and a sign 70' high.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**  
*The site is situated south of Cajalco Road and west of Harvill Ave., within the County of Riverside, approximately 9,000 ft. south of the south end of RWY 14/32 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 three 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. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
4. Draft 2004 ALUCP

#### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 9,000 feet south of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for a Conditional Use Permit on 11.5 acres. The proposed use includes a truck stop with retail. The proposal is near one flight track and within the conical 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 and industrial land use with a few restrictions. Industrial uses are allowed subject to certain constraints. 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 11.5 acres (net). The proposal includes 31,789 sq. ft of buildings and about 54,000 sq. ft. of canopies on 11.5 acres. The structural coverage for the structure will be less than 22%.

Part 77: The elevation at the site is approximately 1,509-1,525 feet. The height of the tallest building is 22.5 ft. The runway end is at 1488MSL and any structures over 1,578 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. The sign will be over that elevation Part 77 obstruction criteria are 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 less 55 CNEL. Previous AICUZ indicated that the noise level was as high as 60CNEL. 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 avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.

(Tel.909- 656-7000)

2. An FAA Part 77 review shall be accomplished and any conditions required shall be met.
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:** October 14, Staff recommended a continuance until the FAA review is complete.

**November 18, 2004:** The FAA review is not complete and the case must be continued until December 9, 2005.

**December 9, 2004:** The FAA review is not complete and the case must be continued until January 13, 2005.

Keith Downs requested continuance for the item, pending 7460 review from the FAA.

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no response he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Housman made a motion of continuance, subject to staff's recommendation. Vice Chairman Hogan seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## FLABOB AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

- C. FL-04-103 – Emerald Meadows Ranch – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:**

FL-04-103 – Emerald Meadows Ranch

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:**

County of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:**

Specific Plan 337, Change of Zone 6893 and GPA 679

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is a mixed-use Specific Plan to include 20.4 acres of retail/commercial, 1,239 residential units along with parks, school and church facilities on 278.45 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located west of the Santa Ana River and south of SR 60 in the County of Riverside, from approximately 3,600 to 7,900 feet northeast of Runway 9-24 at Flabob Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Flabob Airport  
Land Use Policy: ALUP adopted March 30, 1984

- a. Airport Influence Area: Zone III
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area
- c. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

**Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 3,600 to 7,900 ft. northeast of Runway 9-24. The southern half of the proposed site is located within Area III of the adopted Flabob Airport Influence Area. The project is a mixed-use Specific Plan to include 1,239 residential units and 20.4 acres of retail/commercial uses, along with parks, elementary school and church facility on approximately 278.45 acres. Most of the commercial area (Planning Area 17) and approximately 2/3 of the proposed elementary school site (Planning Area 4) falls within Area III. The proposed church site (Planning Area 1) is located outside of Area III. The General Plan Amendment proposes to change the site's General Plan land use designation from Light Industrial, Medium High Density Residential, Recreation, Commercial Retail, Water, and Very High Density Residential to Medium, Medium-High, High and Very-High Density Residential, along with Commercial Retail. The Change of Zone proposes to change the zoning classification from A-1 (Light Agricultural), R-2A (Limited Multiple Family Dwellings), R-1 (One-Family Dwellings), R-2 (Multiple-Family Dwellings), M-SC (Manufacturing-Service Commercial), C-1/C-P (General Commercial), and R-3 (General Residential), to SP (Specific Plan). The specific pattern of development and configuration of the homes are not depicted at this time. Area III has no population limits assigned to it, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot.**

**Noise:** The site is outside of the current 60 CNEL contour for the airport. The site is near an approach and departure flight track and will experience annoyance from over flying aircraft.

**Part 77:** The elevation on the proposed site varies from 780 to 825 MSL and the height of proposed structures is currently unknown. The site is within the horizontal surface and the runway elevation is 765MSL at the east end. An FAA 7460 review will be required for any structure of a height that would exceed a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway. At a distance of approximately 3,600 ft. from the east end of the runway to the western boundary of Planning Areas 7 and 9, a structure height of 801 MSL would require FAA 7460 review.

**DRAFT 2004 ALUCP:** The proposal is within Zones D and E. Zone D allows a residential density greater than or equal to 5 du/acre or less than .2 du/acre. The proposed planning areas include medium density (4.8 du/ac), medium-high density (5.5 du/ac), high density (12 du/ac.), and very high density (20 du/ac.) residential uses located within Zone D. The total proposed residential density is 6.8 du/ac.

The proposed elementary school and Planning Area 4 is located within Zone D. The proposed church facility (Planning Area 1) is located primarily within Zone E, although the westerly portion may fall within Zone D. Zone E has no density restrictions and Zone D allows 90% lot coverage and an average density of 100 persons per acre. The entire project is outside the 55CNEL. Information on the proposed density within the commercial area, church facility or elementary

school is currently unknown.

**Conclusion:** The Land Use Plan for Specific Plan 337, along with Change of Zone 6893 and General Plan Amendment 679 appear to be generally consistent with the Flabob Airport CLUP, however, certain changes and additions to the text and graphics of the Specific Plan and Environmental Analysis are necessary. The necessary changes and additions are listed in Appendix A to this Staff Report.

**The applicant submitted a modified section of the Environmental Analysis (attached), in which some of the items listed in Appendix A were addressed. Those portions of the attached Environmental Analysis that are new or have been modified from the original text have been marked by staff with [ ] (brackets). The applicant also provided the attached "Updated Comments to Appendix A" as a further response to the listed items, along with exhibits showing the project site in relation to the noise contours for Flabob Airport. The applicant's "Updated Comments to Appendix A" and noise contour exhibits should be incorporated into the Specific Plan text, along with the modified section of the Environmental Analysis.**

**A copy of the Specific Plan was submitted by the applicant to Cal Trans Aeronautics and the Airport Operator. Comments on the proposal by Cal Trans Aeronautics are attached.**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the proposed project, subject to the Conditions listed below.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements for the entire proposed development to FLABOB Airport ((951) 683-2309) prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act and prior to recordation of the map, whichever is first (909) 683-2309.
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. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.
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 attached Notice of Airport in Vicinity shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*
6. *No obstruction of the “FAR Part 77 Conical Surface” shall be permitted. An FAA 7460 review shall be completed for any structure of a height that would exceed a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway.*
7. *The Specific Plan and Environmental Analysis shall be modified in content and graphics as indicated on the attached Appendix A, using the following text and exhibits submitted and/or referenced by the applicant:*
  - a. *Modified sections of the Environmental Analysis*
  - b. *Flabob Airport Noise Contour exhibits*
  - c. *Updated Comments to Appendix A submitted 11/22/04.*

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Hogan inquired if the EIR was considered a screen check draft because there was no reference of an airport. Beverly Coleman responded positively. The applicant has made additional modifications to the text and that information has been distributed to the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Hogan inquired if the modifications will be incorporated in the EIR. Ms. Coleman responded positively. Commissioner Housman inquired the reason the proposed school cannot be located in Zone “E” instead of Zone “D”. Ms. Coleman called for the applicant to come forward and present the case. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens inquired if the applicant indicated he would attend the meeting. Ms. Coleman responded positively. Chairman Stephens postponed the item to allow time for the applicant to show.

10:30 a.m.

Jim Stockhansen, applicant came forward and concurred with staff recommendations and conditions of approval. Chairman Stephens inquired if staff’s requested language has been incorporated in the document. Mr. Stockhansen responded positively indicated it has been incorporated in the Environmental Impact Report. Commissioner Housman inquired on the location of the school. Mr. Stockhansen responded that the school is not allowed to be any closer to the freeway, therefore located the site further north.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience hearing no response he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Vice Chairman Hogan made a motion of consistency, subject to staff conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**Regional**

**9:00 A.M.**

- D. Resolution of Adoption – 04-07, 08, 09 – Keith Downs presented the case.

**CASE NUMBER:** RG-04-100 and FL-04-101, BD-104-108, and FV-04-107 Resolutions for Adoption

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** *Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission*

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

An update to the 1984 Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) and the subsequent Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUP) for public use airports in and affecting Riverside County. Jurisdictions affected are: the Cities of Indio, La Quinta, Palm Desert, Riverside, Temecula and Murrieta the County of Riverside and any special district within those Influence Areas.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

All areas within the Draft Airport Influence Areas. Affected Airports are: Flabob, Bermuda Dunes and French Valley.

**BACKGROUND:** The ALUC held a workshop for the plan in March 2004 in Indio and Riverside. The consultants have met with the affected airports and land use jurisdictions and obtained the general plan and zoning ordinance of each. The consultants have reviewed each of those plans relative to the draft Compatibility Plans. Public hearings were held in August, September, October and November. The Commission closed the hearings and moved to have Resolutions prepared for adoption of these plans. Copies of the Resolutions are attached.

Additionally, the ALUC directed the staff to review the proposal presented at the hearing regarding the property at Flabob airport and the situation at French Valley regarding the Borel Airpark. Staff has reviewed those situations and recommends the Commission consider the potential additions listed in the attached addendum to the Flabob and French Valley Plans.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the three resolutions (04-07 through 09) be adopted and the attached letter be sent to all jurisdictions affected by the 8 adopted plans including those affected by the countywide activities in Policy 1.5.3.

Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan  
ADDENDUM #1  
December 9, 2004

Revision to the Bermuda Dunes Airport Compatibility Map (Map BD-1) dated April 2004

Revise the Airport Influence Area boundary as depicted on the attached map so as to expand Zone E both on the north and south of the airport.

Additions to Flabob Airport section of Chapter 3 of the draft plan dated April 2004.

FL.2.1 Loring Ranch: Notwithstanding the criteria established in Table 2A of Chapter 2, the residential subdivision depicted in Tentative Tract Map No. 31503 dated September 2003 the boundaries of which are shown as area (1) on the Flabob Airport Compatibility Map (Map FL-1) shall be permitted provided that the following conditions are met:

- A. For the entire tract:
  - 1. All structures and trees shall comply with applicable Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 criteria.
  - 2. An avigation easement containing the provisions indicated in Countywide Policy 4.3.5 herein shall be dedicated to Flabob Airport for each parcel in the tract. Said easement shall remain in effect for as long as the airport remains in operation.
- B. Additionally, lots within the Compatibility Zone B2 portion of the tract beyond 500 feet from the runway centerline shall be no smaller than 5,000 square feet net.
- C. Within the Zone B2 portion of the tract between 200 and 500 feet from the runway centerline:

1. No lot shall be smaller than 2.5 acres net.
2. Dwellings shall be placed as far as possible from the runway.
3. A minimum of 30 dB exterior-to-interior noise level reduction (NLR) shall be provided for all habitable portions of the dwellings.
4. No buildings shall be permitted within 300 feet of the runway centerline.
5. A taxiway, including a bridge over the flood control channel, shall be constructed to provide small aircraft access to each parcel. The point of connection to the airfield shall be satisfactory to the airport management and both the location and design shall be consistent with applicable Federal Aviation Administration and California Division of Aeronautics standards. Security fencing and gates controlling access to the airfield shall be installed.

*D. With the Zone B1 portion of the tract:*

1. No lot shall be smaller than 2.5 acres net.
2. No dwelling shall be placed situated closer than 400 feet from the runway centerline or extended centerline.
3. A minimum of 30 dB exterior-to-interior noise level reduction (NLR) shall be provided for all habitable portions of the dwellings.
4. No buildings shall be permitted within 300 feet of the runway centerline.
5. Taxiway access to the airfield shall be provided to each parcel in the manner indicated in Policy FL.2.1(c)(5) above.

*E. Within the Zone A portion of the tract:*

1. No buildings shall be permitted.
2. All property shall be under control of the airport by means of fee ownership or an approach protection easement. Said easement shall include the provisions described in Policy FL.2.1(a)(2) above and shall further state that no buildings are permitted within the easement area.

*Additions to French Valley Airport section of Chapter 3 of the draft plan dated April 2004*

*FV.2.1 Zone B2 Building Height: Notwithstanding the limitation of two aboveground habitable floors indicated in Table 2A of Chapter 2, any nonresidential building in Compatibility Zone B2 at French Valley Airport may have up to three aboveground habitable floors provided that no such building or attachments thereto shall penetrate the airspace protection surfaces defined for the airport in accordance with Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77.*

*Revisions to the French Valley Airport Compatibility Map (Map FV-1) dated April 2004*

*Revise Zone B2 as depicted on the attached map such that the boundary of the outer edge of the zone west of existing Runway 18-36 is 1,500 feet from the runway centerline and the boundary of the outer edge of the zone east of the planned future parallel runway is 1,000 feet from the centerline of that runway.*

**Resolution 04-07 Bermuda Dunes**

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no response he called for motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Vice Chairman Hogan made a motion to approve the resolution for the Bermuda Dunes Airport. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Resolution 04-08 Flabob**

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience. Harry Tancredi came forward and referred to the additions to chapter 3 of Flabob Airport mentioned above. Mr. Tancredi requested additional verbiage be added to the easement to indicate termination of such easement if the owner passes away and the airport is sold for another use. Mr. Tancredi objected to item C3 regarding 30dB exterior-to interior noise level reduction since it would violate the ordinance of 45 decibel rating on the inside. Mr. Tancredi indicated the acoustical engineer being present for any questions. The taxiway mentioned on C5 is becoming a problem due to noise and aircraft being 50' from the homes. Mr. Tancredi then requested deletion of item C3 and the taxiway mentioned on item C5.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Housman indicated that the purpose for this part of the project was to be an aviation related use with aircraft operating out of the residence. Mr. Tancredi explained that it is unknown if the County will give them an easement to cross over the drainage ditch. County is also enforcing a 6' masonry wall, which will position the aircrafts 50' through 60' away from the homes creating a noise issue. Commissioner Goldenbaum indicated that the key point and the reason why the Commission came to a compromise at the last meeting was to have residential communities link to the airport in that particular zone. Without the compromise there is absolutely no advantage to the airport what so ever. If noise is the problem it can be discussed but the airport needs a buffer zone of airport friendly people living on those plots with access and an easement to provide a friendly environment. Mr. Tancredi disagrees indicating that residents who own aircraft would give them a reason to own a home in the area and store their aircraft on a hangar facility currently being developed. Staff indicates that the taxiway would create a noise problem. At the beginning it was a great idea, but it is unknown if the County would provide the easement. Commissioner Lightsey interjected indicating that it is incorrect the mitigation of the noise is based on the established noise contours. The fact somebody may occasionally come by in a noisy aircraft does not mean it increase the noise contour for that area. The mitigation is going to be for the noise contours that are plotted on the maps and having a taxiway there isn't going to increase the amount of mitigation. Mr. Tancredi responded that the problem they found was noise both from the aircraft and Loring Road.

Justine Cook, Bridge Net International came forward and made himself available for questions regarding the noise issue. Commissioner Housman inquired if it is possible to develop 2.5 acre lots to allow the use and storage of aircraft owned by someone who would purchase the property. Mr. Cook responded positively. Mr. Cook then indicated that the 30dB reduction is a problem. Commissioner Housman inquired if the 30dB is eliminated and impose the 45 decibel interior standard could this project be build with the taxiway. Mr. Cook responded positively.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called John Lyon to come forward.

John Lyon, Flabob Airport came forward in respond to Chairman Stephens' invitation and expressed his surprised on the proposed changes from the developer. Mr. Lyon then indicated that without the taxiway access the airport withdraws their support of the project.

Keith Downs indicated that the Commission can eliminate the revisions and return to the original proposal. B.T. Miller indicated that in adopting a resolution, if in fact the Commission desires to move forward as originally proposed the language can be eliminated in the resolution that contemplated the possibility of incorporating the compromise.

A discussion ensued between the commissioner in regards to the elimination of the revised resolution and returning to the original proposal.

Commissioner Goldenbaum recommended removing the revised language and moved to approve the original proposal. Chairman Stephens concurred with Commissioner Goldenbaum.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Goldenbaum made a motion to approve the resolution for the Flabob Airport as originally proposed without the revised language. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**\*CONSENT ITEMS:**

Chairman Stephens opened the consent items schedule for 10:00 a.m.

Chairman Stephens indicated that the consent items would be voted for consistency unless any of the Commissioners or any one from the audience has questions on an item. The item will be pulled and addressed separately, otherwise it will be voted as one and no further discussion will be made.

Keith Downs indicated adding MA-04-154 McCanna Hills as a continuance.

Consent items; MA-04-153 Robert Wales, CH-04-111 Albert Webb Associates, RI-04-132 La Quinta Development, RI-04-134 David Lewis and Continuance for MA-04-154 McCanna Hills.

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no reply he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Vice Chairman Hogan made a motion of consistency for the consent items and continuance for MA-04-154. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**CONTINUE RESOLUTION**

**French Valley Resolution 04-09**

Keith Downs indicated that Ray Borel has reviewed the plan for French Valley and finds them acceptable.

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience.

Tom Mathews, Culbertson Adams & Associates came forward and indicated him being present representing Cornerstone Community Corporation. Mr. Mathews indicated being present in order to correct the record with respect to the process, which culminated in Commissions adoption of the Compatibility Plan at the last meeting for the French Valley Airport. Clarification is necessary for several reasons #1 Cornerstone Communities came to your Commission on August 12<sup>th</sup> and received a decision of inconsistent with the Comprehensive plan, which was the plan in effect at the time. Cornerstone Community attempted to work with Riverside County, Planning department at the Murrieta Office in order to address the issues to be resolved with respect to the Land Use Compatibility issues that had been identified by Mr. Downs and his staff. Cornerstone Community has been endeavoring with their partner to address issues under the Specific Plan and General Plan of the County of Riverside. It is understood that there are issues relative to the airport and are ready and prepared to address those issues. There is an adopted Specific Plan for the area. That Specific Plan had flexibility to allow balance and solutions that may not have been available at the time the Specific Plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Mathews referred to Bob Johnson's, Riverside Planning, letter to the Commission dated Oct. 29<sup>th</sup> where it made specific reference to retain the flexibility under the Specific Plan adopted for the French Valley Airport area (Winchester Silver Hawk Specific Plan). Cornerstone Community was unaware of the Compatibility Plan and received no notice. No discussion was made with staff relative to Compatibility Plan and the potential effect it would have on the process inaugurated by the Commissions finding of inconsistency on August 12<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Mathews indicated that the ALUC needs to have better communication with the Planning department and is willing to follow up on with Mr. Johnson and Mr. Downs to see if that can be perfected in such a way that would bring about solutions rather than obstacles. Mr. Mathews then indicated not being able to find any notices with respect to the assistance of the Commission to adopt the Compatibility Plan. There is no reference to the CEQA documentation for the potential expansion of the French Valley Airport including the extension of the main runway and the creation of the parallel runway. Mr. Mathews requested clarification to ensure that there is complete and adequate disclosure.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no reply he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Vice Chairman Hogan made a motion to approve the resolution for the French Valley Airport. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Housman inquired on the type of notices disclosed. Keith Downs responded that workshops were held in Indio and in Riverside, and all jurisdictions were advised including County Planning. Staff and Consultant met with all the jurisdictions and disks were sent out in June as well. Mr. Jolliffe, County Planning prepared the Environmental Impact Report for French Valley Airport and it is unknown why the information was not distributed by County Planning. Notices were also published in July 2004, in the local papers (The Press Enterprise and The Sun).

Jack Rosson, Cornerstone Community came forward and indicated that meetings were held with Ken Graff, which provided them with the Comprehensive Plan and also met with Mr. Downs. The project was designed based on that plan and it was never mentioned to them that the project was going to be obsolete.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for case number FL-04-103 to be reopened and called for the applicant to come forward and present the case (see page 9).

- E. RG-04-100 and BA-04-100, CS-04-100, DC-04-100, FL-04-101, BD-04-108, BL-04-100, CO-04-100, FV-04-107, RI-02-127 and PS-100 – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** RG-04-100 and BA-04-100, CS-04-100, DC-04-100, FL-04-101, BD-04-108, BL-04-100, CO-04-100, FV-04-107, RI-02-127 and PS-100

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** *Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission*

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*An update to the 1984 Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) and the subsequent Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUP) for public use airports in and affecting Riverside County. Jurisdictions affected are: the cities of Banning, Blythe, Corona, La Quinta, Murrieta, Norco, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Indio, Coachella, Palm Springs, Riverside, Temecula and the County of Riverside and any special district within those Influence Areas.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*All areas within the Draft Airport Influence Areas (see Map Attached). Affected Airports are: Banning, Bermuda, Blythe, Chino, Chiriaco Summit, Corona, Desert Center, Flabob, French Valley and Riverside.*

**BACKGROUND:** *The ALUC contracted with the consulting firm of Mead and Hunt to prepare the ALUCP in June of 2002. The ALUC held a workshop for the plan in March in Indio and Riverside. The consultants have met with the affected airports and land use jurisdictions and obtained each of their general plan and zoning ordinances. Our consultant has reviewed the proposal against each of those plans and the review is attached. Staff has called the affected city planning departments in the last weeks.*

**MAJOR ISSUES: Noise Element, Community Plans and Land Use Element Area Plans**

**RECOMMENDATION:** *Staff recommends that; the ALUC continue to take testimony from the jurisdictions and the public, continue to hold the hearing open for any individual airport that the ALUC wishes, and CONTINUE those airports until the next meeting of October 14, 2004, direct staff and the consultant to review any additional responses from the Cities and County, to respond to those comments, prepare resolutions for adoption and prepare the necessary revisions to the general provisions to implement the procedures outlined in the new plan.*

**Response to Comments:** *At the Hearing of August 12<sup>th</sup> there were comments given by a few individuals and some sent in since the hearing. Most of these involve the Initial Study sent out by the Riverside County for their Master Plan for Hemet/Ryan Airport. As you know the airport sponsor, such as a city or county, develop these plans and the ALUC reviews them for consistency. The attached letter has been sent to those senders informing them that they need to direct any further comments to the County. Their specific comments have been forwarded to the County EDA/Aviation.*

**Comment:** *Mr. William Brelliant, Documents submitted at hearing*

**Response:** *His comments are directed toward the Master Plan. His attorney had been told that earlier (See March 15, 2004 letter G. Salomens). The attached letter was sent to Mr. Brelliant.*

**Comment:** City of Riverside letter August 27<sup>th</sup> asking for continuance until after September 28, 2004.

**Response:** The Riverside and Flabob should be continued until October 14, 2004.

**Comment:** Flabob letter received August 17, 2004.

**Response:** All Airports were sent a copy of the Staff Report.

**October 14, 2004,** At the September 16<sup>th</sup> hearing there were three commenters and a request for a further continuance from the City of Riverside.

**COMMENT:** Mike Smith from Bermuda Dunes Airport desired some changes to the Influence Area and some zones and stated he would provide those comments to staff.

**RESPONSE:** No comments were received at this time.

**COMMENT:** Mr. William Devine an attorney representing the Borel family and Mr. Ray Borel in regards to the Borel Airpark Center requesting additional time to respond to the French Valley Airport.

**RESPONSE:** The item was continued to October 14<sup>th</sup>. No further information was received. I have attached the ALUC staff report, Minutes and approval letter from July 18, 1991. Additionally I have included a copy of relevant portions of the County approval from October 4, 1994.

**City of Riverside:** The City had requested another continuance. We were scheduled for a City Council Workshop for the 28<sup>th</sup> of September, but staff requested to meet with us in our office instead of the workshop with the City Council.

**City of Palm Springs:** Staff met with representatives of the City on the 28<sup>th</sup> of September. We had a productive meeting and expect further comments in the near future.

On October 4, 2004 we received the attached letter from the County Planning Director requesting additional time.

**November 18,** At the October 14 meeting requests for further continuances from the Cities of Riverside and Palm Springs and the County of Riverside and Mr. Borel. The Commission continued all of the plans and directed staff to notify the surrounding jurisdictions of the proposed expansion of the Influence Area by the Bermuda Dunes airport manager. The surrounding jurisdictions were notified and a readvertisement was made (see attached). Meetings with Mr. Borel, City of Riverside and the County of Riverside were held. The consultants have reviewed the letter from Palm Springs and the County of Riverside and the response is attached. An additional meeting to discuss specific concerns was scheduled with the City of Riverside staff on November 1. Your staff was scheduled for a presentation at the Technical Advisory Committee of the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG), but only a very short discussion ensued at the last few minutes of the meeting and no action was taken by that group due to a lack of a quorum.

**IMPORTANT TO NOTE:** As of this date none of the comments from any of the local jurisdictions or the public have indicated any corrections to the components in the Compatibility Maps for any of the Airports. The comments we have relate to the land use maps and not the factors from which they are derived.

**October 29 from Riverside County TLMA:** The consultant has addressed the policy concerns and the following addresses statements of information.



*The new ALUCP is guided by the 2002 Handbook; the previous CLUPs from 1984 to 1998 were guided by the 1983 Handbook, while the 1974 Palm Springs version was guided only by the basic version of the state law. The newer zones are consistent with the 2002 Handbook and the 1993 handbook included most of the zones, concerns and differences expressed in the new plan i.e. side line zone and density restrictions.*

**Existing Uses:** *The new plan expands the definition of 'existing use' to include tentative maps. No plan includes that presently besides the exemption clause in FV and RAL. Existing lots of record can build homes on any lot so zoned.*

**December 9, 2004,** *Three of the airports (FLABOB, Bermuda Dunes and French Valley) were approved at the last meeting and Riverside and Palm Springs were continued. A letter from the County dated November 17, was received the day of the hearing. Additional comments may be received from the cities prior to the hearing and the Riverside Council subcommittee is meeting the same morning (Dec. 9<sup>th</sup>) as the ALUC.*

Keith Downs indicated that at the previous hearing two out of the ten items were continued, which are Palm Springs and Riverside at their request. Staff recommends on moving forward with the remaining two items. If the Commission wishes to continue staff recommends it be continue to the February hearing.

Ken Brody presented the Palm Springs International Airport. Mr. Brody indicated that at the last meeting comments and responses were presented to the Commissioner. No further comments have been received and the responses have not changed. The City of Palm Springs has commented that development is already occurring in the north area of Zone C approximately three to four units per acre. A post policy has been added to Zone C that would apply only in the northern part. Currently Zone D is a high density option if it remains a high density it would have to be at least five dwelling units per acre. In Zone A in the area of the runway protection zone, there is two runway protection zones one at each end of the runway one for arrivals and the other for departures. The boundary was changed to reflect the distinction shown in the airport layout plan, which was not reflected on the original draft. It was agreed that the B2 Zone boundaries could be pulled closer in to the runway.

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Housman inquired on the realigning of Zone A. Mr. Brody responded that the realigning was toward the east side.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for Doug Evans, City of Palm Springs to come forward.

Doug Evans came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation. Mr. Evans indicated the recommendations that were summarized are still being studied and have not had the opportunity to brief the City Council with a full presentation. Development cannot be pushed out because it gets into property with significant constrains, therefore it needs to be infill. Mr. Evans then requested continuance till the February hearing to allow further review of the plan.

Chairman Stephens indicated that continuing the hearing to February should be sufficient time for a presentation to be presented to the Commission. It would also be helpful if a presentation could be presented from the developer for the commercial property to the southeast gives as well. Hearing no further comments Chairman

Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Alternate Alberg inquired if the tribal land is a reservation. Mr. Evans referred to an exhibit to illustrate what is considered Indian land.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for a discussion from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Hogan inquired to staff what would be the consequences if the item is continued to the February hearing. Keith Downs responded that further work on the pending items would provide less work on others being the Hemet Ryan and Chino Airports. There would be a \$50,000 short fall since the state will not reimburse unless all airports are complete. There is still work pending on the items that have been approved by the Commission as well. It is estimated that Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport would be completed, but unless additional funding becomes available or reimbursement is received for the additional work needed on these two pending items it is unknown if Hemet and Chino would be completed. The ALUC does not have a general fund. The only source of funding is through grants and applicants' fees. Mr. Downs then indicated that resolutions have been prepared for the Palm Springs and Riverside if the Commission wishes to move forward today. In regards to the amended process if the items get continued to the February hearing the amended process would not apply till 2006.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Butler made a motion for continuance to the February meeting. Commissioner Housman seconded the motion.

**NOES:** Vice Chairman Hogan and Commissioner Lightsey.

Ken Brody came forward and presented the Riverside Municipal Airport indicating that comments were received from the City of Riverside. The focus is on four issues discussed previously. One has to do with the overall density of Zone D similar issues to Palm Springs. An amendment has been suggested to Zone D to lower the upper end threshold from five dwelling units to four dwelling units per acre. The second issue has to do with Zone B2 in the areas lateral to the runway. Based on the safety consideration of the California Land Use Handbook the B2 Zone could be narrower. The issue raised if B2 Zone is adjusted inward it allows Zone D to move closer making it a concern to sensitive uses such as residential. Another issue in Zone B2 is changing the allowable floors from two stories above ground to three not to exceed any Part 77 criteria. The issue still open for discussion has to do with whether the criteria for residential development should be 65 decibels CNEL or 60 decibels as is on the draft plan. Mr. Brody then illustrated the change from 60 to 65 CNEL indicating it would bring Zone C in significantly making safety a controlling factor.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for Mr. Kranenburg to come forward. Mark Kranenburg, Riverside Municipal Airport Director came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation. Mr. Kranenburg indicated that Steve Adams, Riverside City Council was unable to stay for the length of the meeting, but expressed his wishes to the Commission. The Land Use Committee was scheduled to meet today and due to not having a quorum it was canceled. The City staff is requesting for the Land Use Committee to call a special session, to meet again to address the issues and also obtain their input to continue to move forward in this

process. Mr. Adams also has requested a sixty day continuance. Mr. Kranenburg indicated that the City of Riverside may entertain supplemental funding that is necessary in order to get the best plan possible.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for Ms. Jenkins to come forward.

Diane Jenkins, City of Riverside came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation. Ms. Jenkins reiterated the request for continuance to the February hearing.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners. Alternate Alberg recommended setting a January 20<sup>th</sup> deadline for the cities to submit there comments to staff. Keith Downs concurred. Chairman Stephens indicated that if a letter could relate something to the effect that this extension is being granted at some cost.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for Pete Dangermond to come forward.

Pete Dangermond came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation. Mr. Dangermond, Representative for Rancho La Sierra land owners indicated that they support the idea that the Zone D portion will be allow to be the same as the surrounding area. Mr. Dangermond requested for a portion of Zone C be treated the same if possible. Chairman Stephens indicated that the suggestions are not recommendations as of now to staff. Chairman Stephens then recommended to work with the City and at some point coordinate with staff to make sure it does not become a debate at the February hearing.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Butler made a motion of continuance to the February hearing and directed staff to create a letter requesting City comments by January 20<sup>th</sup>. Alternate Alberg seconded the motion.

**NOES:** Vice Chairman Hogan and Commissioner Lightsey.

## NEW BUSINESS

### MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE

10:00 A.M.

- A. MA-04-153 – Robert Wales – Consent item see page 13

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-04-153 – Robert Wales  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** P04-0963

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*Demolition of two theatre buildings and construction of a 3 three new retail building totaling 13,178 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 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.

We utilize four resources for our review:

1. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Draft ALUCP for Riverside County: 2004
4. 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 27,500 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for construction of three retail buildings totaling 13,178 sq. ft. The existing site has two vacant theatre buildings. 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 a contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The structural coverage at the site will be less than present.

Part 77: The elevation at the site is approximately 1,110 MSL feet. The height of the proposed structure is approximately 55 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 avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport (Tel. 951- 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.*

**B. MA-04-154 – McCanna Hills – Consent item see page 13**

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-04-154 – McCanna Hills  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** *County of Riverside*  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** *Specific Plan 246 Amendment 1, Parcel Map 32438, 32439 and 32591, and EIR Addendum*

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*The proposal is a Specific Plan Amendment, Parcel Maps and EIR Addendum for a project that will include a maximum of 3,210 residential units, along with open space, commercial, educational and recreational uses on 1,156.82 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located east of Interstate 215 and south of SR60 in the County of Riverside, from approximately 21,000 to 32,000 feet southeast 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.

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: 2002

Draft ALUCP for Riverside County: 2004

Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

## **MAJOR ISSUES:**

**Land Use: The proposed site is located from approximately 21,000 to 32,000 ft. southeast of Runway 14/32. The proposal is within the outer horizontal surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on the attached flight tracks exhibit. The proposal is a Specific Plan Amendment, Parcel Maps and an EIR Amendment for a mixed-use development, to include a maximum of 3,210 residential units, with open space, commercial, educational and recreational uses on 1,156.82 acres. The development is an amendment to SP246, which was adopted in 1994. The proposal includes 671 acres of residential development, 49 acres of commercial/mixed use development, 43 acres of parks, 20 acres of schools, 282.6 acres of natural open space and 43 acres for project roadways.**

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 western portion of the site is within Area III, as shown on the attached MARB Influence Area exhibit. Based on the Specific Plan exhibits, Planning Areas 1 through 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 17 and a portion of Planning Areas 10, 13, 14, 18, 27B, 27C and 30 are located within Area III. These Planning Areas include residential uses, open space, parks and a school/alternate residential use (Planning Area 13). The remainder of the site is outside of the influence area boundary, based on the 1986 interim boundaries for March Air Reserve Base. Area III allows commercial, residential, industrial and agriculture contingent upon noise and height issues.

**Density and Coverage:** Based on the information submitted by the applicant, the specific pattern of development and configuration of the homes are not depicted at this time.

**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 outside 55 CNEL.

*Part 77: The highest elevation on the site is 1,908 MSL. The runway elevation is 1,488 MSL at the south end. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 2088 MSL feet in elevation. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.*

**Conclusion:** *The Land Use Plan for Specific Plan 246A1, Parcel Maps 32438, 32439 and 32591, and the EIR Addendum appear to be generally consistent with the RCALUP subject to certain conditions, however, certain changes and additions to the text and graphics of the Specific Plan and Environmental Analysis are necessary. The necessary changes and additions are listed in Appendix A to this Staff Report. In addition, a review and comment on the proposal by Cal Trans Aeronautics and the airport operator is required.*

**CONDITIONS:**

1. *Prior to project development 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. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portions of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures into the building construction to ensure that all light is below the horizontal plane.*
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 explosive or flammable materials is prohibited.*
6. *The attached Notice of Airport in Vicinity shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*
7. *No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted. An FAA 7460 review shall be completed for any structure of a height that would exceed a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway.*
8. *The Specific Plan and Environmental Analysis shall be modified in content and graphics as indicated on the attached Appendix A.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a CONTINUANCE in order to obtain comments from the airport operator, Caltrans Aeronautics and to obtain and review the required additional text and information identified in Appendix A.

#### **APPENDIX A**

The following shall be incorporated into the text and exhibits for Specific Plan 246A1 and the Environmental Analysis:

1. Provide a detail of the proposed density within the commercial areas, along with the estimated number of children at the proposed school in Planning Area 13.
2. Using the Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan exhibit from the Riverside County Integrated Plan show the project site in relation to the Airport Influence Area (See Figure 5 of Lakeview/Nuevo Area Plan – March Air Reserve Base Influence Policy Area).
3. Include a discussion of the effect of aircraft noise from March Air Reserve Base on the proposed development in the noise analysis.
4. Include in the Environmental Analysis an evaluation of the impacts of safety and noise using the Cal Trans 2002 California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, pursuant to CEQA.
5. Incorporate Conditions 1 through 7 of the Staff Report, along with any other conditions approved by the ALUC.

#### **FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT**

**10:00 A.M.**

- C. FV-04-110 – Justice Center Plaza, LLC – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-04-110 – Justice Center Plaza  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** PP 19414 and Change of Zone 6969

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A change of zone from Agriculture (A-1-5) to Commercial (C-P-S) and plot plan for a 3 story 78,000 sq. ft. office building with retail and restaurant uses on 4.16 acres.

#### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located south of Auld Road and east of Leon Road within the County of Riverside, from approximately 2,600 ft. east of the current runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

#### **LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport: French Valley  
a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ) **Zone C and D in 2004 ALUCP**  
b. Noise Levels: Outside the 55CNEL for 2013 from the Master Plan

#### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposal is a plot plan for a 3 story 77,599 sq. ft. office and retail complex on 4.16 (gr. 3.59 net) acres. The proposed development includes an office building along with parking and landscape improvements. The existing zone for the site is A-1-5 and the proposed zoning is CPS.



**2004 Draft ALUCP: The new draft plan places the site within Zone C which states that buildings with 3 above ground habitable floors and /or exceeding 75/acre are prohibited. The Zone C at this location derives from the planned secondary runway. A small piece (10%) is within zone D at the southeast corner. The occupancy density for the projects calculates between 118-175 people per acre depending upon the method utilized. This and the inclusion of three habitable floors make it inconsistent with the approved plan for Zone C. The site is located within the TPZ for Runway 18-36 under the 1996 CLUP.**

**The lot coverage for the proposed development area is 15% (net). The lot coverage standard for the TPZ is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross area. The TPZ only has restrictions for 'discouraged' uses. Discouraged uses within the TPZ include public assembly land uses involving large concentrations of people, such as auditoriums and amphitheaters.**

**Part 77:** The site is within the horizontal surface at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,338 MSL. The distance from the end of Runway 18/36 to the building at the proposed site is approximately 2,600 ft. . Any structures over the height of 1,364 MSL at this location require FAA review. The height of the tallest structure is 52 ft. with a pad elevation of 1,370, at a distance of approximately 2,600 ft. from the end of Runway 18-36. The proposed structure is above the maximum heights for which FAA review is required.

**Noise:** The noise contours for 2013 indicate the site is outside 55 CNEL, however the site will get significant regular over flight of aircraft approaching the airfield (see attached exhibit).

**CONCLUSION:** Staff has concluded the following: 1) those portions of the proposal within Zone C are **inconsistent** with the standards of the ALUCP pertaining to land use.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the Commission find the project **Inconsistent** based upon the approved plan.

**CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE: Utilization of these does not make the project consistent.**

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. A FAA 7460 review shall be conducted and any conditions so constructed. No obstruction of any "FAR Part 77 Surface" shall be permitted and any marking required shall be installed.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).
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 any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*
  6. *The attached notice shall be provided to all purchasers and tenants.*

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners.

Chairman Stephens called for Mark Terano to come forward and present the case.

Mark Terano came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation. Mr. Terano indicated that there are already existing 75' power poles unlighted on the property and the buildings would be below 75'. Mr. Terano requested a continuance to meet with staff and discuss the issues of safety and lighting of the buildings for clarification. Commissioner Housman requested to see an exhibit of the Plot Plan showing the power poles surrounding the project site. Mr. Terano responded that the power poles are not shown on the exhibit. Chairman Stephens indicated that a continuance might not resolve the issues.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for a discussion from the Commissioners, hearing no reply he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Goldenbaum made a motion of inconsistency, subject to staff conditions of approval and recommendations. Vice Chairman Hogan seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**CHINO AIRPORT**

**10:00 A.M.**

- D. CH-04-111 – Albert Webb Associates – Consent item see page 13

**CASE NUMBER:** CH-04-111 – Albert A. Webb Associates  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Tract Map 32797 and Parcel Map 33036  
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Tract Map for 119 residential lots and four open spaces on approximately 45.14 acres, and a Parcel Map to divide approximately 71.6 acres into two parcels.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated at the northwest intersection of Harrison Avenue and Limonite Avenue within the County of Riverside, approximately 8,900 – 11,000 ft. east of Runway 26L at Chino Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport:* Chino Airport (County of San Bernardino)  
a. *Airport Influence Area:* Within Area of Influence Study Area  
b. *Land Use Policy:* Influence Area

- c. Noise Levels: See Below

**BACKGROUND:**

Since we have not adopted the CLUP for Chino Airport, we utilize three resources for our review:

1. The San Bernardino CLUP for Chino Airport, 1991
2. The Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan: 1984
3. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 8,900 – 11,000 feet east of Runway 26L. The touch and go flight tracks are overhead and to the west.

The 1991 CLUP places the proposed development within the Area of Influence Study Area, with the western, vacant portion located within Safety Zone III. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues. The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise, type of aircraft and expected type of aircraft, FAA criteria or a combination of these factors. With the present configuration of the airport the site will likely end up in the TPZ or an approach category.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 658 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 635 MSL at the east end of the runway. The proposed development is outside the transitional surface and in order to exceed obstruction standards a structure would need to exceed approximately 127 feet in height. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern with this project. Instrument approaches are near the parcel, and this site can expect overflight from aircraft entering the approaches.

Noise:

1991 Report: The site is outside the 65 CNEL contour developed for the airport in 1991, and likely to be within the 55 CNEL. Page 2-3 of the report discusses these concerns and discusses **prohibiting** residential development within the 60 and 55 CNEL where overflights are conducted, particularly where flights are below 500 feet above ground level.

Master Plan: A new Master Plan at Chino Airport was started is expected to be completed later this year. The site can expect single noise events to disturb indoor and outdoor events.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the County of Riverside and Chino Airport prior to the recordation of the tract, issuance of any permit, or sale of any portion 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 or above the horizontal plane.
3. Proposals for subsequent development of the site shall be reviewed by ALUC until such time that a CLUP is adopted for the Airport by RCALUC.
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 attached notice regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser.*

**RECOMMENDATION:**

*Staff recommends a finding of consistency of this project subject to the conditions noted above. The project can be approved based upon the following, as identified in Section 21675.1 of the California Public Utilities Code (PUC).*

- 1. *The ALUC is making substantial progress toward the completion of the Chino Airport Land Use Plan; and*
- 2. *There is a reasonable probability that the project will be consistent with the plan; and*
- 3. *There is little or no probability of substantial detriment to or interference with the plan, if the project is ultimately inconsistent with the plan.*

**RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT**

**10:00 A.M.**

E. RI-04-132 – Riverside County – Consent item see page 13

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-04-132 – La Quinta Development  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** P04-0593

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A plot plan for 104 hangars totaling 200,000 sq. ft., fuel facility and office at Riverside Municipal Airport.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located 640 ft. south of runway 9/27 and 249 feet west of runway 16/34, within the Riverside Municipal Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal*

- a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area*
- b. Land Use Policy: Traffic Pattern Zone*
- c. Noise Levels: See Below*

**BACKGROUND:** *This project is within the Master Plan of the airport reviewed by the ALUC in 1998.*

## **MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposal is a hangar and FBO facility at the southwest end of the airfield with office facilities and parking for 23 vehicles and 104 aircraft hangar sites. The proposed site is located approximately 250 ft. west of Runway 14/32. The proposal is on the airside of the facility and as such is subject to higher noise and safety factors, but is an airport facility and is within the transitional surface of the PART 77 surfaces.

Density and Coverage: The lot area is approximately 20 acres and the structure is approximately 200,000 sq. ft. or 25% of the site.

Part 77: The finished floor elevation of the project is approximately 756 MSL feet and the height of the structures range from 16' to 22' for a total of 778 MSL. The runway elevation at the intersection is 762 MSL. All structures need an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria are a concern.

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 more than 65 CNEL.

## **CONDITIONS:**

1. Prior to project development 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. 951- 656-7000)
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portions of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures into the building construction to ensure that all light is below the horizontal plane.
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. A PART 77 FAA 7460 review shall be accomplished prior to approval by the airport and any condition required by the FAA shall be adhered to during and after completion of construction.

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

**The Draft 2004 ALUCP has the site within the A and B-2 zone. As an airport use it would be consistent as long as PART 77 is not exceeded.**

F. RI-04-134 – David Lewis – Consent item see page 13

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-04-134- David Lewis  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Change of Zone P04-1478 and Site Plan P04-1477

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Change of Zone from R1-65 & C2 to R3 and Site Plan for 95 residential units on 4.42 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located at 4826 Van Buren Blvd., south of Wells Avenue within the City of Riverside, approximately 5,500 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 proposed site is located approximately 5,500 ft. southwest of Runway 16-34 and 7,200 ft. south of the west end of Runway 9-27. The proposed site is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is a Change of Zone from R1-65 & C2 to R3, and Site Plan for 95 multifamily residential units on 4.42 acres. The TPZ has no population limits assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot. Structural coverage for the site is less than 35% of the net area. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Part 77: The highest pad elevation at the site is approximately 746 MSL feet and the height of the tallest structure is 27 feet. The site is under the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966 MSL. The elevation at the south end of the Runway 16-34 is 748 MSL. Any structure over 803 MSL at this location would need an FAA review. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

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

**DRAFT PLAN:** The new tentative draft ALUP places the site within Zone E and outside the 55 CNEL noise contour. Zone E has no density restrictions.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the conditions listed below.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport (909-351-6113).
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.*
5. *The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.*

## VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

### A. ALUCP Meeting Schedule and Location

The Jacqueline Chorán Regional Airport will be on the agenda for the February hearing and the meeting will be held in Indio.

### B. MARB Status

A summarized package of the laws regarding airport land use put together by Ken Brody for the March Air Reserve base has been distributed to the Commissioners.

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

Bill Storm, McCanna Hills came forward for item VI.B. and indicated he had gone to the wrong location and was not aware the finding was for continuance. The project is scheduled to go before the Planning Commission on January 5<sup>th</sup> and an ALUC clearance is required.

Chairman Stephens indicated that the finding was for continuance to the next scheduled hearing and the public hearing has been closed, therefore it cannot be reopened.

## IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

- X. Adjournment: Chairman Stephens adjourned the meeting at 12:30 P.M.  
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: January 13, 2005 at 9:00 a.m.,  
Riverside.