

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

Riverside County Administration Center
4080 Lemon St., Hearing Room (1st Floor)
Riverside, California

THURSDAY, September 16, 2004
9:00 A.M.

MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on September 16, 2004 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Room.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Ric Stephens, Chairman
Dave Hogan, Vice Chairman
June Stephens, Alternate
Kathy Rohm, Alternate
Marge Tandy
Mark Lightsey

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Sam Pratt
Simon Housman
Arthur Butler
Jon Goldenbaum

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Jiyang Hou
Leroy Edwards
John Lyon
Ray Borel
Hank Van Gaale
William Devine
Devina Felix
Mike Smith

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Chairman Stephens.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR: June 10, 2004

July 15, 2004: Chairman Stephens indicated not having a quorum for the minutes. Chairman Stephens then indicated that the members present give their approval of the minutes and it

would be carried over to the next meeting. Chairman Stephens, Vice Chairman Hogan, and Commissioner Lightsey gave their approval for the minutes.

V. OLD BUSINESS

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

- A. FV-04-103 – Zan Marquis – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: FV-04-103- Zan Marquis
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Murrieta
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Parcel Map 32123, GPA, CZ 004-057 and CUP 004-062
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A General Plan Amendment, Change of Zone (from SP265/Business Park, Rural Residential to Regional Commercial, Open Space) and Parcel Map for 454,789 sq. ft. of commercial retail usage on 79 gross acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located east of Briggs Road, west of Winchester Road and south of Thompson Road in the City of Murrieta, from approximately 3,150 to 6,000 ft. north of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Emergency Touchdown Zone (ETZ), Outer Safety Zone (OSZ), Extended Runway Centerline (ERC), and Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
b. Noise Levels: Mostly Outside of 55 CNEL for 2013

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposal is for a commercial retail center, to include retail stores, garden center and restaurants totaling 454,789 sq. ft. along with open space/wetlands on 79 gross acres. Based on information submitted by the applicant, proposed structures are located within the ETZ, OSZ, ERC and TPZ. Structures are prohibited within the ETZ. As shown in the attached Table 7A to the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan, prohibited uses with the OSZ include hotels, restaurants, bars, schools, hospitals, government services, auditoriums and uses involving as the primary activity the manufacture or distribution of explosives or flammable materials. Uses involving the manufacture or distribution of explosives or flammable materials are also prohibited in the ERC, and are a discouraged use in the TPZ. The proposed use is inconsistent with allowed land uses in the ETZ and OSZ.*

Density and Coverage: *Based on information submitted by the applicant, 14 of the 17 parcels on the site are currently proposed for development and have a total area of 46.24 acres. The number of proposed parking spaces is 2,338. The remaining three parcels are shown as open space or vacant. Assuming 1.5 persons per parking space, an average project density of 76 persons per acre is calculated. Using UBC occupancy standards for retail stores and dining areas, an average density of 174 persons per acre is calculated. The maximum population density in the OSZ is 25 persons per acre, and within the ERC, the maximum is 100 persons per acre. The estimated population density for the project exceeds the OSZ standard. There is no population density standard for the TPZ. Based on the project site plan, structural coverage*

within the parcels proposed for development is less than 25% of the net area. This is within the allowable standard for the OSZ, ERC and TPZ. The maximum structural coverage allowed in the OSZ is 25% of the net area. Within the TPZ and ERC the lot coverage standard is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross, whichever is greater. The proposed structural coverage and estimated population density for the project is inconsistent with the ETZ standard since structures are prohibited within the ETZ.

Part 77: Most of the site is located within the 34:1 approach surface, although the northerly end of the site is within the horizontal surface. Over-flying aircraft will be coming in low (200-400AGL) over the runway centerline. Structures exceeding 1,439 MSL at the south end of the site would be an obstruction. The highest elevation on the property is 1,355 MSL and the height of the tallest building is 46 ft. The horizontal surface is at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 MSL at the north 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 3,150 ft. from the runway, structures exceeding 1,378 MSL at the south end of the site will require FAA 7460 review.

Noise: The site will get significant over-flight especially with GPS approaches, but is outside of the current 55 CNEL. Most of the site is outside the 55 CNEL contour for 2013.

Draft 2004 ALUCP: The draft plan designates the site to be within Zones B1 and C and shows a large portion of the site within the 55 CNEL contour for 2022. An average density of 76 persons per acre is estimated for the project based on the proposed number of parking spaces. Based on UBC building occupancy standards the estimated average density is 174 persons per acre. The maximum allowable density in Zone B1 is 25 persons per acre. In Zone C, the maximum density is 75 persons per acre. Drive-thru restaurants are a generally incompatible use within Zone B1. According to the attached General Plan Consistency Review for French Valley Airport prepared by Mead and Hunt as part of the draft plan, non-residential uses in Zone B1 and Zone C are a potential conflict with the General Plan designation of Heavy Industrial (M2 and M3) due to the intensity limits within Zones B1 and C.

Other: As of the date of this staff report (9/07/04) the applicant has submitted no new or additional information on this proposal.

Conclusion: As submitted, the proposal is inconsistent with the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). Proposed structures within the ETZ and proposed restaurants within the OSZ do not meet the land use and density standards for these safety zones, and would need to be removed or relocated to meet applicable standards.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of inconsistency with the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP).

CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE:

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. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.
4. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.

5. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).*
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 any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
7. *Schools, churches and uses involving higher densities of population shall be avoided.*
8. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*
9. *Any subsequent permits shall be reviewed by the ALUC.*
10. *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.*

Beverly Coleman indicated that the applicant requested a continuance.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for any questions from the Commissioners for staff. Vice Chairman Hogan inquired on the sixty (60) day timeline. Counsel B.T. Miller responded that the timeline won't apply since the commission is relying on the applicant request for a continuance.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for the applicant to come forward and present the case, 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 for continuance to the next scheduled hearing. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- B. FV-04-105 – Hank Van Gaale – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

Keith Downs indicated this item being continued for further review on whether the project is within a Specific Plan. A response has been received from Adam Rush,

County of Riverside indicating the project falls within Specific Plan 106, which is subject for the exemption clause.

CASE NUMBER: FV-04-105 – Hank Van Gaale
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PP 19317

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A plot plan for a child care facility for 144 students plus 12 staff on .897 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located south of Benton Road and west of Van Gaale Road within the County of Riverside, from approximately 5,000 ft. northeast of the Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ) **Zone D in Draft 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 7,143 sq. ft. child care complex on .897 (net) acres. Based on the site plan submitted by the applicant the childcare complex site is located within the TPZ for Runway 18-36. The proposed development, which includes eight classrooms and an office building, along with parking and landscape improvements The existing and proposed zoning for the site is MSC.*

SAFETY ZONES	APPLICABLE LAND USE AND HEIGHT STANDARDS	
	<u>For Areas Inside Adopted Specific Plan</u>	For Areas Outside Adopted Specific Plan (For Comparison Only)
TPZ	Exempt from CLUP requirements applicable to land use, development density, and development intensity. However, development approval is subject to certain land use restrictions (Table 7 A, Notes A & B), sound insulation (Section 7.3.1) and height standards (FAR Part 77) set forth in the CLUP.	<p>Discourage schools, auditoriums, amphitheaters, stadiums, churches, and uses involving as the primary activity, manufacture, storage, or distribution of explosives or flammable materials</p> <p>Max. Density Not Applicable Max. Structural Coverage– greater of 50% of gross area or 65% of net area. Max. Height – F.A.R. Part 77 standards</p> <p>The note in 7.5.2 states that within the TPZ, a variety of land uses are to be discouraged from being developed. When development of these uses is proposed, the Airport Land Use Commission shall require the applicant to show that alternative locations have been considered and are not feasible. The applicant shall then be directed to consider a development plan that will minimize the exposure to hazard as much as possible. This might involve reducing structure heights, reducing lot coverage, or reducing the overall scale of the project, considering satellite location for some of the proposed functions of the facility.</p>

All of the building is located within the TPZ. The lot coverage for the proposed development area is 18% (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. For proposed developments that include discouraged uses the CLUP requires that the applicant show that alternative locations have been considered and are not feasible. The applicant has not provided information on alternative locations.

The proposed site is located within adopted Specific Plan 106. Policies described in Section 7.4 of the French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), included as Exhibit B to this staff report, provide for the exemption of projects located within adopted specific plans from all requirements of the CLUP pertaining to land use, development density and development intensity.

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

Land Use Restrictions Applicable to Projects within Approved Specific Plans (Notes from

Table 7A of French Valley Airport CLUP):

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

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 ultimate end of Runway 18/36 to the building at the proposed site is approximately 5,000 ft. . Any structures over the height of 1,388 MSL at this location require FAA review. The height of the tallest structure is 27 ft. with a pad elevation of 1,364.5, at a distance of approximately 5,000 ft. from the ultimate 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).

2004 Draft ALUCP: The new draft plan places the site within Zone D which states that children's schools are discouraged. The note (#17) states 'Discouraged uses should generally not be permitted unless no feasible alternative is available.

Addendum September 16: At he last meeting it was requested that the applicant obtain specific Plan information from the County to verify that the project is within a Specific Plan and whether it is consistent with that plan The attached communication form the County staff indicates that it is within the Dutch Village Specific Plan and is consistent.

CONCLUSION: Staff has concluded the following: 1) those portions of the proposal within the TPZ uses are inconsistent with the standards of the CLUP pertaining to land use. 2) According to Section 7.4 of the CLUP, projects located within adopted specific plans are exempted from the standards of the CLUP pertaining to land use, development density and development intensity; 3) The proposal is within SP 106, and would be therefore exempt from the standards of the CLUP pertaining to land use, development density and development intensity that would be otherwise applicable.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Commission find the project "Exempt" based upon section 7.4 of the current CLUP.

CONDITIONS: For County Utilization

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.*
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 and users of the facility including parents and guardians.*

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioners for staff hearing no response Chairman Stephens called the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Hank VanGaale came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and made him self available for any questions. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for discussion from the Commissioners. Alternate Rohm voiced her opposition of a daycare facility being so close to the airport. Vice Chairman Hogan concurred. Chairman Stephens indicated that making a finding on the project is out of the Commissions jurisdiction. Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephen called for motion to be set. A discussion ensued among the Commissioners in regards to the opposition of the project and not making a motion. Counsel B.T. Miller indicated that if a motion is not made the project would be considered a consistent project. Commissioner Lightsey indicated wanting the override conditions attached and would be preferable to act on the item. Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Lightsey made a motion to exempt the project. Vice Chairman Hogan seconded the motion.

ABSTAINED: Commissioner Tandy and Alternate Rohm.

Motion failed due to a 3/2 vote.

Chairman Stephens clarified that the exemption does not indicate the Commission supporting the project it indicates that the ALUC does not have authority to make a finding on the project. Counsel B.T. Miller indicated that if the Commission desires a new motion could be made.

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Hogan made a motion to exempt the project. Commissioner Lightsey seconded.

ABSTAINED: Commissioner Tandy

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

- C. 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. 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 has been submitted by the applicant to the FAA. As of the date of this staff report (9/07/04), an FAA 7460 review has not been received.**

Draft Plan: The draft 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 draft plan subject to certain constraints.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend that the proposal be continued to October 14, 2004 ALUC meeting in order to receive the FAA 7460 review.

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 buildings in this project shall have an active FAA 7460 review at the time of construction and shall not exceed obstruction standards. Structures shall be lighted as per FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1K.*
9. *The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*

Beverly Coleman indicated this item being continued from the previous meeting due to height issue. The applicant has submitted a 7460 review to the FAA and has not received a response at this point.

Chairman Stephens inquired on the length of time the FAA takes to respond. Beverly Coleman responded that the FAA is required to respond within thirty (30) days.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for question from the Commissioners for staff. Hearing no response Chairman Stephens called for the applicant to come forward and present the case, hearing no response Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments from the audience.

Mike Smith, Bermuda Dunes Airport Manager came forward and commented that the FAA has been neglecting to notify the airport of these types of proposed constructions for the purposes of making comments. Mr. Smith then voiced his concern with height, indicating the building should not be no more than twenty three feet (23') above filled elevation. Mr. Smith then requested to receive a copy of the FAA response.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Lightsey made a motion for continuance to the next scheduled meeting. Alternate Rohm seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Regional

9:00 A.M.

- D. 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 –

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 12th 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 27th 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.

Keith Downs indicated that a letter from William Divine was distributed to the Commissioners.

Chairman Stephens called for William Divine to come forward.

William Devine, came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and indicated being present on behalf of the Borel Family owners of the Air Park Center surrounding French Valley Airport. The property was approved and adopted by a specific plan in 1991, which falls under the exemption clause. A potential buyer contacted the Airport Land Use Commission for compatibility and consistency for proposed project and where informed that the new Compatibility Plan would create inconsistency. Mr. Devine requested continuance for the French Valley Airport to allow time for review of the Compatibility Plan.

Ray Borel came forward and indicated that the draft Compatibility Plan does not provide his property with economic value and requested time to work with staff in regards to the inconsistencies.

Keith Downs indicated that letters of comments have been distributed to the Commissioners. On the previous hearing public testimony was taken from Mr. Brelant in regards to the Hemet Ryan Airport Master Plan. A response has been sent to Mr. Brelant, his attorney and Mr. McLaughlin, directing them to the County of Riverside. Letters have been received from neighbors adjacent to the Hemet Ryan Airport requesting to be informed of any hearings concerning the Hemet Ryan Airport. Staff has also responded to these individuals. A letter was received from the City of Riverside requesting additional time till November. City of Palm Springs and Corona are also requesting continuance.

Keith Downs indicated that the following airports are recommended for continuance; Flabob, Riverside, Palm Springs and French Valley all the other airports are open for consideration. No comments have been received for the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport Master Plan formerly (Desert Resorts) it is expected to be before this Commission next month.

Jon Lyon, Flabob Airport came forward and concurred with the Compatibility Plan for the airport.

Chairman Stephens called for Leroy Edwards to come forward. Leroy Edwards came forward in response to Chairman Stephens' invitation and voiced his concerned in regards to 2.5 acres adjacent to Flabob airport. Mr. Edwards purchased the property in January 2003, to build a single family dwelling unit and inquired if the new plan would affect his proposal.

Chairman Stephens indicated that the plan will not impact the ability to build a home in that location.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for opened the floor for comments from the audience.

Mike Smith, Bermuda Dunes Airport came forward and voiced his concern with the draft plan. Mr. Smith indicated extending one of the zones and would like to get together with staff in regards to the details. Mr. Smith then complimented on the tremendous work with the draft plan.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens indicated that the draft motion is to close the hearing for its considerations of the Airport Land Use Compatibility plan for Banning, Chiriaco Summit, Desert Center, Bermuda Dunes, Blythe and Corona. That the Commission adopt the following findings and direct staff for preparation of resolutions for adoption of the ALUCP.

Commissioner Lightsey indicated that if Bermuda Dunes needs adjustments the hearing for that airport would need to stay open.

Mike Smith requested continuance for the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

The revised motion would be for the following airport Banning, Chiriaco Summit, Desert Center, Blythe and Corona.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Hogan made a motion of approval for the compatibility plan for the above underlined airports. Close public hearings for these airports, adopt the findings and directed staff to prepare the appropriate resolutions for adoption of the ALUCP. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

The remainder airports; Flabob, Riverside, Bermuda Dunes, French Valley and Palm Springs are being recommended for continuance.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Hogan made a motion to continue the above underlined airports to the next scheduled hearing. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion.

***CONSENT ITEMS:**

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 a consent item it will be pulled and addressed separately, otherwise it will be voted as one and no further discussion will be made.

Consent items are as follows: BD-04-110 Delta Group Engineering, HR-04-103 RGP Planning, HR-04-104 David Jeffers Consulting, Inc., MA-04-134 Lou Ochoa, MA-04-135 Lou Ochoa, MA-04-136 Andy Bodewin, MA-04-138 CSL Engineering, MA-04-139 Trip Hord, MA-04-140 James Hill, MA-04-141 Nick Tavaglione, FV-04-108 T&B Planning, and RI-04-128 Gerald Bushore.

Keith Downs indicated that item BD-04-110 Delta Group Engineering would need to be pulled due to needing additional information.

Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioner, 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 Tandy made a motion of consistency, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

- A. BD-04-110 – Delta Group Engineering – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: BD-04-110 – Delta Groups Voluntary Review
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Plot Plan 19263

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The plot plan for a 75' high cell tower and associated facilities.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located east of Adams Street and north of Varner Road in the County of Riverside, from approximately 1,500 ft. north of the west end of 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*

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: *The proposal is for a 75' cell tower located approximately 1,500 feet north of the west end of the runway at Bermuda Dunes Airport. The proposal is within Area III of the Airport Influence Area. The proposed use is an acceptable use, contingent upon noise and height issues.*

NOISE: *The site will be subject to intermittent aircraft noise of some annoyance. The entire site is outside of the 60 CNEL according to the current noise study. Ultimate traffic with seasonal and weekend peaking will likely produce noise of some annoyance on the site, the use is not noise sensitive.*

PART 77: *The highest pad elevation at the site is 72 MSL and the height of the proposed structures is 75 feet. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. At a distance of 1,500 feet from the runway to the site, proposed structures exceeding 97 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.

DRAFT PLAN: *Places the project in Zone D, which requires airspace review for structures over 70 feet.*

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. *Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport.*
2. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
3. *Proposed structures exceeding 88 MSL ft. in elevation shall be submitted to the FAA for review and any conditions for the project required by the FAA shall be satisfied.*
4. *The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser.*
5. *The tower shall be light in accordance with accordance with FAA advisory Circular 70/7460-1 70/7460-1K. (to be added September 16,2004)*

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

Keith Downs indicated this being a voluntary review and the 7460 review was received. Staffs recommendation is a finding of consistency with the addition of number five (#5).

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

Devina Felix, Delta Group came forward and concurred with staff's recommendation including the addition of #5.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens opened the floor for comments.

Mike Smith, Bermuda Dunes Airport came forward voiced his concerned on the height of the tower and the possibly affecting the instrument approach indicating it could possibly represent hazard, although it meets FAA criteria. Mr. Smith requested on a voluntary bases if the tower could be lowered.

Devina Felix indicated that in a cell site area the engineers determine the height for coverage. Devina Felix then indicated that she would direct these issues with the engineer and request a letter to be directed to Mr. Smith.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for further questions hearing no response he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion of consistency, subject to staffs conditions of approval and recommendations.

ABSTAINED: Vice Chairman Hogan

HEMET RYAN AIRPORT

10:00 A.M.

B. HR-04-103 – RGP Planning & Development Services – Consent item see pages 14-15

CASE NUMBER: HR-04-103-RGP Planning & Development Services
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Hemet
JURISDICTION CASE NO: SPA 03-2 and TM 31513

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Specific Plan Amendment and Tentative Tract Map for a residential development with park area, open space, vernal pool conservation areas and detention basin.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located east of Warren Road, north of Devonshire Avenue within the City of Hemet, from approximately 6,450 to 9,100 feet north of Runway 5-23 for Hemet/Ryan Airport.

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

a. Airport Influence Area: Area III, Area of Moderate Risk
b. Noise Levels: Outside 55CNEL, but subject to annoyance levels

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located from approximately 6,450 to 9,100 feet north of Runway 5-23. The proposed site is within Area III (Area of Moderate Risk) of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for a 178-unit residential development with park area, open space, vernal pool conservation areas and detention basin on 121.3 acres. The proposed project is part of Specific Plan No. 90-9, which includes 710 units on 351.8 acres. Area III has no population density limits assigned to it, but requires a discretionary review for certain uses.*

NOISE: *The site is underlying general traffic patterns for sailplane approaches and will experience some annoyance from over flying aircraft. The 1989 plan indicates that the area is outside of the 55CNEL.*

PART 77. The runway elevation is 1,512 MSL. The highest pad elevation on the proposed site (located at the north end) is 1,581 MSL. 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 6,450 from the runway, structures exceeding 1,576 MSL at the south end of the site will require FAA Review. A proposed structure within Area III that exceeds the horizontal surface elevation of 1,662 MSL or a proposed structure that extends beyond the conical surface would be an obstruction.

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW: Pages 35 and 37 of the Hemet-Ryan CLUP include the discretionary review procedures and require us to review: 1) structure height, 2) population density, 3) nature of the land use activity, 4) noise, 5) relevant safety factors, 6) institutional uses, and 7) places of assembly. The present proposal would be consistent with the plan; however, review of subsequent proposals for the development of the site will be required.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the conditions noted below.

CONDITIONS: For the City to Utilize

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the operator of Hemet-Ryan Airport prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Any subsequent permits shall be reviewed by the ALUC.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
6. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.
7. 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. The buildings in this project shall have an

active FAA 7460 review at the time of construction and shall not exceed obstruction standards.

8. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.

C. HR-04-104 – David Jeffers Consulting, Inc. – Consent item see pages 14-15

CASE NUMBER: HR-04-104-David Jeffers Consulting, Inc.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Hemet
JURISDICTION CASE NO: SPA 04-02, TM 31731, PM 32733 and Change of Zone 88-2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Specific Plan Amendment, Tract Map and Parcel Map for 167 single family residential units on 56.7 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located north of Florida Avenue, east of Hyatt Avenue, within the City of Hemet, from approximately 6,000 to 8,000 feet northwest of Runway 5-23 for Hemet/Ryan Airport.

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

a. Airport Influence Area: Area III, Area of Moderate Risk
b. Noise Levels: Outside 55CNEL, but subject to annoyance levels

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: The proposed site is located from approximately 6,000 to 8,000 feet northwest of the runway. The proposal is for 167 single-family residential units, along with park/recreation area and a detention basin, on 56.7 acres. The proposed site is within Area III (Area of Moderate Risk) of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Influence Area. Area III has no population density limits assigned to it, but requires a discretionary review for certain uses.

NOISE: The site is underlying general traffic patterns for sailplane approaches and will experience some annoyance from over flying aircraft. The 1989 plan indicates that the area is outside of the 55CNEL.

PART 77. The runway elevation is 1,512 MSL. The highest elevation on the site is 1,507 MSL. The maximum height of the proposed structures is 35 feet. Structures exceeding 1,572 MSL at the southeast end of the site would require FAA Review. A proposed structure within Area III that exceeds the horizontal surface elevation of 1,662 MSL or a proposed structure that extends beyond the conical surface would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criterion is not a concern.

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW: Pages 35 and 37 of the Hemet-Ryan CLUP include the discretionary review procedures and require us to review: 1) structure height, 2) population density, 3) nature of the land use activity, 4) noise, 5) relevant safety factors, 6) institutional uses, and 7) places of assembly. The present proposal would be consistent with the plan.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the conditions noted below.

CONDITIONS: For the City to Utilize

1. *Provide Avigation Easements to the operator of Hemet-Ryan Airport prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.*
2. *Any subsequent permits shall be reviewed by the ALUC .*
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. *No obstruction of the “FAR Part 77 Conical Surface” shall be permitted.*
6. *The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*

MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE

10:00 A.M.

D. MA-04-134 – Lou Ochoa – Consent item see pages 14-15

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-134 –Lou Ochoa
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Perris
JURISDICTION CASE NO: GPA P04-0197, SPA 04-0392, CZ P04-0198

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan Amendment and Change of Zone (from R-4 to R-14) for 101 townhouse units on approximately 10.8 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is north of Rider Street, east of Bradley Road within the City of Perris, approximately 20,000 feet southeast 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:

Staff utilized four resources for review:

1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004
4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 20,000 ft. southeast of Runway 14/32. The proposal is near a major approach and departure track. The proposal consists of a 101-unit townhouse development and office/retail building on approximately 10.8 acres. The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III of the 1986 Influence Area Map for March Air Reserve Base. Residential uses are an acceptable use in Area III subject to noise and height issues. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within Area III.

Density and Coverage: The average gross density for the site is 9.35 units per acre. Structural coverage is less than 60% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,477 MSL and the height of the proposed structures is 30 feet. In order to be an obstruction a structure would need to exceed 2,088 feet. The project is not within Part 77 obstruction review criteria.

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. Previous AICUZ reports indicated the property to be outside 65 CNEL.

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

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 the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45 CNEL-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 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 attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.

E. MA-04-135 – Lou Ochoa – Consent item see pages 14-15

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-135 – Lou Ochoa
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Perris
JURISDICTION CASE NO: GPA P04-0393, CZ P04-0394

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A General Plan Amendment and Change of Zone (from RRA to R-14) for proposed residential condominium development on 16.42 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is north of Rider Street, east of Bradley Road within the City of Perris, approximately 20,500 feet southeast 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:

Staff utilized four resources for review:

1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004
4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 20,500 ft. southeast of Runway 14/32. The proposal is near a major approach and departure track. The proposal consists of a General Plan Amendment and Change of Zone for proposed residential condominium development on 16.42 acres of already developed, rural residential land. The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III of the 1986 Influence Area Map for March Air Reserve Base. Residential uses are an acceptable use in Area III subject to noise and height issues. The proposed land use designation would be consistent with allowed land uses within Area III. Information on proposed structures is currently not available.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,482 MSL and the height of proposed structures is unknown. In order to be an obstruction a structure would need to exceed 2,088 feet. The project is not within Part 77 obstruction review criteria.

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. Previous AICUZ reports indicated the property to be outside 65 CNEL.

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

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 the building construction to insure interior noise levels are at or below 45 CNEL.*
3. *Any subsequent permits shall be reviewed by the ALUC.*
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.*

F. MA-04-136 – Andy Bodewin – Consent item see pages 14-15

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-136 Andy Bodewin
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Tract Map 32270

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Tentative Tract Map for seventeen residential lots on approximately 35.2 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated east of Via Vista Drive, south of Crystal Ridge Ct. within the City of Riverside, approximately 26,000 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 98/99 Draft CLUP efforts were prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the superceded 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

We will utilize four 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 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004
4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is for a seventeen lot residential development on approximately 35 acres. The proposed site is located approximately 26,000 ft. northwest 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 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 sizes range from .6 to 3 acres with a proposed lot density of .5 units per acre. Structural coverage will be less than 10% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 1,475 MSL feet and the height of the structures is 30 feet. Any structures over 1,785 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not 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 in the 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 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-04-137– Andy Bodewin – Consent item see pages 14-15

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-137 Andy Bodewin
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Tract Map 31799

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Tentative Tract Map for seven residential lots on approximately 18.65 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated west of Chicago Ave., south of the extension of Bradley St. within the City of Riverside, approximately 26,000 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 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 98/99 Draft CLUP efforts were prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the superceded 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

We will utilize four 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 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004
4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is for a seven lot residential development on approximately 18.65 acres. The proposed site is located approximately 26,000 ft. northwest 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 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 sizes range from 1 to 7.26 acres with a proposed lot density of .4 units per acre. Structural coverage will be less than 10% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is 1,450 MSL feet and the height of the structures is 30 feet. Any structures over 1,785 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not 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 in the 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 aviation 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 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.

H. MA-04-138 – CSL Engineering – CSL Engineering

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-138- CSL Engineering
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Tentative Tract Map 32180

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Tentative Tract Map for nine single-family residential lots on 10.04 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated north of Moss Road and east of Bush Avenue within the County of Riverside, approximately 19,000 feet west of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

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

BACKGROUND:

Staff utilized four resources for review:

1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004
4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 19,000 feet west of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for nine single-family residential lots on 10.04 acres. The existing site is vacant and zoned for residential uses. The proposal is under one major flight track and within the outer 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, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III, which has no residential density restrictions. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: No structures are currently proposed, however, structural coverage is expected to be less than 50% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,577 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 1535 MSL at the north end. The height of the structures is unknown at this time, but likely to be less than 35 feet. Any structures over 1725 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Any structures over 2088 MSL feet in elevation would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not 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 property to be outside the 55 CNEL.

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

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act. (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. Any subsequent permits shall be reviewed by the ALUC.
4. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane.
5. The following uses shall be prohibited:

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

I. MA-04-139 – Trip Hord Associates – Consent item see pages 14-15

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-139- Trip Hord Associates
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: GPA 00669, TM 31536, and CZ 06820

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A General Plan Amendment, Change of Zone (A-1-1 to R-A) and Tentative Tract Map for 84 single-family residential lots on 49.47 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located north of Citation Avenue, east of Cumming Avenue within the County of Riverside, approximately 49,000 southeast of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

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

BACKGROUND:

Staff utilized four resources for review:

1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004
4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 49,000 feet southeast of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for 84 single-family residential lots on 49.47 acres. The existing site is vacant

and zoned for residential uses. The proposal is under or near a major flight track and within the outer 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, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area III, which has no residential density restrictions. The proposed land use would be allowed within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: Information on proposed structures is currently not available, however, structural coverage is expected to be less than 50% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at the site is approximately 1,566 MSL feet. The runway elevation is 1,488 MSL at the south end. Any structures over 2088 MSL feet in elevation would be an obstruction. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not 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 property to be outside the 55 CNEL.

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

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act. (909) 656-7000
2. Any subsequent permits shall be reviewed by the ALUC.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
4. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane.
5. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor, or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
6. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.

J. MA-04-140 – March JPA – Consent item see pages 14-15

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-140 - March JPA
APPROVING JURISDICTION: March JPA
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Z04-02

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A rezone of two acres to allow a restaurant in a former fast food restaurant.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located south of 'N' Ave and east of 4th, within the March Joint Powers Authority approximately 7,000 ft. east 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 and subsequent activity.

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 98/99 Draft CLUP effort was prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the superceded 1993 CalTrans Handbook.

We will utilize four 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 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004*
- 4. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposal is to change the zoning to allow a former fast food restaurant to convert to a sit down restaurant. This would be at a density of 56-59 people per acre (109 plus staff divided by 2 acres). The proposed site is located approximately 7,000 ft. east of Runway*

14/32. The proposal is not under any major flight track, but is under one that is at a high elevation and 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 commercial and industrial land uses with discouragement of high-risk land uses'. These are defined on attached APPENDIX B The proposed contains an existing structure that contained a fast food restaurant. Future land uses designations must be consistent with allowed land uses within this area contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage: The lot area is 1.8 acres and the structure is approximately 3,388 sq. ft.

Part 77: The finished floor elevation of the parcels is approximately 1,523 MSL feet and the height of the structures is unknown, but single story. The horizontal surface elevation is 1,685 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,535 MSL at the north end. Any structure exceeding 1,605 MSL needs an FAA 7460 review Part 77 obstruction criteria is not 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 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. The above ground storage of explosive or flammable materials is prohibited.
6. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.

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

- L. MA-04-142 – Rick Engineering – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: MA-04-142–Rick Engineering

APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Perris

JURISDICTION CASE NO: Tract Map 32793, General Plan Amendment P04-0427 and Change of Zone P04-0428

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A General Plan Amendment, Tract Map and Change of Zone (from CC to R-7) for a 54-unit single family residential Development on 12.8 net acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is north of Nuevo Road, east of Evans Road within the City of Perris, approximately 26,000 feet southeast 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:

Staff utilized four resources for review:

1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: 2004
4. Noise Data from Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 26,000 ft. southeast of Runway 14/32. The proposal is under or near a major approach and departure track. The proposal consists of a 54-unit single-family residential development on 12.8 net acres. The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II of the 1986 Influence Area Map for March Air Reserve Base. Area II requires a minimum of two and one-half acres for residential lots. The proposed lot sizes range from 7,000 to 7,749 sq. ft. The surrounding property adjacent to the site is primarily vacant or agricultural land. The proposed land use designation would be inconsistent with allowed land uses within Area II.

Density and Coverage: The average gross density is 4.2 DU/acre. The area of the proposed structures is currently unknown, however, structural coverage is expected to be less than 50% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,429 MSL. In order to be an obstruction a structure would need to exceed 2,088 feet. The project is not within Part 77 obstruction review criteria.

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 at 60 CNEL. Previous AICUZ reports indicated the property to be at 70 CNEL.

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends a finding of inconsistency for the project, subject to the conditions noted below, based on the findings that:*

- 1. The proposal is inconsistent with the 1984 RCALUP*
- 2. The proposal is under or near the flight track*

Should the City wish to override the ALUC findings the following conditions should be utilized, and PUC 21670(a) should be followed per the attached information regarding overrides of Airport Land Use Commission decisions.

CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE:

- 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 the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45 CNEL-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 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 attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.*

Beverly Coleman indicated the applicant had requested for a continuance.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Stephens called for questions from the Commissioner, 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: Commissioner Tandy made a motion for continuance. Vice Chairman Hogan seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

M. FV-04-108 – T&B Planning – Consent item see pages 14-15

CASE NUMBER: FV-04-108 T& B Planning
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Change of Zone 6656 and TM 30433
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Tract Map for 513 single-family residential lots and 22 open space lots on 188 acres and a change of zoning from A-2-10 and RR to R-1.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is south of Pat Road, north of Baxter Road and west of Winchester Road in the County of Riverside, approximately 10,000-14,000 ft. northwest of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ) for a very small portion and the remainder
b. Noise Levels: Outside of 55 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposal is for 513 single-family residential lots on 189 with appr. 26 acres of open space and detention basins. The lot coverage standard for the TPZ is 65% of the net or 50% of the gross, but this is outside the TPZ..*

Part 77: *The highest elevation on the site is 1,453MSL for the residential units. 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 1,497 MSL in elevation will require FAA 7460 review. Part 77 is not a concern*

Noise: *The site is outside of the current and near future 55 CNEL, but will get occasional traffic overhead*

Draft Plan: The Draft Plan includes the area within the Influence Area and it is within area E,

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 for any portion of the project within the Influence Area 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.

N. RI-04-128 – Calvary Deaf Church – Consent item see pages 14-15

CASE NUMBER: RI-04-128 Calvary Deaf Church
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: CUP P04-0936

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A church and related facilities of 19,311 sq. ft.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 8223 California Ave., west of Van Buren Blvd., within the City of Riverside, approximately 8,400 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 55 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 8,400 ft. southwest of Runway 16-34 and approximately 9,000 ft. southwest of the west end of Runway 9-27. The proposal is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for 19,311 sq. ft. church building. Structural coverage for the site, including existing and proposed structures is less than 23% 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 elevation at the site is approximately 768 MSL feet and the height of the structure is approximately 35 feet. The site is under the horizontal surface at this location,

which is approximately 966 MSL. The elevation at the west end of Runway 9-27 is 758 MSL. Part 77 obstruction criterion is not a concern.

Noise: The site is outside of the 55 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 Influence area .

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.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- A. ALUCP Meeting Schedule and Location
Chino Airport no change as of today. Jacqueline Cochran the Master Plan is expected to be before the commission next hearing.
- B. MARB Status
The cargo facility that was before the commission seems to be a controversy at March.
- C. Ontario Airport Master Plan
Staff attended the Ontario Airport Master Plan scoping session. Information with diagrams has been distributed to the Commissioners.

- VIII. ORAL COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA.
None
- IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS
- X. Airport Tour: Information tour of Jacqueline Cochran Airport with Lunch.
- XI. Adjournment: Chairman Stephens adjourned the meeting at 10:45 A.M.
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: October 14, 2004 at 9:00 a.m.,
Riverside.