

# AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

Riverside County Administration Center  
4080 Lemon St., Board Room (1<sup>st</sup> Floor)  
Riverside, California

**THURSDAY, December 11, 2003**  
**9:00 A.M.**

## MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on December 11, 2003 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Room.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Ric Stephens, Chairman  
Marge Tandy  
Paul Bell  
Jon Goldenbaum  
Mark Lightsey  
Dave Hogan (Alternate)

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Walt Snyder  
Sam Pratt

STAFF PRESENT: Beverly Coleman, Development Specialist III  
B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel  
Bernadette Cruz

OTHERS PRESENT: Bob Fallon, Newland Communities  
Shane Fowler, Aardex  
Mick Ratican, Rick Engineering

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:04 a.m. by Chairman Stephens.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR August 21, 2003 and October 16, 2003 and November 13, 2003

Chairman Stephens indicated not having a quorum for the approval of the minutes, therefore would be continued to the next schedule meeting. Chairman Stephens then indicated that the members who were present state their approval of the minutes.

Commissioner Goldenbaum gave approval for the August and October minutes Commissioners Tandy, Bell and Chairman Stephens gave their approval for the October minutes.

The minutes for November 13, 2003 were not available, therefore were continued to the next schedule meeting.

V. OLD BUSINESS

**MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE/MIP**

**9:00 A.M.**

Keith Downs indicated that staff received a letter from the applicant requesting a continuance on this item.

Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Tandy made a motion for a continuance, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

A. MA-03-137 – T&B Planning Consultants – Continued see above

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-137 T & B Planning  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Perris  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** General Plan Amendment P03-0289, Specific Plan Amendment P03-288, C. Z. P03-0290 and TR 31157

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A General Plan Amendment to change the designations as indicated on the attached Statistical Summary. It would delete 32 acres of Commercial designation, increase the Multiple Family to 300 units and reduce the single family by 150 units for a total of 2,027 dwelling units. Open space is increased from 52 to 108 acres. Total Park space remains at 19.6 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is south of Nuevo Road, east of the Perris Valley Storm drain, west of Dunlap Rd., and southeast 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 and 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, 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 the March JPA is pursuing separate funding for that portion.

Since we have not adopted the CLUP for MARB, we utilize five 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 CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
4. Noise Data from the A.I.C.U.Z. Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP

### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 26,000–32,000 feet southeast of the south end of Runway 14-32. The proposal consists of a change that would redistribute the housing and parks in a different manner. The proposal is underlying two approach tracks and near others within the approach surface. The land is vacant to the north, east and south with the Perris Valley Storm drain to the west,

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 disallows 'high risk' commercial and industrial uses and agriculture, but allows no residential below lot sizes of two and one half acres. Area III has no residential density restrictions. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property inside of the 60, 65 and 70 CNEL.

Density and Coverage: The lots are a minimum of 5,000 sq. ft. and the average gross density is 3.8 DU/acre including the 19 acres of park and open space/detention basin and structural coverage would likely be less than 30%.

Part 77: The elevation at the tract site is between 1,416 and 1,422 MSL feet and the maximum allowed building height is 2,000 MSL feet. The site is under the approach surface. The entire project is not within Part 77 obstruction review criteria.

Noise: The site has been shown to have noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1986 report showed 65 to 75 CNEL over the property and the 1994 Draft indicated it to be within the 60 and 65+CNEL. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have from below 55 CNEL to well above 60 CNEL. The inclusion of another 2,027 homes will likely result in over six thousand new residents (3.35pph x 2,027+ 6,790). The predicted level of noise complaints from the project would likely produce a complaint level of 3-7% of that population (i.e. 203). This project would likely result in new complaints regarding noise from the airport.

Other: The Traffic Pattern Zones (TPZ's) 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. None are indicated.

Wildlife Attractant: The project contains a large regional detention basin. An analysis concerning that issue would need to be accomplished and sent to USDA, Wildlife Services for review. The lead agency may be the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

Environmental: No environmental assessment was included. It should include a requirement for an acoustical analysis in the areas above 60 and 65 CNEL.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the ALUC finds the proposed land use changes within Area II 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 AREAS II and III.

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 45 dB (CNEL of Ldn) in any inhabited room with windows closed." Area III has no residential density restrictions.

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 MARB

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 60-65+ 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 proposal as submitted would be inconsistent with the 1994 Draft for both safety and 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.

A "First Draft" of the text was completed for review by CalTrans, 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**

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

\* Within Area II \*\* for portions within 60 CNEL

**CONDITIONS FOR OVERRIDE**

Should the City of Perris 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 (CRL) of 25 and 30 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 buildout capacity. and*
  - c. *Notice to buyers that there is no effective mitigation for outdoor noise.*
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.*
  - a. *No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted*
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.*
5. *All prospective buyers and/or tenants shall receive a copy of the enclosed NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY.*

6. *Include the availability to homebuyers of an additional noise insulation package (i.e. windows, walls).*
7. *An analysis regarding wildlife attractants shall be submitted to the USDA, Wildlife Services and any conditions shall be included with the Specific Plan.*

**\*Consent items for 9:00 a.m.**

Keith Downs indicated that the following consent items would be voted as a group unless any of the Commissioners or anyone from the audience has questions. The consent items are as follows; RI-03-139 Evergreen Devco, RI-03-141 Michael Mc Hale, MA-03-145 Canty Engineering, MA-03-148 Aadex Corporation, MA-03-149 Gabel Cook & Becklund, MA-03-150 Fred Cook Architects, MA-03-153 Riverside County, and BD-03-113 Warner Engineering,

Chairman Stephens called for anyone wishing to pull an item or unclear on any of the consent items to come forward. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set.

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

VI. NEW BUSINESS

**RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

- A. RI-03-139 – Evergreen Devco – Consent item see above

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-03-139 – Evergreen Devco  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** PP 18847

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A 14,820 sq. ft. drug store on approximately 1.5 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located east of Clay Street, south of Limonite Avenue within the County of Riverside, approximately 8,500 ft. north 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 8,500 feet north of Runway 16-34 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for 14,820 sq. ft. retail on approximately 1.5 acres. Structural coverage for the site, including open space, would likely be less than 25%. 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 elevation at this site is approximately 796 MSL feet and the height of the structures is approximately 30 ft. The site is under the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966 MSL. The elevation of the south end of Runway 16-34 is 748 MSL. Any structure over 906 MSL 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. The site has lot coverage of less than 50%, and Zone E has no lot coverage limit. The proposed use is a generally compatible use under the draft plan.**

**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.

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

B. RI-03-141 – Michael Mc Hale – Consent item see page 6

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-03-141-Michael McHale  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Design Review

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A dental office building consisting of 4,773 sq. ft. on .57 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at 4942 Arlington Avenue, west of Aden Way within the City of Riverside, approximately 7,900 ft. east of Runway 9-27 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport*

- a. Airport Influence Area: ERC*
- b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

*Land Use:* *The proposed site is located approximately 7,900 feet east of Runway 9-27 and is within the EXTENDED RUNWAY CENTERLINE (ERC). The proposal is for a 4,773 sq. ft. dental office building with 36 parking spaces on approximately .57 acres. Maximum ground coverage is limited to 50% of the gross or 65% of the net area in the ERC. Structural coverage for the site will be less than 25% of the net area. Population density is limited to 75 persons per acre. The estimated building occupancy is 29 persons based on the UBC, or 52 persons per acre. 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 elevation at this site is approximately 810 MSL feet and the height of the structures is approximately 23 ft. The site is under the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966 MSL. The elevation of the east end of Runway 9-27 is 816 MSL. Any structure over 895 MSL 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 C. The site has coverage of less than 25%. Zone C allows at least 80%. Certain uses are prohibited in Zone C, including children’s schools, day care centers, libraries, hospitals and nursing homes.***

**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.*

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

**MARCH AIR RESERVED BASE/MIP**

**9:00 A.M.**

C. MA-03-145 – Canty Engineering – Consent item see page 6

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-145-Canty Engineering Group, Inc.  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Variance and Design Review  
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*An apartment complex consisting of approximately 9,350 sq. ft. on .81 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is south of Central Avenue and west of Canyon Crest Drive within the City of Riverside, approximately 26,900 feet 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 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 adopted 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 1999 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: 1993/2002

Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994

Noise Data from 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 26,900 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is within the outer horizontal surface. The proposal is for a 16-unit apartment complex consisting of one two-story building, one three-story building and a garage building. 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. Residential uses are acceptable in Area III contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The gross area of the proposed site is .81 acres and structural coverage is approximately 9,350 sq. ft., which is less than 40% of the lot.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,100 MSL feet and the height of proposed structures is 38 ft. The runway elevation at the north end is 1,535 MSL. Any construction above an elevation of 1,804 MSL feet at this location will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

Noise: The site has been shown to have significant noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be outside 55 CNEL.

### **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 aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any office portions of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Lighting plans for any additional development on the vacant lots shall be reviewed and approved by an airport lighting consultant or MARB/MIP prior to placement.
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 provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.

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

- D. MA-03-146 – Rick Engineering – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-146- Rick Engineering Company  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Tract map 30592

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Tract Map for 131 single-family residential lots and a detention basin on 32.5 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is south of Rider Street, west of Patterson Avenue within the County of Riverside, approximately 12,200 ft. south 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.

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, 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 five 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: 1993/2002
3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
4. Noise Data from the A.I.C.U.Z. Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
5. Draft 98/99 CLUP for MARB/MIP

### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 12,200 feet south of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for 131 single-family residential lots on 32.5 acres. The proposal is underlying an approach track and within the horizontal surface.

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 disallows 'high risk' commercial and industrial uses and agriculture, but allows no residential below lot sizes of two and one half acres.

Density and Coverage: The lots are a minimum of 7,200 sq. ft and the proposed density is 4.1 DU/acre. Structural coverage would likely be less than 50%.

Part 77: The highest pad elevation at this site is 1,577 MSL feet and the building height is 23 feet. The runway elevation at the north end is 1,535 MSL. Any construction above an elevation of 1,657 MSL at this location would require an FAA review. Part 77 obstruction review criteria is not a concern.

Noise: The site has been shown to have noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1986 report showed less than 65 CNEL over the property and the 1994 Draft indicated it to be inside the 60 CNEL. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be within 55 CNEL. The inclusion of another 131 homes will likely result in new residents (3.35 pph x 131=439). The predicted level of noise complaints from the project would likely produce a complaint level of 3% of that population (i.e. 13) regarding noise from the airport.

Wildlife Attractant: The project contains one small detention basin. An analysis concerning that issue would need to be accomplished and sent to USDA Wildlife Services for review.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the ALUC finds the proposed Tract Map 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 45 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 inside the 60 CNEL. Section 7.3.1 of the 1994 Draft CLUP states that 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 proposal as submitted would be consistent with the 1994 Draft for both safety and noise, with appropriate noise attenuation measures.

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.

A "First Draft" of the text was completed for review by CalTrans, 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 consistent with the 98/99 Draft CLUP.

**TABLE 1**

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

CONDITIONS FOR OVERRIDE

Should the County 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 (CRL) of 25 and 30 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 buildout capacity and

- c. Notice to buyers that there is no effective mitigation for outdoor noise.*
- 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. 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. All prospective buyers and/or tenants shall receive a copy of the enclosed NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY.*
- 5. Include the availability to homebuyers of an additional noise insulation (5NLR) package (i.e. windows, walls).*
- 6. An analysis of the detention basin shall be submitted to USDA Wildlife Services, and any conditions required by the USDA Wildlife letter shall be accomplished by the project.*

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners for staff, hearing no responses Chairman Stephens called the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Matt Hardy, Stowe Passco Development came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and indicated that the county planning commission is recommending this project for approval with conditions. This project is a completion of an original tentative map that was approved in 1986 for 7200 sq. ft. lots. The lots have been built and houses exist on the westerly boundary area of the project site. This tentative map was approved with an additional 9 lots, which was expired and acquired by Stowe Passco who re-instituted the tentative map. An environmental assessment was submitted to the County of Riverside to remove about 300,000 cubic yards of soil off the site and a bond has been presented to the Board of Supervisors, which has been accepted and approved. Mr. Hardy expressed his concern for the finding of inconsistency and indicated that the tentative map is in the process of being finalized. Mr. Hardy then urged the Commission to reconsider the facts; on the staff report this project is inconsistent in one of the nine categories and with the 1984 RCALUP. In the intervening 20 years an excess of 100 houses have been built under the previous

approval of this tentative map, which is a later stage, and the reason for it not going forward in the past was due to market conditions in the early 90's.

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 response he called for discussion from the Commissioners. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens inquired if the RCIP has a different density than the CLUP's. Keith Downs indicated that the ALUC's consultant reviewed the area and the CLUP's are incorporated into the plan including the 1984-86. Even though there may be a designation of one-acre lots, further review of the General Plan would include a review of ALUC's Plan and preclude the 2.5 acres.

Mick Ratican, Rick Engineering came forward and indicated that the RCIP shows a higher density than the Airport Land Use Plans. Chairman Stephens inquired if the Commission makes a finding of consistency would the applicant be amenable to the conditions. Mr. Ratican responded that some of the conditions have already been met and does not object to the other conditions, although he is unsure what an analysis of the detention basin would entail under condition number six. The detention basin is on a very small drainage area, which will fill up very quickly in a two to four hour storm and will empty within two hours. There will not be any standing water beyond a period of the intensity of a local storm, but if an analysis is required it will be done.

Dave Hogan, Alternate, inquired to staff regarding the different Land Use Plans used for the March Air Reserved Base. Keith Downs responded that the 1984 plan is a generic textural document without any mappings. It describes areas 1, 2 and 3, and what is precluded in those particular areas. It also talks about Avigation Easements and generically what these areas would be composed of. What has occurred is that the law didn't require CLUP's for military facilities or any federal facilities until about two years ago. There was an effort in 1994 to do a CLUP for the area, but the BRAC's base realignments came in and the nature of the base was changing. There were questions about its applicability and a hearing has never taken place. In 1998 an attempt was made to update that CLUP, but the same problems occurred with some of the information. The new CLUP that's upcoming next year will extensively fix all of that, but it's not on the immediate horizon. The 1984 text with the 1986 map is the legally adopted plan for March Air Reserve Base.

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

Hearing no response Chairman Stephens called upon Commissioner Goldenbaum. Commissioner Goldenbaum indicated sympathetically that looking at the project as a matter of policy it's inconsistent. Commissioner Bell interjected indicating he concurs, although it's unfortunate, but this Commission has to follow the rules that are set.

Chairman Stephens then called a roll call for voting of the Commissioners for this project.

Alternate Hogan indicated inconsistency, Commissioner Tandy indicated inconsistency and Commissioner Lightsey also indicated inconsistency. Chairman Stephens then indicated he would be the descending vote and its unfortunate this project was in the mist of some changes that weren't ratified or concluded.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Inconsistency passes at 5 to 1.

E. MA-03-148 – Aadex Corporation – Consent item see page 6

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-148- Aadex Corporation  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Plot Plan 18961

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A plot plan for an 183,387 sq. ft. warehouse with 19,000 sq. ft. of offices on 11.3 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated west of Patterson Ave., and south of Cajalco Road within the County of Riverside, approximately 10,000 ft. south 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 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.*

*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 efforts were 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 large record warehouse on 11.3 acres. The proposed site is located approximately 10,000 ft. south of Runway 14/32. The proposal is near a major flight*



*track and within the inner horizontal surface.*

*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 few restrictions. 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 area of the proposed structures is approximately 183,387 sq. ft. The lot area is approximately 11.5 acres (net). Structural coverage will be less than 36% of the net area.*

*Part 77:* *The finished floor elevation of the building is 1,540-45 MSL feet and the height of the structure is approximately 26 ft. The runway elevation is 1,488 MSL. Any structures over 1,588 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 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 outside 55 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. 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 shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.*
7. *Structures exceeding 1,588 MSL feet in elevation shall require FAA 7460 review.*

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

F. MA-03-149 – Gabel Cook & Becklund – Consent item see page 6

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-149 Gabel Cook & Becklund  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Tract Map 31859

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Tentative Tract Map for twelve residential lots on approximately 26.64 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is situated south of Overlook Parkway and opposite Bodewin Court within the City of Riverside, approximately 33,000 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 residential development on approximately 26.64 acres. The proposed site is located approximately 33,000 ft. north of Runway 14/32. The proposal is near a major flight track and within the outer horizontal surface.

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 land use with a few restrictions. 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 lot area is approximately 24,240 sq. ft. (net). Structural coverage will be less than 25% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 1,370 MSL feet and the height of the structures is unknown at this time. Any structures over 1,888 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 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 less than 55 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. 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. Structures exceeding 1,888 MSL feet in elevation shall be submitted to the FAA for review.

6. The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.

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

G. MA-03-150 – Fred Cook Architects – Consent item see page 6

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-150-Fred Cook Architects.  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Design Review  
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A drive-thru restaurant totaling 3,100 sq. ft. on .71 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is south of Canyon Springs Parkway, west of Day Street within the City of Riverside, approximately 14,400 feet north 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 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 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 Realignment: However, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone adopted 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 1999 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:

1. The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base
2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 1993/2002
3. Draft CLUP for March Air Force Base: 1994
4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
5. 98/99 Draft CLUP

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 14,400 feet north of Runway 14-32. The

proposal is near a major approach and departure track and within the outer horizontal surface. The proposal is for a drive-thru restaurant totaling 3,100 sq. ft on .71 acres. 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 II. Commercial uses are allowed in Area II subject to certain constraints.

Density and Coverage: The gross area of the proposed site is .71 acres and structural coverage is approximately 3,100 sq. ft., which is less than 20% of the lot.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,606 MSL feet and the height of the proposed structure is approximately 30 ft. The runway elevation at the north end is 1,535 MSL. Any construction above an elevation of 1,679 MSL feet at this location would require FAA review.

Noise: The site has been shown to have significant noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be outside 55 CNEL.

**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 aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any office portions of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Lighting plans for any additional development on the vacant lots shall be reviewed and approved by an airport lighting consultant or MARB/MIP prior to placement.
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 provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.

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

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-03-153-Riverside County  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** GPA 680

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A General Plan Amendment changing various land use designation from Business Park to Light Industrial, Commercial Retail and Public Facilities and Community Center to Community Center Overlay on 650 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated south of Nandina Avenue, north of Rider Street and west of I-215 within the County of Riverside, approximately 3,000-10,000 ft. southwest 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 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:*

- 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 to delete the Community Center Designation and replace it with a Community Center Overlay and to change designations from Business Park to Light Industrial*

and Commercial retail on 660 acres. The proposed site is located approximately 3,000-10,000 ft. southwest of Runway 14/32. The proposal is within the inner horizontal surface.

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 industrial land use. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: None of the factors within the County General Plan (RCIP) that implement the ALUP are changing.

Part 77: Any structures exceeding the Part 77 notification procedure criteria will require an FAA 7460 review. This could involved structures from 25 to 100 feet in height over the runway elevation Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with the project at this time.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1994 Draft CLUP placed the property inside of the 60 and 65 CNEL. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the noise level on portions of the property to be over 55 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. 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. 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 attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential tenant or buyer.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project subject to the

conditions outlined above.

**BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

I. BD-03-113 – Warner Engineering – Consent item see page 6

**CASE NUMBER:** BD-03-113 – Warner Engineering  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** PP 18868, Parcel Map 31704

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is a Plot Plan for a 38,000 sq. ft. of offices and a Parcel Map for 6 lots on 6.93 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located on the north side of Wildcat Drive west of Washington Street in the County of Riverside, approximately 5,500-6,500 ft. northwest of Runway 10-28 at the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport

**Land Use Policy:**

- a. Airport Influence Area: Area III
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area
- c. Noise Levels: Outside 60 dB CNEL (February 1996)

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposal is for a retail center located approximately 8,000 feet northwest of the west end of Runway 10-28 at Bermuda Dunes Airport. The proposal is within Area III of the Airport Influence Area. The area of the proposed buildings is 38,000 sq. ft. and the lot area is approximately 6.93 acres (net). Structural coverage will be less than 20% of the net area. The proposed use is an acceptable use, contingent upon noise and height issues.

NOISE: The site will be subject to aircraft noise of some annoyance. The entire site is outside of the 60 CNEL according to the 1996 noise study, but those noise projections considered less traffic than is now being experienced and were annualized over the entire year. Ultimate traffic with seasonal and weekend peaking will likely produce noise of some annoyance on the site.

PART 77: The highest elevation at the site is 98 MSL and the height of the tallest structure is approximately 35 ft. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. At a distance of 8,000 ft. from the runway, proposed structures exceeding 153 MSL will require an FAA 7460 review.

Lighting intensity and patterns can adversely affect pilot visibility near airports. Any light that would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber other than an FAA approved system can cause confusion.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport.
- 2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior



noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.

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 a 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.*
4. *The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential property purchaser or tenant.*
5. *The applicant shall complete an FAA 7460 review for all structures over 30 feet on height prior to building permits and implement any conditions required.*
6. *Subsequent permits for uses within the center shall be reviewed by the ALUC prior to approval by the City. Any noise sensitive use within the site shall have an acoustical noise study completed prior to that review. Day centers, libraries, hospitals, churches and nursing homes shall not be allowed.*

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

**DRAFT ALUP:** The tentative draft plan designates the area as Zone D and certain use would be prohibited and some discouraged. The draft noise contours for the airport place the site within the 55 CNEL.

## **CHINO AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

### **J. CH-03-108 – Albert Webb Associates – Continuance**

Keith Downs requested a continuance due to not receiving the proper documentation for review.

Chairman Stephens called for the applicant to come forward and present the case, hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Bell made a motion of continuance to the next schedule hearing. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**CASE NUMBER:** CH-03-108 – Albert Webb Associates

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** SP 331, CZ 6759 and Tract Map 30971

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*Specific Plan, Change of Zone, and Tract Map for 242 single-family lots and 278 condominium lots.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is situated west of Archibald Avenue south of Schleisman Road within the County of Riverside, approximately 8,800-11,000 ft. southeast 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 8,800 feet east of Runway 26L. The touch and go flight tracks are overhead and to the west and one departure flight track is overhead.*

*The 1991 CLUP places the property outside of Safety Zone III but is within the Area of Influence Study Area. 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 626 MSL feet The runway elevation is 635 MSL at the east end of the runway. The site is within the horizontal surface at this location. Structures exceeding 723 MSL in elevation at this location will require an FAA 7460 review. An instrument approach is 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 may 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 last year and 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 would recommend continuance until January 15, 2003 in order to review the revised Tract and the proposed Specific Plan, which was not received until December 2.*

*In order to recommend approval of this project the following findings must be made 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.*

**FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

- K. FV-03-117 – RBF Consulting – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and

using exhibits, staff report and recommendations

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-03-117 RBF Consulting  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** TM 30694  
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Tract Map for 81 single-family residential lots and open space on 35 acres. This project was reviewed by the ALUC as part of Specific Plan 312 in 2000.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is south of Leon Road, north of Briggs Road and west of Winchester Road in the County of Riverside, approximately 5-6,000 ft. north of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport: French Valley  
a. Airport Influence Area: Extended Runway Centerline (ERC) Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)  
c. Noise Levels: Outside of 55 CNEL for 2013

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposal is for 81 single-family residential lots on 35 acres. The lot coverage standard for the TPZ and ERC is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the site is 1,412 MSL and the highest pad elevation of the residential units is 1,412 MSL. The height of the tallest building is 27.5 feet. The horizontal surface is at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 MSL at the north end. Structures exceeding 1,397 MSL in elevation will require FAA 7460 review.

**Noise:** The site will get significant over flight especially with GPS approaches, but is outside of the current and near future 55 CNEL. These aircraft will be coming in low(300-500AGL) over the site as shown on Figure V.C-13.

Conclusion: The proposal is consistent with the French Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) 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.
2. The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.
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.*

**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.*

**Draft Plan:** *The Draft Plan has not been completed, but should be soon. With the GPS approach over this site those occasional aircraft using it will be close to the surface at this location and will be of some annoyance to the residents. Additional notification, such as surface signage indicating the approach zone may be necessary.*

Keith Downs indicated that the next three cases are adjoining properties, which are legally consent projects. They were not under the consent calendar due to some issues the Commission needs to be aware of. This Commission reviewed the Specific Plan in the year 2000. Some things have happened since then and other will happen in the near future. One of them is the notification of airport in vicinity that will be required January 1<sup>st</sup> the other is the handbook came out in 2001, which was not available. The handbook would indicate that in some of these areas there shouldn't be residential allowed although the current plan allows three units per acres and more in some of the areas.

Mr. Downs then indicated that more notices need to go to the potential occupants and suggested, but not required that signs be placed on the roadways indicating, " This is the center line of the runway or the pattern zone, approaches". Mr. Downs indicated staff is recommending a finding of consistency, but series consideration should be given to the additional notification. This Commission has never asked for any street marking, it would be something new if the Commission goes this direction as a recommendation.

Hearing no comments Chairman Stephens called for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Bob Fallon, Newland Communities came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and concurred with the recommendations listed on the staff report. As for the posting of signs if it's the applicable way of notifying the home owner there wouldn't be any problems doing so. Mr. Fallon then made himself available for any questions.

Commissioner Goldenbaum indicated that looking at accident statistics the majority of fatal and catastrophic accidents happen on non-precision approaches, which is the case for the French Valley Airport. The approach path that is set up over such a clustered

residential area from an aviator's point of view is a worse case scenario.

Chairman Stephens inquired to Mr. Downs that since the applicant has agreed to the additional condition of posting signs on the roadways, would the Commission consider it at this time. Keith Downs responded positively and indicated it would be appropriate.

B.T. Miller clarified that the finding is for consistency and making a recommendation to the County on the posting of signs.

Alternate Hogan expressed his discomfort with finding this project consistent and suggested continuing the project for further review of the draft plan.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Alternate Dave made a motion of continuance to the next schedule meeting. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

L. FV-03118 – RBF Consulting – Continuance see above

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-03-118 RBF Consulting  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** TM 30695  
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Tract Map for 110 single-family residential lots and open space on 49.17 acres. This project was reviewed by the ALUC as part of Specific Plan 312 in 2000.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is south of Leon Road, south of Briggs Road and west of Winchester Road in the County of Riverside, approximately 5-6,000 ft. north of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.*

**LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport: French Valley  
a. Airport Influence Area: Extended Runway Centerline (ERC) Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)  
c. Noise Levels: Outside of 55 CNEL for 2013

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposal is for 110 single-family residential lots on 49 acres. The lot coverage standard for the TPZ and ERC is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross.*

Part 77: *The highest elevation on the site is 1,412 MSL and the highest pad elevation of the residential units is 1,412 MSL. The height of the tallest building is 27.5 feet. The horizontal surface is at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 MSL at the north end. Structures exceeding 1,397 MSL in elevation will require FAA 7460 review.*

**Noise:** *The site will get significant over flight especially with GPS approaches, but is outside of the current and near future 55 CNEL. These aircraft will be coming in low(300-500AGL) over the site as shown on Figure V.C-13.*

Conclusion: *The proposal is consistent with the French Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan*

(CLUP) 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.
2. The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.
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.

**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.

**Draft Plan:** *The Draft Plan has not been completed, but should be soon. With the GPS approach over this site those occasional aircraft using it will be close to the surface at this location and will be of some annoyance to the residents. Additional notification, such as surface signage indicating the approach zone may be necessary.*

M. FV-03-119 – RBF Consulting – Continuance see page 30

<b>CASE NUMBER:</b>	<u>FV-03-119 RBF Consulting</u>
<b>APPROVING JURISDICTION:</b>	County of Riverside
<b>JURISDICTION CASE NO.:</b>	TM 30696
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION:</b>	

A Tract Map for 464 single-family residential lots and open space on 173 acres. This project was reviewed by the ALUC as part of Specific Plan 312 in 2000.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is north of Leon Road, north of Briggs Road and west of Winchester Road in the County of Riverside, approximately 5-9,000 ft. north of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport: French Valley  
a. Airport Influence Area: Extended Runway Centerline (ERC) Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)  
c. Noise Levels: Outside of 55 CNEL for 2013

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposal is for 464 single-family residential lots on 173 acres. The lot coverage standard for the TPZ and ERC is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the site is 1,412 MSL and the highest pad elevation of the residential units is 1,412 MSL. The height of the tallest building is 27.5 feet. The horizontal surface is at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 MSL at the north end. Structures exceeding 1,397 MSL in elevation will require FAA 7460 review.

**Noise:** The site will get significant over flight especially with GPS approaches, but is outside of the current and near future 55 CNEL. These aircraft will be coming in low(300-500AGL) over the site as shown on Figure V.C-13.

Conclusion: The proposal is consistent with the French Valley Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) 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.
2. The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.
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.

**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.

**Draft Plan:** The Draft Plan has not been completed, but should be soon. With the GPS approach over this site those occasional aircraft using it will be close to the surface at this location and will be of some annoyance to the residents. Additional notification, such as surface signage indicating the approach zone may be necessary.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. Draft Plan Airport Plan

Keith Downs indicated that at the next meeting the draft plan for Desert Center, Corona, Chiriaco Summit and French Valley airports would be presented.

B. MOATF Committee November 17<sup>th</sup> and December 15<sup>th</sup>

Keith Downs indicated that the meeting scheduled for November 17<sup>th</sup> was postponed till December 15<sup>th</sup>. Dr. Jeffers, consultant will be attending the meeting and will be speaking about encroachment around airbases and what it means from an AICUZ perspective. A grant has not been received at this time and that makes it six months to a year before a draft plan is available for March.

VII. ORAL COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA. NONE

VIII. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Chairman Stephens welcomed Commissioner Lightsey and Alternate Hogan.

IX. Adjournment: Chairman Stephens adjourned the meeting at 10:10 A.M.

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: January 15, 2004 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside.