

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

Riverside County Administration Center
4080 Lemon St., Board Chambers (1st Floor)
Riverside, California

THURSDAY, June 9, 2005
9:00 A.M.

MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on June 9, 2005 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Chambers.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Simon Housman, Chairman
Lori Van Ardsdale, Vice Chairman
Ric Stephens
Dave Hogan
Mark Lightsey
Arthur Butler
Kathy Rohm, Alternate

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Sam Pratt
Marge Tandy
Jon Goldenbaum

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

OTHERS PRESENT: John Guerin
Emily Hemphill
Mike Brown
Dan Wishard
Robert Field

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairman Housman.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR: February 10, 2005 and March 10, 2005

Minutes February 10, 2005: Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners. B.T. Miller indicated a modification was made to page 17th and it has been distributed to the Commissioners for review. Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for a motion to be made.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Hogan made a motion to approve the minutes with the modifications. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Minutes April 14, 2005: Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners, hearing no response he called for a motion to be made.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Stephens made a motion to approve the minutes. Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Minutes May 12, 2005: Chairman Housman indicated no meeting was held due to the lack of a quorum. Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Lightsey indicated a correction to be made under adjournment. Chairman Housman indicated striking out the word MINUTES to be replaced with the word MEMORANDUM.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for a motion to be made.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Stephens made a motion to approve the memorandum. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

***CONSENT ITEMS:**

Keith Downs opened the consent items schedule for 9:00 a.m.

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

FV-05-104 T&B Planning, RI-05-108 Patrick Conover, RI-05-109 Patrick Conover, RI-05-110 Mark Schroeder, RI-05-112 Tom Brooks, RI-05-116 Pence Construction, Inc., MA-05-110 Steve Schneider, MA-05-111 Canty Engineering, MA-05-113 March JPA, RG-05-101 General Plan Amendment No. 733.

OFF CALENDAR ITEMS:

FV-05-103 Inland Empire Development Services.

CONTINUED ITEM: BD-05-106 Robert Ricciardi Architect

Keith Downs indicated a letter was received for item RI-05-116 in regards to the lot line and concurrence with the project as well.

Chairman Housman indicated a request for item RG-05-101 to be pulled was received from the applicant therefore the item would be pulled and addressed separately.

Alternate Rohm inquired whether staff would respond to the letter received for item RI-05-116. Keith Downs responded negatively.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no reply he called for a motion to be made.

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale made a motion of consistency for the consent items with the exception of item RG-05-101, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations and for item FV-05-103 to be pulled off calendar. Commissioner Hogan seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

V. OLD BUSINESS

REGIONAL

9:00 A.M.

- A. RG-04-100 and TH-04-102 Jacqueline Cochran Regional – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: RG-04-100 and TH-04-102 Jacqueline Cochran Regional
APPROVING JURISDICTION: Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

An update to the 1991 Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUP) for Jacqueline Cochran Regional (Thermal) Airport. Jurisdictions affected are: the cities of La Quinta and Coachella: and the County of Riverside and any special district within that Influence Area.

PROJECT LOCATION:

All areas within the Draft Airport Influence Area (see Map Attached)

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 has met with the affected airport 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 and was sent to the local jurisdictions in early January.*

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

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that; the ALUC take testimony from the jurisdictions and the public, close the hearing or continue to hold the hearing open until the next meeting of May 10, 2005, direct staff and the consultant to review any responses from the Cities and County, to respond to those comments, and prepare a Resolution for adoption.*

April 14, 2005: *At the February meeting there was testimony and a letter submitted (see attached) from a representative from the Kohl Ranch (SP313) requesting that the g Specific plan be recognized as an 'existing land use'. The consultant's response is attached.*

The Commission requested that the representative return with specific on site changes, but none were received as of April 1st. At the February hearing there was no testimony from any of the local jurisdictions. The staff has endeavored to make additional contact with the two cities and County.

May 12, 2005 RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that; the ALUC take testimony from the jurisdictions and the public, close the hearing, approve the plan and adopt the Resolution.*

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman requested for Emily Hemphill to come forward.

Emily Hemphill, attorney representing Kohl Ranch came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation. Ms. Hemphill indicated speaking before the Commission back at the February hearing. Ms. Hemphill briefed the Commissioners on the location of Kohl Ranch which lies south of the Jacqueline Cochran Airport. Kohl Ranch is a very large Specific Plan originally proposed and approved in the 90's. It is a mixed used development both residential and commercial. Land was sold to the School District, which a school has now been built in the south western portion. The School District, CDWD and Kohl Ranch have already constructed a major water system, which Kohl Ranch has contribute about 3.5 million dollars towards the constructions of those facilities. If the airport's land use designation were to go into place for Jacqueline Cochran without any exceptions most of Kohl Ranch's densities within the 'D' zone would be lost. A letter was sent to Rob Field, Economic Development Agency back in February requesting that the Commission consider in the adoption of the JCRA ALUCP Kohl Ranch's density as well as the investment of the water system and the approval of the Specific Plan, which was done in consultation with ALUC and the mitigation measures required by ALUC were incorporated. A letter dated May 6th from Rob Field was sent to the ALUC suggesting some language be added to the County Wide Policies adopted specifically in sections 3.3.7. Ms. Hemphill then requested for the Commission to accept Mr. Field's recommendations in his letter of May 6th. It is believed that if those changes are made it would resolve the issues with respect to Kohl Ranch.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners. Chairman Housman inquired about any discussion being made between the client and ALUC staff in regards to any refinements or adjustments to the plan to accommodate the project. Ms. Hemphill responded negatively.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no response Chairman Housman called for Commission discussion.

Commissioner Hogan indicated that at the February hearing he requested information showing the incompatibilities similar to what Riverside and Palm Springs presented to the Commission. It would have been helpful to see specifics, but as the Commission is aware next year the plan might need to be amended to assure the Commission is going on the right direction. Commissioner Hogan then made a motion to accept staff's recommendations.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Hogan made a motion to adopt the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport ALUCP. Commissioner Stephens seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

B. FV-05-103 – Inland Empire Development Services – Off Calendar Item see pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER: FV-05-103 – Inland Empire Development Services
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Plot Plan 20375
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A plot plan for a drive-thru restaurant.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located east of Briggs Rd., north of Benton Rd. in the County of Riverside approximately 2,800 ft. north of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone B1
b. Noise Levels: Inside of 55 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposal is for a drive-thru restaurant consisting of 3,183 sq. ft. on 1.07 net acres. The project is located in Zone B1. Zone B1 allows an average site density of 25 persons per acre. Based on the proposed number of parking spaces the estimated maximum density is 100 persons divided by 1.07 acres (net), or 93 persons per acre. If the gross acreage of 1.5 acres is used, the estimated maximum density is 67 persons per acre. Using the UBC method the total people expected would be 3,183 sq. ft. divided by 15 sq. ft. per occupant times 50% divided by 1.07 acres (net), or 114 persons per acre. The estimated density based on gross acreage would be 70 persons per acre. The project is inconsistent with the density standards for Zone B1.

Part 77: The finished floor elevation of the building is 1,345 MSL and the height of the structure is approximately 24 feet. The horizontal surface is at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 SL at the north end. Based on the height standards for Zone B1 and the distance of the site from the runway, structures exceeding 35 ft. or 1,375 MSL in elevation require FAA 7460 review.

Noise: The site will get significant overflight, and is inside of the current and near future 55 CNEL.

Other: On April 11, 2005, the applicant requested a continuance of this item to the May 12, 2005 meeting, however, no new or modified information on the project has been provided to ALUC staff. The application was originally submitted to ALUC staff on March 24, 2005, and any additional continuance of this item would exceed the 60-day review period.

RECOMMENDATION: That the ALUC find the project inconsistent with the ALUCP for French Valley Airport based on the proposed density.

CONDITIONS for the County to use for an override in accordance with PUC 21675.1:

1. Provide Avigation Easements/Deed Notices to the French Valley Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, prior to recordation of any map, or issuance of any permit, whichever is first.

2. *The attached Notice shall be given to each prospective buyer or tenant.*
3. *No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.*
4. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).*
5. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - (b) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*

C. FV-05-100 – City of Temecula – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: FV-05-100 – City of Temecula
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Temecula
JURISDICTION CASE NO: General Plan Update

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

2004 Temecula General Plan Update. The General Plan is the comprehensive planning document that provides guidelines for growth and land-use related decisions made by the City, expresses the community's goals with respect to both the human-made and natural environment, and sets forth the policies and implementation measures to ensure the safety and welfare of those who live, work, and do business in the City of Temecula. This review does not include the EIR or any other associated documents.

PROJECT LOCATION:

All incorporated and unincorporated area within the Adopted Influence Area (see Map Attached) of French Valley Airport.

BACKGROUND: *The City filed their new General Plan effective February 2005. We have drafted a contract with our consultant to review the proposal and that will not be available until April. Staff has included:*

1. *Copies of the letter from the City dated January 31, 2005,*
2. *The Caltrans letter dated December 29, 2004,*

3. *The Consistency Checklist from the adopted ALUCP (Appendix F), and*
4. *Response from the City staff regarding certain factors.*
5. *Report from Mead and Hunt regarding their review.*

MAJOR ISSUES: *Noise Element, Safety Element and Land Use Element Area Plan, parallel runway and unincorporated area designations. At the April meeting there was extensive discussion regarding the parallel runway, designations within the unincorporated area. The City had already adopted their plan, so there are only slight modifications that can be done through the current effort.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that the ALUC approved the attached letter.*

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

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Stephens made a motion to approve the post dated letter. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion.

ABSTAINED: Commissioner Hogan.

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

- D. BD-05-106 – Robert Ricciardi Architect – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: BD-05-106 – Robert Ricciardi, Architect
APPROVING JURISDICTION: *County of Riverside*
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: *Plot Plan 19953*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a plot plan for a 7,740 sq. ft. industrial building on approximately .75 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located south of Country Club Drive, west of 42nd Street in the County of Riverside, approximately 100 to 150 ft. north of Runway 10-28 at the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport

Land Use Policy: RCALUCP (Adopted Dec. 2004)
 a. *Airport Influence Area: Zone A and B2, within the approach surface*
 b. *Noise Levels: Inside 70 dB CNEL*

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: *The proposal is a plot plan for an industrial building/sheet metal fabrication plant consisting of 7,740 sq. ft. on .75 acres. The proposal is within Zones A and B2. Zone A allows no obstructions , however, the building is placed away from the runway. The proposal is consistent with allowed uses within Zones A and B2 subject to noise and height restrictions.*

NOISE: *The proposal is within 70 CNEL as indicated by the 2003 Existing Noise Impacts Data for Bermuda Dunes Airport. 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.

PART 77: Part 77 approach profiles overlie the property. The highest elevation at the site is approximately 52.4 MSL. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. Structures exceeding 70 feet in height or of a height exceeding a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway require FAA review. The height of the structure is 24 ft. 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 (04/04/05), the applicants are waiting for a response from the FAA.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend that the proposal be continued to the May 2005 ALUC meeting in order to receive the FAA 7460 review. **As of the date of this staff report (05/04/05), the applicants response from the FAA has not be received by staff.**

CONDITIONS:

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

Beverly Coleman requested a continuance due to 7460 review from the FAA.

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

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale made a motion of continuance to the next scheduled meeting. Commissioner Stephens seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- E. RI-05-104 – Mike Brown – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: RI-05-104 Mike Brown (Amended)
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Plot Plan and Parcel Map 31398

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Parcel Map for 14 lots with 43,656 sq. ft. of two story buildings and structures on a 2.54 gross (2.36 net) acre lot north of the airport.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 7085 and 7095 Jurupa Avenue, east of Payton Avenue within the City of Riverside, from approximately 2,000-3,600 ft. north of Runway 16-34 at the Riverside Municipal Airport and approximately 1,200 feet west of the extended centerline.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
 a. Airport Influence Area: B-1
 b. Noise Levels: Inside 55 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 2,000-2,600 ft., north of Runway 16 at elevation of 768 MSL. At the runway centerline the elevation is proposed to be 825-835 MSL where the 20/1 approach surface is at 850 MSL. The site is located within the Inner Approach and Departure ZONE B-1 of the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The proposal is for approximately 43,656 sq. ft., buildings and on an existing vacant lot. Zone B-1 has population limits of 25 people per acre assigned, and has a lot open land standard of 30% of the gross. Structural coverage for the site, including proposed structures would be less than 42% of the net area. **The amended application has the same structures and layout, but proposed that all the units are to be warehouses with small offices and does not calculate the restrooms or covered enclosures as part of the calculated area.** With 99 parking spaces the expected density would be 58 people/acre, which exceeds the zone allowance of 25/acre. Utilizing the UBC method the total people expected would be 40/acre **under the original submittal.**

Parking: 99 spaces provided x 1.5 = 149 people divided by 2.54 (gross) acres = 58/ acre. **This is the same as before.**

UBC: Warehousing = 47 people, Offices = 117 people and manufacturing = 38 people for a total of 202 people divided by 2.54 acres = 80/ acre x 50 % = 40/ acre. **The amended application has occupancy of 126.58 divided by the 2.54 acres = 49.835 people per acres divided by 50%. This results in 24.91 per acre.**

Part 77: The height of the structure is approximately 28 feet at the top of the structures. The site is under the transitional and approach surface (966 MSL) at this location. The elevation at the north end of Runway 16-34 is 771 MSL. Any structure over 791 MSL at this location would need an FAA 7460 review.

Noise: The site is inside of the 55 CNEL contour for the airport.

Addendum: May 12, 2005 In April the applicant requested a continuance in order to redesign the project. The project has been redesignated as two story warehousing, has the gross acreage and the restrooms deleted from the calculations.

CONDITIONS for the City to use for an override in accordance with PUC 21675.1

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport (951-351-6113).
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
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 Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a Form 7460 review, unless that agency determines in writing that such a review is not required or not applicable.
5. Obstruction lighting and marking shall be placed upon all towers and power lines that exceed the obstruction standards of PART 77.
6. **Uses shall be limited to warehousing. Uses exceeding an occupancy of 25/acre such as the following shall not be allowed: Schools, day-care, places of worship, storage of hazardous materials, offices, food preparation and retail sales, retail stores, residential and noise sensitive uses.**

RECOMMENDATION: That the ALUC find the project Inconsistent with the ALUCP for the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan due to the density of the project.

Keith Downs indicated the applicant has amended his application, originally mostly office with warehouse. The amendment does not change the buildings or parking lot. This is in Zone B1 very close to the runway 25 people per acre is the standard reviewed over all, which exceeds with the first calculations both due to the parking and building code. With the modification for the building code it has brought it to less than 25 people/acre, however using the parking calculation there is no change, making it 58 people/acre. Staff is recommending a finding of inconsistency part of it is an issue with policy and whether the Commission desires to recognize it from building code over to

parking. Both components are used and weighing both components in the case of parking it doubles the number of people expected on site.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Hogan inquired on the location in proximity to the airport. Keith Downs illustrated the site being on Jurupa Ave. Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman requested Dan Wishard to come forward and present the case.

Dan Wishard, Wishard Architects, came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation indicating the project was reduced to meet the criteria. In order for the project to fall within the occupant per acre requirement the office space was reduced causing an increase in the warehouse space and left the parking as originally proposed.

Mike Brown, owner of the project came forward indicating the office space has been reduced to reduce occupancy onto the property and changing the parking space will require re-engineering the entire project.

Alternate Rohm inquired on the number of employees and the amount of parking space. Mr. Brown responded the occupancy level could be met. In regards to the parking space it would require re-engineering and going back to the Planning Commission with the change, which has already been approved. The Planning Commission requires more parking.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for a Commission discussion. Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale inquired about the City's requirements for parking. Keith Downs responded it being fairly normal for the City to require more parking than the minimum. Chairman Housman voiced his concern about the logical connection between the number of people on site and the safety of those people and the use of parking spaces attracting the number of people who are expected to be on the site. There are very few tools that the Commission could use at this early planning stage to identify what the focus is going to be, which staff has addressed by the additional language, restricting the use of the property. In this instance the applicant came to the Commission with a project and was informed of the concerns the applicant then modified the project. It makes sense that they don't want to incur the administrative cost or designing cost to change the plan to eliminate the parking space.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for further discussion, hearing no response he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Stephens made a motion of consistency, subject to staff's conditions of approval including the additional language regarding uses. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion.

OPPOSITION: Commissioner Hogan.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

A. FV-05-104 – T&B Planning – Consent item see pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER: FV-05-104 – T & B Planning
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: SPA 284A2, CZ 7061 and Tract Map 33170

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Specific Plan Amendment, Change of Zone and Tract Map for 150 multi-family residential units on approximately 18 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at the northwest corner of Benton Road and Leon Road within the County of Riverside, from approximately 4,000 to 5,200 ft. northeast of Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone D
b. Noise Levels: Outside of 55 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposal is for 150 multifamily residential units on approximately 18 acres. As shown on the attached Compatibility Factors Map, site is within Zone D. Zone D allows density less than or equal to .2 units per acre or greater than or equal to 5 units per acre. The residential density proposed for the site is approximately 8.3 units per acre.*

Part 77: *The highest elevation on the site is 1,355 MSL, and the structures are not expected to exceed 40 feet. The horizontal surface is at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,347 MSL at the north end. Structures exceeding 70 feet in height or of a height exceeding a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway require FAA review. At a 100:1 slope from the runway to the south end of the site, structures exceeding 1,387 MSL in elevation would require FAA 7460 review.*

Noise: *The site will get significant over flight, but is outside of the current and near future 55 CNEL.*

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

CONDITIONS:

1. *Provide Avigation Easements/Deed Notices 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 CNEL-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 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. *No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted. An FAA 7460 review shall be completed for any structure of a height exceeding a 1:100 slope from the end of the runway.*
6. *During initial sales of properties within the subdivision, large airport related informational signs shall be installed and maintained by the developer. These signs shall be installed in conspicuous locations and shall clearly depict the proximity of the property to the airport and aircraft traffic patterns.*
7. *The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential property purchaser or tenant. An informational brochure shall be provided to prospective buyers or renters showing the locations of aircraft flight patterns (Exhibit FV-6 of RCALUCP shall suffice). The frequency of overflights, the typical altitudes of the aircraft, and the range of noise levels that can be expected from individual aircraft overflights shall be described.*

RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

- B. RI-05-108 – Patrick Conover – Consent item see pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER: RI-05-108 Patrick Conover
APPROVING JURISDICTION: *City of Riverside*
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: *5950 Payton Ave.*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Design Review for 26,600 sq. ft. of buildings on a 4.22 (net) acre lot northwest of the airport.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 5950 Payton Avenue, north of Jurupa Avenue within the City of Riverside, from approximately 2,000-3,600 ft. north of Runway 16-34 at the Riverside Municipal Airport and approximately 1,200 feet west of the extended centerline.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone C
b. Noise Levels: Inside 55 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 2,000-2,600 ft., north of Runway 16 at elevation ranging from ???MSL to ??? MSL. At the runway centerline the elevation is proposed to be 825-835 MSL where the 20/1 approach surface is at 850 MSL. The site is located within the Extended Approach and Departure ZONE C of the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The proposal is for approximately 26,600 sq. ft., buildings and on existing vacant lots. Zone C has population limits of 75 people per acre assigned, and has a lot open land standard of 20% of the gross. Structural coverage for the site, including proposed structures would be less than 15% of the net area.

With 76 parking spaces the expected density would be 27 people/acre, which is within the zone allowance of 75/acre. Utilizing the UBC method the total people expected would be 40/acre.

Parking: 76 spaces provided x 1.5 = 114 people divided by 4.22 (net) acres = 27/ acre.

UBC: Warehousing = 44 people, Offices = 50 people for a total of 94 people dived by 4.22 acres = 23 acre x 50 % = 12/ acre.

Part 77: The height of the structure is approximately 33 feet at the top of the structures. The site is under the transitional and approach surface (966 MSL) at this location. The elevation at the north end of Runway 16-34 is 771 MSL. Any structure over 791 MSL at this location would need an FAA 7460 review.

Noise: The site is inside of the 55 CNEL contour for the airport.

CONDITION:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport (951-351-6113).
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
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 Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a Form 7460 review, unless that agency determines in writing that such a review is not required or not applicable.
 5. Obstruction lighting and marking shall be placed upon all towers and power lines that exceed the obstruction standards of PART 77.

RECOMMENDATION: That the ALUC find the project Consistent with the ALUCP for the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

C. RI-05-109 – Patrick Conover – Consent item see pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER: RI-05-109 Patrick Conover
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: 7363 Orangewood Ave

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Design Review for 6,398 sq. ft. of buildings on a .39 (net) acre lot northwest of the airport.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 7363 Orangewood Avenue, north of Jurupa Avenue within the City of Riverside, from approximately 2,000-3,600 ft. north of Runway 16-34 at the Riverside Municipal Airport and approximately 1,200 feet west of the extended centerline.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
 a. Airport Influence Area: Zone C
 b. Noise Levels: Inside 55 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 6,000 ft., northwest of Runway 16 at elevation 789 MSL. At the runway centerline the elevation is proposed to be 825-835 MSL where the 20/1 approach surface is at 850 MSL. The site is located within the Extended Approach and Departure ZONE C of the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The proposal is for approximately 6,398 sq. ft., buildings and on existing vacant lot. Zone C has population limits of 75 people per acre assigned, and has a lot open land standard of 20% of the gross. Structural coverage for the site, including proposed structures would be less than 40% of the net area.

With 14 parking spaces the expected density would be 53 people/acre, which is within the zone allowance of 75/acre. Utilizing the UBC method the total people expected would be 40/acre.

Parking: 14 spaces provided x 1.5 = 21 people divided by 39 (net) acres = 53/ acre.

UBC: Warehousing = 12 people, Offices = 6 people for a total of 18 people divided by .4 acres = 45 acre x 50 % = 23/ acre.

Part 77: The height of the structure is approximately 30 feet at the top of the structures. The site is under the horizontal (966 MSL) at this location. The elevation at the north end of Runway 16-34 is 771 MSL. Any structure over 831 MSL at this location would need an FAA 7460 review.

Noise: The site is inside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport.

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport (951-351-6113).
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
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 Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct a Form 7460 review, unless that agency determines in writing that such a review is not required or not applicable.
5. Obstruction lighting and marking shall be placed upon all towers and power lines that exceed the obstruction standards of PART 77.

RECOMMENDATION: That the ALUC find the project Consistent with the ALUCP for the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

D. RI-05-110 – Mark Schroeder – Consent item see pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER: RI-05-110- Mark Schroeder
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Minor Conditional Use Permit for a Church.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 7209 Arlington Avenue, Suite G, in the City of Riverside, approximately 1,200 ft. west of Runway 16-34 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone D
b. Noise Levels: Inside 55 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 1,200 ft. west of Runway 16-34. The site is located within the Zone D of the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The proposal is for a 60-seat, 3,708 sq. ft. church within an existing retail commercial building. Zone D allows a maximum average density of 100 persons per acre (or 300 per any single acre) and allows up to 90% lot coverage. The lot coverage and proposed density are consistent with the plan.

Part 77: The elevation of the site is 740 MSL height of the structure is 19 feet. The site is under the horizontal (966 MSL) at this location. The elevation at the south end of Runway 16-34 is 771.8 MSL. Any structure over 831 MSL at this location would need an FAA 7460 review.

Noise: The site is inside of the 55 CNEL contour for the airport.

RECOMMENDATION: That the ALUC find the project Consistent with the ALUCP for the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, subject to the conditions outlined below.

1. Provide Avigation Easements/Deed Notices to Riverside Municipal Airport (951-351-6113).
2. The attached Notice regarding Proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser or lessee.

E. RI-05-112 – Tom Brooks – Consent item see pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER: RI-05-112 Tom Brooks
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: TM 33731

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Tract Map for a 16-lot residential development on 3.25 gross acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located west of Challen Avenue, South of Cypress Avenue within the City of Riverside, approximately 6,000 ft. southwest of Runway 16-34 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone D
b. Noise Levels: Inside 55 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 6,000 ft., southwest of Runway 16-34 and 6,500 ft. southwest of the west end of Runway 9-27. The site is located within Zone D of the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The proposal is for a 16-lot residential development on 3.25 gross acres. Zone D allows residential density less than or equal to .2 units per acre or greater than or equal to 5 units per acre. The proposed residential density for the development, excluding streets is approximately 5.4 units per acre.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the site is 745 MSL and the height of proposed structures is unknown. The site is under the horizontal (966 MSL) at this location. The elevation at the south end of Runway 16-34 is 771.8 MSL. Any structure over 831 MSL at this location would need an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criterion is not a concern.

Noise: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport.

RECOMMENDATION: That the ALUC find the project Consistent with the ALUCP for the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, subject to the conditions outlined below.

1. Provide Avigation Easements/Deed Notices to Riverside Municipal Airport (951-351-6113).
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45 CNEL-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 regarding Proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser or lessee.

F. RI-05-116 – Pence Construction, Inc. – Consent item see pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER: RI-05-116-Pence Construction, Inc.
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside

JURISDICTION CASE NO.:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Design Review P05-0490 for two commercial buildings on 1.37 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located north of Morris Street and west of Doolittle Avenue, within the City of Riverside, approximately 1,900 ft. west of Runway 9-27 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.

*Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone C
b. Noise Levels: Inside 60 CNEL*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 1,900 ft. west of the west end of Runway 9-27. The site is located within the Zone C of the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The proposal is for two commercial buildings for a dairy on 1.37 acres. Zone C allows a maximum average density of 75 persons per acre (or 150 per any single acre) and allows up to 80% lot coverage. The lot coverage and proposed density are consistent with the plan.*

Part 77: *The elevation of the site is 740 MSL and the maximum structure height is approximately 30 feet. The site is under the horizontal (966 MSL) at this location. The elevation at the west end of Runway 9-27 is 794 MSL. Any structure over 813 MSL at this location would need an FAA 7460 review.*

Noise: *The site is inside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport and will experience annoyance from overflying aircraft. The proposed use is an acceptable use with the appropriate mitigation for noise.*

RECOMMENDATION: *That the ALUC find the project Consistent with the ALUCP for the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, subject to the conditions outlined below.*

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements/Deed Notices to Riverside Municipal Airport (951-351-6113).*
- 2. The attached Notice regarding Proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser or lessee.*
- 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.

MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE

9:00 A.M.

G. MA-05-110 – Steve Schneider – Consent item see pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER: MA 05-110 –Steve Schneider
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Drive-thru Restaurant and Parcel Map

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a drive-thru restaurant and parcel map.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at the southeast corner of Alessandro Blvd. and Barton Road, within the City of Riverside, approximately 15,000 ft. northwest of March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

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

BACKGROUND:

Staff utilized four resources for our review:

1. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Noise Data from the AICUZ Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
4. ALUCP for Riverside County: 2004

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 15,000 feet northwest of north end of Runway 14-32. The project is a 2,466 sq. ft. drive-thru restaurant on a 1.8 acre retail-commercial site. The proposed property area for the restaurant is .639 acres. The proposal is under or near the major approach and departure track and within the 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 uses.

Density and Coverage: The proposed property area is .639 net acres The structural coverage of the site is less than 30% of the total acreage.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 1,627 MSL and the maximum building height is 22 feet. The runway elevation is 1535 MSL. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1838 MSL feet in elevation. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have over 60 CNEL.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of Consistency of the project, subject to the conditions outlined below.

CONDITIONS:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act. (Tel. 951- 656-7000)
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above 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 explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.
6. The attached Notice regarding Proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser or lessee.

H. MA-05-111 – Canty Engineering – Consent item see pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER:

MA 05-111 Canty Engineering

APPROVING JURISDICTION:

City of Riverside

JURISDICTION CASE NO.:

LLA P05-0379, PW05-0941 and PW04-0527

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a two story office building.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at the Southwest corner of Mission Grove Parkway South and Earhart Way northwest of March Air Reserve Base

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area

b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area II

c. Noise Levels: See Below

BACKGROUND:

Staff utilized four resources for our review:

- 1. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*
- 2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- 3. Noise Data from the AICUZ Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*
- 4. ALUCP for Riverside County: 2004*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 13,000 feet northwest of north end of Runway 14-32. The project consists of a two story office building. The proposal is near the major approach and departure track and within the 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 uses.

Density and Coverage: *The structural coverage of the total site would be approximately 17% of the total acreage.*

Part 77: *The elevation at this site is approximately???*MSL *and the maximum building height is 45 feet. The runway elevation is 1535 MSL. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1695 MSL feet in elevation. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project.*

Noise: *The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to have over 60 CNEL and close to the 65 CNEL.*

CONDITIONS:

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act. (Tel. 951- 656-7000)*
- 2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portions building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
- 3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above*

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 explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.
6. The attached Notice regarding Proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser or lessee.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of Consistency of the project.

I. MA-05-113 – March JPA – Consent item see pages 2-3

CASE NUMBER: MA-05-113- March JPA
APPROVING JURISDICTION: March JPA
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: unknown

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Rezoning fuel farm to provide fuel to the cargo port from undesignated to Aviation Use Zone.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 17305 Heacock Avenue, north of Nandina from approximately 1,200 to 1,500 ft. east of the runway at March Air Reserve Base, within the March Joint Powers Authority.

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:

Staff utilized five resources for our review:

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

2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. Noise Data from the AICUZ Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base
4. Draft ALUCP for Riverside County: 2004

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located from approximately 1,200 to 1,500 feet east of Runway 14-32. The proposal is a change of zone from undesignated to Aviation Use Zone for a fuel farm to provide fuel to the cargo at the southeast end of the airfield. The General Plan designation of the proposed site is Aviation.

The proposed site is located approximately 1,500 ft. southeast of Runway 14/32. The proposal is on the airside of the facility and as such is subject to higher noise and safety factors, but is an airport facility and is within the transitional surface of the PART 77 surfaces.

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 agricultural, industrial and commercial uses.

Density and Coverage: The structural coverage of the total site would be less than 30% of the total acreage.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately XXX MSL and the maximum building height is 13 feet. The runway elevation is 1488 MSL at the south end. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1688 MSL feet in elevation.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the noise level at the property to be more than 70 CNEL.

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

CONDITIONS:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act. (Tel. 909- 656-7000)
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any office portions building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above 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 regarding Proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser or lessee.
 6. A PART 77 FAA 7460 review shall be accomplished prior to approval by the JPA and any condition required by the FAA shall be adhered to during and after completion of construction.

REGIONAL

9:00 A.M.

- J. RG-05-101 – GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 733 – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: RG- 05-101 County of Riverside and BA-05-100, DC-05-100, FL-05-100, PS-05-100, SK-05-100, CH-05-100, BD-05-109, BL-05-100, CO-05-100, FV-05-105, MA-05-112, RI-05-111 and TH (JCRA)-05-102

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: GPA 733 and Environmental Assessment # 39960

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

2001 Riverside County Integrated Plan (General Plan), Housing Element: Addendum Comprehensive General Plan Amendment No.733 and Environmental Assessment #39960 (SCH# 2002051143). The Housing Element of the Riverside County General Plan identifies and establishes the County’s policies with respect to meeting the needs of existing and future residents in Riverside County. It establishes policies that will guide County decision-making and sets forth an action plan to implement its housing goals in the next seven years. These commitments are in furtherance of the statewide housing goal of “early attainment of decent housing and a suitable living environment for every California family,” as well as a reflection of the concerns unique to the County of Riverside.

PROJECT LOCATION: All unincorporated area; Affected Airports: Banning, Chino, Bermuda, Blythe, Chiriaco, Corona, Desert Center, Jacqueline Cochran Regional, Flabob, French Valley, Hemet/Ryan, MARB/MIP, Perris, Valley, Riverside, and Skylark.

BACKGROUND: The County filed with ALUC their new General Plan the R.C.I.P. in December 24, 2002 and over the next few months reviewed it and the Commission found it consistent with the CLUP’s on May 22, 2003. That effort did not include the update to the Housing Element. We have contracted with our consultant to review this proposal and their comments are incorporated into this Staff Report.

We have utilized the following resources for our review:

1. *All Adopted CLUP and ALUCP's*
2. *The RCALUP: 1984 with 1986 Interim Boundaries for March Air Force Base and Chino*
3. *Noise data from any source newer than the adopted CLUP for Chino, Hemet and Jacqueline Cochran Regional.*

MAJOR ISSUES: Noise and Buyer Awareness

As is typical of housing elements, the Riverside County Housing Element is primarily policy and number-oriented. There is little of a site-specific nature indicating where development is proposed to occur. That type of information is primarily found in the land use and other elements of a general plan. Consequently, nothing in the document can be pointed to as being clearly in conflict with the adopted ALUC policies.

That said, the Housing Element should at least make reference to the importance of compatibility between future housing development and nearby airports. This discussion could be added to the section on environmental constraints (Page H-138) or could be part of a broader discussion of the need to locate housing where it is compatible with surrounding land uses (e.g., industrial, agricultural, etc.). At a minimum, reference to the specific ALUC policies noted below should be included.

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that the ALUC find the project consistent with the adopted ALUCP and CLUP's, if the following policies are added to the plan:*

1. *No new residential housing shall be built within the noise-impact area of airports in the county as defined in the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan; and*
2. *The attached statement shall be given to all prospective residential tenants or buyers for projects within the adopted Airport Influence Areas.*

Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners, hearing no response he requested John Guerin to come forward and present the case.

John Guerin, Riverside County Planning, came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation. Mr. Guerin concurred on behalf of the County Planning Department for its finding of consistency. The intent of this revision is to amend the 2001 housing element to incorporate revisions that were approved by the State of Housing and Community Development.

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

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

- K. RG-05-102 – Proposed Bylaws – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE NUMBER: RG-05-102 Proposed Bylaws

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

An update of the current 1998 Rules for the Airport Land Use Commission Airports affected are: Banning Municipal, Chino, Bermuda Dunes, Blythe, Chiriaco Summit, Corona Municipal, Desert Center, Desert Resorts Regional, Flabob, French Valley, Hemet/Ryan, MARB/MIP, Palm Springs, Perris Valley, Riverside Municipal and Skylark Airports.

BACKGROUND: *We contracted with our consultant to review the current Rules and this proposal is attached. Staff and Counsel have reviewed the proposal, but need to ascertain the affect they have on the remaining unfinished updated airports (Chino, MARB, Thermal, and Hemet Ryan).*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends that the Commission review the proposed bylaws and continue them until the next meeting of June 9th in order to clear ascertain the effect upon the older CLUPs and the Chino Interim Influence Area.*

*Attachments: Proposed Bylaws
Current Rules*

Keith Downs indicated the By Laws have been in discussion for the past two months and Commissioner Hogan has made comments, which are attached.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners. Keith Downs referred to item 2.5 Election and Terms of Officers, indicating that the state law prescribes for the election to occur at the end of the meeting in April in order to take over the first meeting in May.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no response Chairman Housman called for discussion from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Hogan indicated that the reason he provided comments was due to him not being available at the last meeting. Chairman Housman thanked Commissioner Hogan for the time and effort in proving the Commission with his comments. Chairman Housman concurred with the mass majority of Commissioner Hogan's comments. Chairman Housman inquired on item 3.1, which relates to the ability of the Commission to schedule its next meeting either one week before or one week after. This would be a continuance of a regular meeting as distinguish of a special meeting. If a meeting could not be held the meeting should be scheduled a week before or the week after due to applicants that are in the process of obtaining some type of finding in order for their projects to move forward. Chairman Housman then indicated keeping the existing language rather than adopt Commissioner Hogan's recommended change on 3.1. Commissioner Hogan concurred.

Chairman Housman referred to section 3.3 in regards to moving item 'B' to another section, which is appropriate in either section. On item 4.6 recommends only including the language "The minutes shall include but not be limited to". The minutes can be expanded on each case to include the names of each applicant where appropriate as necessary. On item 1.5 an organization should not change its rules in the middle of a contestant matter and believes the super majority to change the By Laws is very appropriate. Chairman Housman referred to Robert's Rules of Order indicated being unaware on the official rules. Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale indicated if held to the strict

accountability to Robert's Rules it would be difficult to follow Counsel's advice on many things that don't fall under Robert's Rules. B.T. Miller interjected voicing his concern about Robert's Rules being inserted in the By Laws. It could be highly technical and onerous in trying to follow. If the spirit is good there may be times when matters get contentious and perhaps at those times the commission would want to follow Robert's Rules. Given the nature of this Commission the way it operates its gotten its business done without necessarily following Robert's Rules and done so adequately and legally, but its those times when perhaps special circumstances when the commission might want to invoke strict compliance.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for a motion for continuance be set for the matter to allow staff to incorporate the items discussed including some language that will make Robert's Rules of Order available to the Commission when necessary, but following the spirit for the efficient movement of business at other times.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Stephens made a motion for continuance to allow staff to modify the proposed By Laws and come back with a revised version, incorporating the provisions of Commissioner Hogan's letter as modified by Chairman's and Counsel's comments with the implications of the spirit of Roberts Rules of Order. Alternate Rohm seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY

9:00 A.M.

- L. Request from Riverside County – Keith Downs presented the request by referring to the letter dated May 6, 2005.

Keith Downs indicated the letter was received two weeks ago and the presenter is present.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman requested Robert Field to come forward.

Robert Field, Riverside County EDA came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation. Mr. Field indicated the letter being prepared by Bob Johnson, Riverside County Planning Director and himself. Mr. Field indicated the request being for the County Wide Policy section of the Compatibility Plan to be amended to allow previous approvals made by the ALUC prior to the adoption of the Compatibility Plan continue to be consistent, such as Specific Plans (primarily), Plot Plans, Parcel Maps & Tract Maps. Mr. Field then made himself available for any questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Hogan inquired if exhibits are available showing where the exemptions would apply. Mr. Field responded negatively indicating a list of parcels is available, but could prepare exhibits to be submitted to the Commission. In terms of request by property owners who have expressed concern the primarily airports affected are French Valley and Jacqueline Cochran Regional.

Chairman Housman expressed his concern in adopting the proposed language requested, without having specific information. Mr. Field concurred with Chairman Housman's concerns indicating specific information would be provided to the Commission.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman requested for John Guering to come forward.

John Guerin, Riverside County Planning came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation. Mr. Guerin indicated the Planning Department and EDA are working together to bring the County's General Plan and the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan into consistency with each other.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hogan, Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale and Chairman Housman on their uncomfortable level of not having visuals of the proposals. Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for a motion to be set, for staff to do further review on the issue and be brought back to the Commission.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Stephens made a motion to allow staff to review the matter further and be brought back to the Commission for further discussion. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

VII. EXECUTIVE SESSION:

B.T. Miller indicated Executive Session took place at 10:32 a.m. thru 10:55 a.m. and the Commission authorized the defense on the matter.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. ALUCP Update

Keith Downs indicated working on an administrative draft for the Chino and Hemet/Ryan Airports with Mead & Hunt and Coffman & Associates. With the action taken today on the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport there is a good chance in receiving the \$50,000 being withheld.

B. MARB Status: Review of Existing CLUP and proposal

March is having difficulty obtaining radar flight tracks, therefore is not moving forward at this time.

C. Muzzy vs Solano

B.T. Miller indicated the opening brief on the Muzzy vs Solano case from Solano County's Counsel has been distributed to the Commission.

Keith Downs presented the Commission with the award ALUC received for Distinguished Leadership and a copy will be provided to each Commissioner.

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

NONE

X. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

NONE

Commissioner Stephens indicated he will be moving out of state and would be resigning from the ALUC indicating this being his last meeting he will be attending.

XI. ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Housman adjourned the meeting at 11:00 a.m.
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: July 14, 2005 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside.