

# AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

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

**THURSDAY, July 14, 2005**  
**9:00 A.M.**

## MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on July 14, 2005 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Chambers.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Simon Housman, Chairman  
Lori Van Ardsdale, Vice Chairman  
Mark Lightsey  
Arthur Butler  
Dave Hogan  
Jon Goldenbaum

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Sam Pratt  
Marge Tandy

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Leo Doiron  
John Lyon  
John Guerin  
Rob Field  
Sam Annabi  
Mike Monteleone  
Ben Parry

- 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: June 9, 2005

June 9, 2005: Due to the minutes not being available Chairman Housman continued the minutes to the next scheduled meeting.

### **\*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.

Consent items as follows; HR-05-104 KB Homes, FV-05-106 Cassatt Academy, MA-05-116 Albert Webb Associates

Continued items: BD-05-106 Robert Ricciardi Architect

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 for the consent items and continuance for the continued items listed above, subject to staff's conditions of approval and recommendations. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## V. OLD BUSINESS

### BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

#### A. BD-05-106 – Robert Ricciardi Architect – Continued item see above

**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 42<sup>nd</sup> 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. **As of the date of this staff report (07/05/05), the applicant's response from the FAA has not been received by staff.**

**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.

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY**

**9:00 A.M.**

- B. Request from County – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE SUMMARY:**

County request for countywide amendment

3 of 21

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** County letter (May 6, received May 24) requesting amendment to adopted plan

**BACKGROUND:** At the meeting of June 9 the Commission was asked by the County to consider an amendment to the ALUCP's County-wide policies. The amendment would allow specific plan, tracts, parcel maps or plot plans that were approved prior to the adoption of the ALUCP's County-wide policies to be consistent with the plan if the project's conditions were satisfied and was not within zones A or B-1.

Existing Land Uses: Our adopted plan already defines approved tracts, parcel maps and plot plans as existing land uses and therefore this clause is unneeded for those types of permits.

Countywide policy: Staff has examined all of the airports for this proposal and can see no need for this clause to apply to Banning, Bermuda Dunes, Blythe, Chiriaco Summit, Corona, Desert Center Flabob, Riverside and Palm Springs. This is because either the County has no jurisdiction or because there are no Specific Plans that are either within the Influence Area or affected by the ALUCP. The Chino, Hemet Ryan and March plans are not completed, but are unlikely to have the issues which the proposed amendment seeks to address. As the representative of the County stated, this leaves only French Valley and Jacqueline Cochran as the two airfields where the language would have any effect. In conclusion, there is no need to change the ALUCP's County-wide policies affecting all airports when the proposed amendment holds practical implication for only two airfields.

Exemption clause: Additionally, the proposed amendment would have the same effect as the "exemption clause" contained in the prior French Valley CLUP which the Attorney General has opined was inappropriate.

Other: At the last meeting, John Guerin from County Planning outlined that further comments and requests will be coming from the county at some time in the near future. If the Commission is interested in pursuing any such an amendment to the ALCUP, then staff would recommend that it relate only the French Valley and Jacqueline Cochran airports and with a narrow intent that will not compromise the public safety purpose of the other adopted plans.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that: 1) that any action by the commission on the proposed amendment await the County's further actions relative to the ALUCP; and 2) if the Commission wants to adopt the proposed amendment, that it apply only to French Valley and Jacqueline Cochran airports.

Keith Downs indicated that at the previous meeting a letter was received from Rob Field, EDA and Mr. Johnson, County Planning Department requesting amendment to the ALUCP County wide policies. This amendment will be for Specific Plans, Tract Maps, Parcel Maps and Plot Plans that were approved prior to the adoption of the ALUCP.

Staff has reviewed all the airports and concluded it to be an unnecessary clause for Banning, Bermuda Dunes, Blythe, Chiriaco Summit, Corona, Desert Center, Flabob, Riverside and Palm Springs due to no specific plans being affected by the ALUCP. The proposal would have the same effect as the exemption clause, which this Commission over the last three years has stated its opposition. There is now an Attorney General's opinion that states the exemption clause is inappropriate, therefore that exemption clause was not included in the ALUCP. Staff has been working with County staff in regards to their concerns. The County is working with the Board of Supervisors (BOS)

in understanding the issues and the BOS has continued the item to July 26<sup>th</sup>. There is more things involved than just the County wide proposal, therefore recommend continuance in order to obtain additional response. Keith Downs then indicated an amendment could be done once a year for each particular airport and Jacqueline Cochran has had one amendment this year, calendar wise no action could be taken till January 2006, leaving French Valley, but would be appropriate to act on all concerns at one time.

Chairman Housman called for John Guerin to come forward.

John Guerin, Riverside County Planning Department, came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation and concurred with staff's recommendation for continuance. County staff is gathering data on five of the airports, Bermuda Dunes, Blythe, French Valley, Flabob and Riverside Municipal to prepare for meetings with staff from various members of the BOS for the types of actions to take for each of the affected airports.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners, hearing no response he called for Mr. Monteleone to come forward.

Mike Monteleone, property owner of affected airport (French Valley) came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation. Mr. Monteleone indicated the offsets have been completed for the property and with the conditions being imposed by the ALUC most of the property devaluates.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale inquired to Mr. Monteleone when he became aware of the conditions. Mr. Monteleone responded approximately two months ago. Chairman Housman inquired if a tentative map was in place. Mr. Monteleone responded positively.

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, hearing no reply he called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale made a motion for continuance to the September 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## NEW BUSINESS

### SKYLARK AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

- A. SK-05-100 – Century American Development – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:**

SK-05-100 Century American Development

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:**

County of Riverside

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:**

TM 31345, GPA 672 and Change of Zone 6836

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is a Tract Map for subdivision of 50 lots on 14.9 acres ranging in size from 7,200 to 12,912 sq. ft., Change of Zone from RR to R-1 and General Plan Amendment from RLI to Residential 2-4/acre.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located easterly of the airport in the County of Riverside, from approximately 3,600 to 4,200 feet from the Runway at Skylark Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Skylark Airport  
Land Use Policy: Interim – Influenced Area adopted October 23, 1975

- a. Airport Influence Area: Zones III
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area
- c. Noise Levels: Outside unknown but likely outside 55-65CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located in line with and southeasterly of the RWY. The proposed site is within the Areas III of the adopted Skylark Airport Influence Area. The project is a Tract Map for a subdivision of 50 lots on 14.9 acres. The proposal has fifty lots that range in size from 7,200 to 12.912 sq. ft. in size: and an open space linear lot reflecting the flood control facilities of the project. The general plan and zoning would be changed from RR and RLI to R-1 and 2-4 d.u. /acre. Area III has no population limits assigned to it, but areas II has a two and one/half acre minimum lot size with no structures within the close-in areas.

Noise: There are no noise contours for the airport, but is likely to be outside the 55 CNEL. The site is near and underlying an approach and departure flight track and will experience noise from over flying and adjacent aircraft.

Part 77: The elevation on the proposed site varies from 1,300 to 1,315 MSL and the height of structures could be two story or 28 feet. The site is near the approach and transitional and within the horizontal surface. The surface of the runway varies from 1.260 MSL to less than that. All structures at this location will require an FAA 7460 review.

**Caltrans Handbook:** This plan is almost 30 years old and does not reflect the more recent Caltrans Handbooks and reflects a runway that no longer exists. This is further compounded by the fact that the runway end points are not precisely established by the current permit or known by the operator or Caltrans. Exhibit D shows the appropriate handbook from exhibit 9K overlaying the area. A portion of the site could be within zone 4 or our zone C.

Conclusion: The project as submitted is consistent with the adopted 1975 Interim Influence Area.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements for the entire proposed development to SKYLARK Airport. (951) 245-4595.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.

3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
  - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
  - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
  - c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
  - d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of Consistency for the project, but recommends a CONTINUANCE in order to obtain comments from the airport operator and, Caltrans Aeronautics.

Keith Downs briefed the Commissioners on the Skylark Airport. In 1974 there were two runways one of those has not been in existence for decades. This airport does not have latitude and longitude end points for the runway. The activity is unknown and no ALP is available, therefore the direction of the runway's use is unknown.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners. Vice Chairman Van Arsdale inquired if the airport is privately owned. Keith Downs responded positively. Commissioner Hogan inquired on the distance from Mission Trail to the proposed Tract. Keith Downs responded approximately 3,600'.

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

Ben Parry, Century American Development came forward in response to Chairman Housman's invitation and made him self available for questions. Chairman Housman inquired on the type of development surrounding the project site. Mr. Parry responded that to the east is a church and Elsinore High School, to the north and south is single family residential and to the west vacant parcels.

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. A discussion ensued between the Commission regarding the

continuance and pending information. Keith Downs indicated waiting for response from the airport operator as well as Caltrans. Mr. Parry concurred with the one month continuance.

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

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

## HEMET/RYAN AIRPORT

9:00 A.M.

- B. HR-05-103 – Frey Associates – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** HR-05-103 – Frey Associates  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Hemet  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** PM 30602

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Parcel Map for eight industrial parcels on approximately 18.64 acres.*

### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at the northeast corner of Wentworth Drive and Cawston Avenue within the City of Hemet, approximately 1,200 feet southeast of the runway at Hemet/Ryan Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport:* Hemet-Ryan Airport  
*Land Use Policy:* CLUP 1989: Adopted by City of Hemet

- a. Airport Influence Area:* Area I, Area of Extreme Risk, and Area II, Area of High Risk  
*b. Noise Levels:* Inside 60 to 65 CNEL

### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located approximately 1,200 feet southeast of the runway. The proposal is for eight industrial parcels on approximately 18.64 acres. The northwest portion of the site is within Area I, Area of Extreme Risk of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Influence Area. The remainder of the site is within Area II, Area of High Risk. Area I shall be kept free of all high-risk land uses, including hazardous material facilities, institutional uses, places of assembly, critical facilities and residential uses. Public and private schools, institutional uses, places of assembly and hazardous material facilities are not permitted in Area II. Agricultural uses and open spaces are permitted in Area I, and a discretionary review of commercial and industrial uses is required. Industrial and agricultural uses are permitted within Area II, and a discretionary review of commercial uses is required.*

NOISE: *The site is in the approach path and will experience significant annoyance from over flying aircraft. The 1989 plan indicates that the area is inside the 60 and 65 CNEL noise contours.*

PART 77. *The runway elevation is 1,512 MSL. The highest elevation on the site is 1,530 MSL.*



The height of proposed structures is currently unknown. Structures at the site will require FAA Review.

**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 proposed industrial use would be consistent with the plan, however, subsequent review of proposed structure height and type of industrial use is required.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the parcel map 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. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
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. 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.
6. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.
7. Subsequent review of proposed structures and industrial uses by the ALUC is required.

Hearing no further comments Chairman Housman called for questions from the Commissioners for staff. Commissioner Hogan inquired if future proposals within parcels 4 and 5 are expected to come to the ALUC for review. Beverly Coleman

responded positively as per condition #7.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Lightsey made a motion of consistency, subject to further review of land uses. Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

C. HR-05-104 – KB Homes – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** HR-05-104 – KB Homes  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Hemet  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** TM 33075

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Tract Map for 38 single-family residential lots on approximately 10.5 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at 3620 West Fruitvale Avenue, west of Sanderson Avenue, within the City of Hemet, approximately 9,600 feet north of the runway at Hemet/Ryan Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Hemet-Ryan Airport  
Land Use Policy: CLUP 1989: Adopted by City of Hemet*

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

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located approximately 9,600 feet north of the runway. The proposal is for 38 single-family residential lots on approximately 10.5 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 and mandatory review for all legislative cases.*

NOISE: *The site is near 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 55 CNEL.*

PART 77. *The runway elevation is 1,512 MSL. The highest elevation on the site is 1,521.4 MSL. Structures exceeding 1,608 MSL at the south end of the site would require FAA Review. 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 tract map 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. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.*
3. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
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. 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.*
6. *The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*

**FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

- D. FV-05-106 – Cassatt Academy – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-05-106-Cassatt Academy  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Temecula  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Conditional Use Permit PA-05-0060

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A preschool consisting of four buildings totaling 6,048 sq. ft on approximately 2 acres (net).*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at 39960 Calle Girasol, within the City of Temecula, approximately 10,000 feet southeast of the runway at French Valley Airport.*

**LAND USE PLAN:**

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

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposed site is located approximately 10,000 feet southeast of the runway. The proposal is for a preschool consisting of four buildings totaling 6,048 sq. ft. on approximately 2 acres (net). The proposed site is within Zone E. Zone E has no density restrictions. The proposed use is an acceptable use subject to noise and height restrictions.

NOISE: The site will get significant overflight, but is outside of the current and near future 55 CNEL.

PART 77: The highest elevation on the site is 1,205 MSL and the height of the structures is approximately 13.2 ft. The horizontal surface elevation is at 1,500 MSL. Part 77 obstruction criterion is not a concern.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of consistency for the tract map subject to the conditions noted below.

**CONDITIONS:** For the City to Utilize

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the operator of French Valley Airport prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
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 and tenants.

**MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE**

**9:00 A.M.**

E. MA-05-116 – Trammell Crow Company – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-05-116-Trammell Crow Company  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** PA 05-0591, EIR

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*Five industrial buildings consisting of 987,875 sq. ft. on 50.11 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located south of Eastridge Avenue and east of Sycamore Canyon Blvd. within the City of Riverside, approximately 13,800 feet northwest of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.*

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

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

*In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The 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 proposed site is located approximately 12-14,500 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is under a major approach and departure track. The proposal consists of five industrial buildings totaling 987,875 sq. ft. on 50.55 acres. Specific information on the type of industrial uses at the facility is currently unknown except that it would be manufacturing or*

warehouse. The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft expected to use the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area I. Area I allow industrial uses but prohibit certain high-risk land uses. Those uses are listed in the attached Appendix B to the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan.

Density and Coverage: The area of the proposed structures is 987,875 sq. ft., which is less than 45% of the area. There are 2,192 parking spaces provided on the project which could result in 59 people per acre or using the UBC it could result in 32/acre gross.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,535 MSL feet and the height of the tallest building is approximately 38 ft. The runway elevation at the north end is 1,535 MSL. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1,655 MSL feet in elevation. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

Noise: The site has been shown to have significant noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be within 65 CNEL. Previous AICUZ reports indicated the property to be within 75 CNEL.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of consistency of the project subject to the conditions noted 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 any office portions of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. Lighting plans for any additional development on the vacant lots shall be reviewed and approved by an airport lighting consultant or MARB/MIP prior to placement.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
  - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. The above ground storage of explosive or flammable materials is prohibited.

6. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers and tenants.

7. Use listed on attached Appendix B shall not be allowed.

F. MA-05-117 – Thomas Merrick Co. Inc. – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA 05-117-Thomas Merrick Co. Inc.  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*The project is a proposed church within an existing business park.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at 2220 Eastridge Avenue, approximately 14,000 ft. northwest of the runway 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 I (APZ 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 14,000 feet northwest of north end of Runway 14-32. The project consists of a church within an existing business park. The proposal is under 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 I, which prohibits high-risk land uses such as places of assembly. The proposed use is inconsistent with allowed uses within Area I.*

Density and Coverage: *The proposed use is within an existing business park with less than 40% structural coverage of the total site.*

Part 77: *The elevation at the site is approximately 1,530 MSL and the building height is unknown. The runway elevation is 1,535 MSL. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1,888 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 be within 55 CNEL.*

**CONCLUSION:** *The proposed use is inconsistent with the RCALUP based on the land use standards within Area I.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** *Staff recommends a finding of Inconsistency of the project.*

**CONDITIONS OF OVERRIDE (for City Use):**

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. *The attached Notice regarding Proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser or lessee.*

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.

Reverend Randall Pierpoint, representing the church came forward and requested the opportunity to allow the use of the facility. Chairman Housman inquired on the size and times they meet. Mr. Pierpoint responded that the size of the congregation is approximately 20 people and meet once a week on Sundays.

Erin Lagomarsino, came forward and indicated an existing church has been leasing in the same building for the past five years. Commissioner Lightsey inquired about the uses of the remainder of the units in the building. Ms. Lagomarsino responded the uses are very light industrial. Commissioner Lightsey inquired on the amount of people in the units during the week versus the weekends. Ms. Lagomarsino responded approximately 75% of the parking is utilized during the week. On Saturdays approximately 10 vehicles utilize the parking and on Sundays is just the church. Chairman Housman inquired about the location of the church. Ms. Lagomarsino responded the proposed church will be utilizing unit A. The existing church utilizes unit V and the previous church utilized units I & J. Vice Chairman Van Arsdale inquired about the inconsistency finding. Keith Downs responded that it's a noise sensitive issue as well as a place of assembly. Vice Chairman Van Arsdale inquired whether the prior and present church had ALUC review. Keith Downs responded that the City of Riverside did not participate in the ALUC process until about 5 years ago. Vice Chairman Van Arsdale inquired on the override process. Keith Downs responded that the City would need to make basic findings, such as protecting health and safety of the citizens. Commissioner Hogan inquired if the March plan has any occupancy goals. Keith Downs responded negatively. Commissioner Goldenbaum indicated other industrial sites are available and it does not make sense to have a church directly under the flight path of an approach path of a runway. Chairman Housman inquired if the proposed church falls under the existing use clause. Keith Downs responded negatively.



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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Lightsey made a motion of inconsistency. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- G. MA-05-118 – Transcan Development – Keith Downs presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-05-118 Transcan Development (Part of MA-03-122)  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** P05-0613

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Conditional Use Permit to add a 50,112 sq. ft. restaurant and entertainment center on 5.1 net acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is south of SR 60, east of I-215 north of March Air Reserve Base/MIP.*

*Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port*

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

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

*The countywide effort we have completed for the balance of the airports, but do not include an update to the Airport, but that effort has been imitated by the March JPA for this airport.*

*Since we have not adopted the CLUP for MARB, we utilize four resources for our review:*

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

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 16,000 –16,500 feet north of the north end of Runway 14-32. The proposal consists of a specialty restaurant and attendant uses such*

as bowling alley, arcade, carousel and amusement rides and individual party rooms. The proposal is near the primary departure track and is 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, and noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, which allows limited commercial, industrial and agriculture. 1984 RCALUP: The 1984 RCALUP with the 1986 map identifies the entire project as within AREA II. Area II, Policy #2 states: "Area II shall have a minimum residential lot size of two and one-half acres. Agricultural, industrial and commercial uses are acceptable."

Density and Coverage: The project is part of a much larger center that was reviewed under MA-03-122 (see attached staff report). The original application had apartments and a theatre associated with the project and was recommended for inconsistency based upon the residential use density and noise sensitivity of the theatres. These were removed and the Commission found the balance of the project consistent. The attached analysis indicates the proponent's estimate of the occupancy load for the various uses and the parking committed to the site. Using the parking of 319 spaces and a factor of 1.5 the occupancy would be approximately 480, but a load factor for the vehicles should be higher for this use and a factor of 2.5-3/vehicle would be more appropriate. This would result in occupancy of roughly 1,000 people. Using the occupant load from the proponent there would be approximately 188/acre. Using the occupancy from the proponent it would be approximately 480 people/acre. This use would be considered a HIGH RISK LAND USE as shown on Exhibit B of the current plan. These uses are precluded from Area I, but are not specifically inconsistent with Area II. With the recently adopted ALUCP this use would be allowed in Zone E and possibly Zone D.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is between 1,545 and 1,598 MSL feet and the maximum allowed building height is 45 feet. None of the project is within Part 77 obstruction criteria of the outer horizontal surface elevation of 1,888 MSL. The highest structure on the entire commercial site is 93 feet on a pad elevation of 1568.5 for high point of 1,662 MSL. Being approximately 16,500 feet from the runway end point anything exceeding 1,700 MSL would need a 7460 review. Part 77 height issues are not a concern.

Noise: The site has been shown to have varying noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1986 Map covered most of the property with 65 CNEL and the balance would have been within the 60 CNEL 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be below 55 CNEL. The project would not be considered a noise sensitive use.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the ALUC CONTINUE this until August 11 to obtain responses regarding this proposed use from the March JPA's, March ARB and Caltrans:

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an aviation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.
2. Lighting shall be reviewed and approved by an Airport Lighting Consultant/or the airport operator prior to placement.
3. No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.
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 OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*
  - 7. *The usage of helium filled balloons shall be controlled so that none are released to the outside.*

Keith Downs indicated that two years ago on this same site apartments and a theater were proposed which concerned March JPA due to the high densities. This proposal consists of a much higher density, therefore staff is recommending a continuance to receive a response from March JPA, Caltrans and the Air Force.

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.

Annie May Grantan came forward and inquired on the public notice she received by mail. B.T. Miller responded that by law ALUC is required to send public notices to residences and property owners within a certain radius of the project site. The ALUC deals with safety, noise and obstruction, any other issues need to be addressed to the local jurisdiction, which in this case would be the City of Riverside.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Goldenbaum made a motion for continuance to the next scheduled meeting. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**BY LAWS**

**9:00 A.M.**

- H. Commission By Laws – 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, Jacqueline Cochran 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, and Hemet Ryan).*

**RECOMMENDATION:** *Staff recommends that the Commission and counsel review the proposed bylaws and continue them until the next meeting of August 11 in order to clearly ascertain the effect upon the remaining CLUPs and the Chino Interim Influence Area.*

Keith Downs requested a continuance to review some of the aspects in relationship to the complaint filed against the ALUC. Chairman Housman requested continuance for two months due to him not attending the next scheduled meeting.

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

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Hogan made a motion of continuance to the September 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

### A. ALUCP Update

Keith Downs indicated that he has been working with Ken Brody in developing the factors for the Chino Airport. A draft will be developed of the components and presented it to the airport manager. The same will be done with Hemet/Ryan Airport.

### B. MARB Status: Review of Existing CLUP and proposal

Ken Brody, Mead & Hunt, briefed the Commission on the progress for the March Air Reserve Base plan. At this time no further information has been received from the FAA in regards to the flight tracks. There is some confusion on departures and arrivals as well as insufficient information on where the closed circuit training activity takes place. The AICUZ is being updated and a new draft is scheduled to be released soon. Within the next two weeks it will be determined whether any other flight track recorded data is obtained. The first draft of the Compatibility Plan has similar patterns as the previous plans developed. This plan is more directed specifically to the individual agencies, which somewhat by passes the format the ALUC uses, and more directed to the land use format. Commissioner Goldenbaum informed Ken Brody on where additional information regarding the flight track data could be obtained.

### C. Muzzy vs Solano

B.T. Miller indicated no additional information is available at this time.

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

David Warren came forward to inquire about the proposed runway extension at the Hemet/Ryan Airport. Chairman Housman indicated the ALUC does not deal with the internal operations of the airports. The ALUC deals with development of land outside of the airports. B.T. Miller referred Mr. Warren to the Riverside County Airport for information on his inquires.

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS  
NONE

- X. Executive Session: B.T. Miller stated a recess would be taken (10:40 a.m.) into executive session to discuss this item.

Returned from executive session at 11:15 a.m. B.T. Miller indicated the Commissioners while in session took no action.

- XI. ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Housman adjourned the meeting at 11:18 a.m.  
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: August 11, 2005 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside.