

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

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

Thursday, December 8, 2005
9:00 A.M.

MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on December 8, 2005 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Chambers.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Simon Housman, Chairman
Mark Lightsey
Jon Goldenbaum
Rod Ballance
Paul Bell, Alternate

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Arthur Butler
Charles Washington
Lori Van Ardsdale, Vice Chairman

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Phil Clayton
Dave DeGennaro
John Guerin, Riverside County Planning
Mark Dillon, Attorney

- 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: Chairman Simon Housman moved the October and November minutes be continued to the next meeting.

V. OLD BUSINESS

RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

- A. RI-05-127 – Riverside Commercial Investors’s Inc. – CUP P05-0922, 23, & 24 for an industrial office complex, north of Arlington Avenue, on both sides of Airport Dr., within the City of Riverside.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

An industrial/office complex consisting of approximately 170,000 sq. ft. on 11.6 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at the northeast and northwest corner of Arlington Avenue and Airport Drive within the City of Riverside, from approximately 300 to 800 ft. southeast of Runway 16-34 at Riverside Municipal Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport:	Riverside Municipal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area:	Zone C, D and B1
b. Noise Levels:	Inside 55CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: The proposed site is located from approximately 300 to 800 feet southeast of Runway 16-34 and 1,900 ft. south of Runway 9-27. The proposal is for an industrial office complex consisting of approximately 170,000 sq. ft. on 11.8 acres. The project site is within Zones C, D and B1. Based on the revised building layout and density information submitted by the applicant, Buildings 13, 14 and portions of Building 9, 10, 11 and 12 are within Zone B1. The applicant estimates the maximum occupancy of the buildings that fall within Zone B1 to be 98 persons on 4.9 acres, or 20 persons per acre. Two of the buildings (Building 13 and 14) are proposed for office use, and the remaining buildings are proposed for manufacturing. Based on the required number of parking spaces for the project (234), the estimated occupancy for the entire site is 351 persons, or 29 persons per acre. Based on the proposed number of parking spaces (492), the estimated occupancy is 738, or 64 persons per acre. The applicant estimates the maximum occupancy for the entire site is 500 persons, or 43 persons per acre. Zone B1 allows up to 70% lot coverage and an average density of up to 25 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 50 persons. Zone C allows up to 80% lot coverage and an average density of up to 75 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 150 persons. Zone D allows up to 90% lot coverage and an average density of 100 persons per acre, with allowable

clustering on a single acre of up to 300 persons. Based on the applicant's revised building layout and density estimates, the proposed use is an acceptable use subject to noise and height restrictions, provided the density limitations for Zones B1, C and D are not exceeded. This review applies only to the permits/ City of Riverside case numbers listed in this staff report and the revised site plan submitted by the applicant dated September 27, 2005.

NOISE: The site will get significant overflight, and is inside 55CNEL.

PART 77. The highest elevation of any object or terrain on the site is 790 MSL and the highest structure height is approximately 31 ft. The runway elevation is 774 MSL. FAA 7460 review is required for structures exceeding 35 ft. in height or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway. At a distance of 300 to 800 ft. from the runway, structures exceeding 777 MSL in elevation require FAA review.

Other: On October 13, 2005, the ALUC continued this item in order to allow the applicant to submit the FAA 7460-1 determination. The FAA determination letter has not been received by staff.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends continuance of the case until the next ALUC meeting due to failure of the applicant to provide the FAA 7460-1 determination letter.

CONDITIONS: For the City to Utilize

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the operator of Riverside Municipal 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 the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
4. Children's schools, hospitals, day care center, libraries and nursing homes are prohibited in Zones B1 and C. Above ground bulk storage of hazardous materials is prohibited in Zone B1.
5. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing

at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.

- b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
6. No obstruction of the “FAR Part 77 Conical Surface” shall be permitted. An FAA 7460-1 review shall be completed for any structure of a height that exceeds 777 MSL, or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway and any conditions listed in the FAA determination letter shall be satisfied.
7. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.

Beverly Coleman recommends continuance of the case until the next meeting due to failure of the applicant to provide the FAA 7460-1.

ACTION TAKEN: Hearing no further comments, Chairman Housman motioned for continuance, Paul Bell seconded the motion. All in favor, eye, all opposed none.

VI NEW BUSINESS

MARCH AIR RESERVE

- A. **MA-05-143 - CBC** – Change of Zone and General Plan Amendment from commercial to light industrial for 5 lots on 24.6 acres, east of I-215, and south of Morgan Street, within the City of Perris.

CASE NUMBER: MA-05-143 -CBC
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Perris
JURISDICTION CASE NO: TPM 33759, GPA & CZ

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Tentative Parcel Map, GPA and Change of Zone from Commercial to Light Industrial for a mixed-use commercial retail and industrial center on 24.5 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated south of Morgan Street west of Webster Avenue within the City of Perris, approximately 9,100 feet south of Runway 14/32 at March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port.

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

BACKGROUND:

Staff utilized four resources for review:

1. RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986
2. Current Cal Trans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002
3. 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 9,100 feet south of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for a mixed-use commercial retail and industrial center on 24.5 acres. The existing site is vacant and zoned for commercial uses. The proposal is under the major flight track and within the approach surface.

The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, which allows commercial and industrial uses.

Density and Coverage: Based on the proposed building layout, structural coverage is expected to be less than 45% of the net area.

Part 77: The highest elevation at this site is approximately 1,495MSL feet and the height of the tallest structure proposed is 28 feet. The runway elevation is 1,488 MSL at the south end. Any structures over 1,579 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria is not a concern.

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

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

CONDITIONS:

1. Provide Avigation Easements/Deed Notice to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act. (951) 656-7000
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. 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 shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.
6. The uses in Appendix B shall not be allowed in this project.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Rod Ballance made a motion to approve consent agenda for VI. New Business, Item A, C, and E. Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum seconded the motion. All in favor, eye, all opposed none.

- B. **MA-05-145- David DeGennaro** - Commercial project for 80,000 square feet east of Barton Street, north of Alessandro Blvd., within the City of Riverside.

CASE NUMBER: MA 05-145 David DeGennaro
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Design Review and Permits

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Office and Commercial Center

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at the northeast corner of Alessandro Blvd. and Barton Road, within the City of Riverside, approximately 14,500 ft. northwest of March Air Reserve Base.

Adjacent Airport: March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area
b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area 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 and 2005 March Air Reserve Base
4. ALUCP for Riverside County: 2004

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 14,500 feet northwest of north end of Runway 14-32. The project is a commercial /office/retail restaurant on a 6.26 acre 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 6.26 net acres the structural coverage of the site is less than 20% of the total acreage. Using the provided parking the site would have 84 people per acre. Using building code it would have 196 people per net acre or approximately 152 per gross acre.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 1,621 MSL and the maximum building height is 26 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 the 2005 shows less than 60CNEL.

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.
- 7. The uses in the attached exhibit B shall not be allowed in this project.

Keith Downs recommends a finding of consistency for Item B.

Item B is moved off the consent agenda by Chairman Housman, applicant David DeGennaro came forward with his concerns on height restrictions and the building of restaurants, small banks, small markets and small drug stores.

Chairman Housman indicated that the issue before the commission narrowly is framed is that the general commercial use outlined in the application does not specify the use of the facilities. Under the bold plan that we have to operate on there is a list of things that are not permitted to be done in that location, we are going to attach that because in the future when you get to your approvals, local jurisdiction can override our decision. Applicant David DeGennaro responded so we don't have to come back. Chairman Housman responded to Mr. De Gennarro that he will have a problem down the road, but he does not have to come back to us to deal with it.

ACTION TAKEN: Rod Ballance made a motion of consistency for staff recommendations and applications. Commissioner Paul Bell seconded the motion. All in favor, eye, all opposed none.

- C. MA-05-146 – I.W. Consulting Engineers – Industrial Project for 12,400 square feet west of Box springs, north of Eastridge Avenue, with the City of Riverside.

CASE NUMBER: MA-05-146 - I.W. Consulting
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: unsubmitted

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Three industrial buildings consisting of 12,400 sq. ft. on 1.53 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 6477 Box Springs 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 Area I
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. Currently a newer draft is being prepared by the March JPA.

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 and 2005 March Air Reserve Base

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 15,000 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is under a major approach and departure track. The proposal consists of three industrial buildings totaling 12,400 sq. ft. on 1.53 acres. Specific information on the type of industrial uses at the facility is currently unknown. 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 allows industrial uses but prohibits 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 12,400 sq. ft.; currently there are four buildings on site totaling approximately 15,000 sq. ft, which is less than 45% of the area.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,531 MSL feet and the height of the tallest building is approximately 36 ft. The runway elevation at the north end is 1,535 MSL. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1,673 MSL feet in elevation. Part 77 obstruction criteria are 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 55 CNEL. Previous AICUZ reports indicated the property to be within 70 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.

Keith Downs requested to add Item C to the consent agenda MA-05-146 for a finding of consistency, Keith called anyone from the audience to speak otherwise this item will be approved under the consent agenda.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Rod Ballance made a motioned to approve consent agenda for VI. New Business, Item A, C, and E. Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum seconded the motion. All in favor, eye, all opposed none.

RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

- D. **RI-05-136 – Bluestone Communities** – CUP P05-1188, GPA P05-1197 and CZ P05-1198/DR for a drugstore, at 7305 Arlington Avenue and 6869 Van Buren Blvd., within the City of Riverside.

CASE NUMBER: RI-05-136-Bluestone Communities
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: CUP P05-1188, GPA P05-1197 and CZ P05-1198

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Conditional Use Permit, General Plan Amendment and Change of Zone for a drugstore.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 7305 Arlington Avenue and 6869 Van Buren Blvd., within the City of Riverside, approximately 720 ft. west of Runway 16-34 at Riverside Municipal Airport.

LAND USE PLAN:

Adjacent Airport:	Riverside Municipal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area:	Zone D, B2
b. Noise Levels:	Outside 55CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: The proposed site is located approximately 720 ft. west of Runway 16-34. The proposal is a drugstore consisting of 14,576 sq. ft. on 2.52 acres. The project site is within Zone D and B2. Zone D allows up to 90% lot coverage and an average density of 100 persons per acre for non-residential uses. Zone B2 allows an average density of 100 persons per acre. The proposed use is consistent with the density limits and allowable uses for Zone D, B2.

NOISE: The site is outside 55CNEL.

PART 77. The highest elevation on any part of the site is 772 MSL and the highest structure height is 32 ft. The runway elevation is 747 MSL. FAA 7460 review is required for structures exceeding 35 ft. in height (70 ft. for Zone D), or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway. At a distance of 720 ft. from the runway, structures exceeding 754 MSL in elevation require FAA 7460 review.

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

CONDITIONS:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the operator of Riverside Municipal 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 the 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.
 6. No obstruction of the “FAR Part 77 Conical Surface” shall be runway and any conditions listed in the FAA determination letter shall be permitted. An FAA 7460-1 review shall be completed for any structure of a height that exceeds 754 MSL, or a 100:1 slope from the end of the satisfied.

Beverly Coleman came forward and informed the Commissioners that staff recommended a finding of consistency for RI-05-136 Bluestone Communities.

Applicant Phil Clayton from Bluestone Communities came forward, indicating he received the conditions for approval and agreed with staff findings.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Lightsey made a motion of consistency for Item D. Rod Ballance seconded the motion. All in favor, all opposed none. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Housman requested to change the order of the Agenda. Moved to Executive Session at 9:23 a.m.

E. **RI-05-140 – Patrick Conover** – Design Review Office Industrial Facility at 7353 Oranewood Ave., within the City of Riverside.

CASE NUMBER: RI-05-140 Patrick Conover
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside

JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Design Review Office Industrial Facility

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Design Review for 33,862 sq. ft. of buildings on a 1.78 (net) acre lot northwest of the airport.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 7353 Orangewood Avenue, north of Jurupa Avenue within the City of Riverside, from approximately 2,800-3,000 ft. north of Runway 16-34 at the Riverside Municipal Airport and approximately 1,900 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 3,000 ft., northwest of Runway 16 at elevation 758 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 33,862 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 45% of the net area.

With 66 parking spaces the expected density would be 55 people/acre, which is within the zone allowance of 75/acre. Utilizing the UBC method the total people expected would be 40/acre.

Parking: 66 spaces provided x 1.5 = 99 people divided by 1.78 (net) acres = 55/acre.

UBC: Warehousing = 57 people, Offices =46 people for a total of 103 people dived by 1.78 acres = 58 acre x 50 % = 29/ 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 801 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. *Obstruction lighting and marking shall be place 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.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Rod Ballance made a motioned to approve consent agenda for VI. New Business, Item A, C, and E. Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum seconded the motion. All in favor, eye, all opposed none.

REGIONAL

- F. **RG-05-103 ALUC** – An Amendment to the ALUCP – The proposed change would utilize net acreage rather than gross acreage as the basis on which compliance with the high density option in Zone “D” is measured.

CASE NUMBER: RG-05-103 and BA-05-100, CS-05-100, DC-05-100, FL-05-10), BD-05-116, BL-05-100, CO-05-100, FV-05-112, RI-05-141, TH-05-103 and PS-100

APPROVING JURISDICTION: Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

An amendment to the 2004 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for public use airports in and affecting Riverside County. Jurisdictions affected are: the cities of Banning, Blythe, Corona, La Quinta, Murrieta, Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Indio, Coachella, Palm Springs, Riverside and Temecula; the County of Riverside and any special district within those Influence Areas. This effort does not apply to March ARB, Hemet/ Ryan or Chino airports. The attached letter and notice has been sent to those airports and local jurisdictions affected by this proposal.

PROJECT LOCATION:

All areas within Zone D within the Adopted Airport Influence Areas. Affected Airports are: Banning, Bermuda, Blythe, Chiriaco Summit, Corona, Desert Center, Flabob, French Valley, Jacqueline Cochran, Palm Springs and Riverside.

BACKGROUND:

The ALUC contracted with the consulting firm of Mead and Hunt to prepare the ALUCP in June of 2002 and adopted the new plan for 8 airports in 2004 and three in 2005. Fairly immediately staff noticed that utilization of the gross density for the floor of the high density option was sometimes inappropriate for the uses intended.

MAJOR ISSUES: Density in Zone D

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that; 1) The ALUC **close** the hearing for the Banning, Bermuda, Blythe, Chiriaco Summit, Corona, Desert Center, Flabob, French Valley airports, 2) **Approve** the amendment as indicated on Exhibit A for those airports, and 3) **Adopt Resolution** 05-104 and 4) The ALUC continue to take testimony from the jurisdictions and the public for Riverside, Jacqueline and Palm Springs airports, leave open and continue those airports until the next meeting of January or February, 2006.

Exhibit A: Amendment to ALUCP

Add to section 1.2 *Net Acreage*: For the purposes of this *Compatibility Plan*, the net acreage of a project equals the overall developable area of the project site exclusive of permanently dedicated open lands (as defined in Policy 4.2.4) or other open space required for environmental purposes. In most cases, particularly those involving relatively small project sites, the net acreage of a project will be the same as the size of the parcel or parcels to be developed.

Change Footnote 16 on Table 2A to read: Two options are provided for residential densities in *Compatibility Zone D*. Option (1) has a density limit of 0.2 dwelling units per acre (i.e., an average parcel size of at least 5.0 gross acres). Option (2) requires that the density be *greater than* 5.0 dwelling units per net acre (i.e., an average parcel size *less than* 0.2 net acres). The choice between these two options is at the discretion of the local land use jurisdiction. See Table 2B for explanation of rationale. All other criteria for *Zone D* apply to both options.

The following page (Gross v. Net Acreage Examples): illustrates the difference that the proposal would make for a typical 40 acre residential project.

The attached diagram shows how the density of residential development would be calculated using the net acreage of the site versus gross acreage. The net acreage measurement would be applied to the high-density option in *Zone D*.

The current policy of using gross acreage makes it difficult for a project to achieve the required minimum of 5.0 dwelling units per acre under the *Zone D* high-density option, particularly when a portion of the site must be devoted to open land for environmental, flood control, or other reasons.

As shown in the two examples, both would meet the minimum density requirement of 5.0 dwelling units per acre if based upon net acreage. When measured on a gross acreage basis, however, Example 1 would still essentially meet the criterion, but Example 2 would clearly not comply.

Keith Downs recommends we adopt resolution today and continue other 3 airports until the next meeting in January 2006.

John Guerin from Riverside County Planning came forward discussing the overall approach in regards to the net versus gross issue. The Riverside County Planning Department supports amendment as proposed by the ALUC staff and are still planning for the year 2006 to propose additional amendments to ALUCP for various airports. We would note that in the case of the vicinity of the French Valley airport we are looking at for the future amendment proposals, some of the issues in regards to density. Densities are limited by the highway 79 policy area. French Valley is of limited assistance, but every amount of flexibility can be beneficial, so we do support.

Chairman Housman sees conflicting problems with "Zone D" more noise with high density. Keith responds higher densities are more tolerant of noise.

Commissioner Rod Ballance concerned that residential developers are increasing density around airports and higher densities of residential use could cause potential problems. Alternate Paul Bell agreed with Rod Ballance more people more complaints. Jon Goldenbaum responds less people, more open land a good thing. Mark Lightsey agrees less people more open space. Chairman Housman questioned, how do you structure open space for an airport? Commissioner Goldenbaum responds economics will take care of it.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Mark Lightsey motioned to adopt proposed resolution presented by staff. Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum seconded the motion. All in favor, all opposed none. Motion carried unanimously.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

a. ALUCP Update

BACKGROUND:

Chino Airport: The status has changed. The San Bernardino airport staff has approved a contract for additional environmental work at the airport and it was completed and copies of the plan were given to the commissioner's at the last meeting. Your staff has asked that additional information be supplied and a response from the San Bernardino ALUC is available prior to the hearing by the Riverside County ALUC. A draft of the relevant factors has been prepared and staff met with the San Bernardino County airport's staff (July 27, 2005) for review and comment. Comments were received on October 3rd and the consultant has finished the background information at this time. It has been placed on the website at this time.

Phase II: Funding: Funding was exhausted from the original grant for the updates and we filed an application with Caltrans Aeronautics for phase II to complete the project that may be adequate to complete the contracted work.

Caltrans has released the (10% = \$50,000) retainer prior to completion of the project and all of the grant funds have been expended.

Hemet/Ryan Airport: The status is unchanged. A draft Master Plan has been completed and the initial study was sent out by the airport sponsor for comments and ultimate scheduling for the ALUC review after the comment period ended (September 15, 2004) and prior to any Board of Supervisor's hearing. The County has indicated that some individuals and the City of

Hemet and RCTC have requested that an EIR be prepared for the Hemet Master

Plan. The County and City of Hemet have had discussion regarding adding the street replacements to the effort. After adoption of the Master Plan by the Board of Supervisors the update for this airport could go to hearing. A new alternative of an addition to the original plan of an extension to 6,000 feet may be added to the plan.

A contract amendment was negotiated for additional and continuing services with Mead and Hunt. The item was approved by the Board on April 5, 2005.

RECOMMENDATION: Information only

b. MARB STATUS

SUMMARY: March Operations Assurance Task Force and Joint Land Use Study (JLUS)/ALUCP

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Task force to assist Continuing Operations at March Air Reserve Base (MOATF)

BACKGROUND:

As approved at the May 2003 ALUC meeting, your staff has attended the meetings of the March Operations Assurance Task Force (MOATF). The major concern of the group is the upcoming 2005 BRAC (Base Realignment) review and the potential loss of the military from the facility due to 'encroachment' and the major costs associated with maintaining the facility. The Task Force wishes too emphasize land use issues and the economic value of the facility to the community. The BRAC recommendation came out May 13th and largely retains the great majority of the operations at the base.

To that end the JPA obtained funding from the Office of Economic Assistance to develop a Joint Land Use Study JLUS and update the CLUP. The March JPA has applied for and received the grant. Staff is participating in that effort on the Technical Subcommittee. The contract was approved by the March JPA on October 20th, 2004.

Meetings of the MOATF were held on November 1, 2004, December 13th, February 14th and April 4th.

The effort is dependant upon noise contours being developed by the Air Force as part of a new AICUZ, which was released September 20th. An internal Draft of the plan was given out in April and the planning staff (TAC) of the affected jurisdictions met on April 26th and as recently of August 30th. The attached letter was sent to the March JPA regarding that draft. No additional flight radar paths have been obtained, but controversy has ensued regarding a

displayed flight track. Staff gave a summary of the current status of the plan at this meeting along with some illustrations and questions about the plan. A meeting of the TAC will likely occur in early December.

RECOMMENDATION: Continue to follow the progress with updates at each meeting.

Keith Downs referred to staff report for Administrative Items A and B, stating that the final check has been received from Caltrans for the ALUCP grant. We expect to finish the Chino plan on the agenda for February.

VIII. ORAL COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC ON ANY ITEM ON THE AGENDA

NONE

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Chairman Housman concerned about reimbursement of mileage for going to and from meetings. Chairman Housman will be attending the Palm Springs event in the agenda package,

X. EXECUTIVE SESSION: Conference with legal counsel regarding existing litigation (Government Code section 54956.9): Silverhawk Land & Acquisitions, LLC v. Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission et al. (Riverside Superior Court case no. RIC 431176).

XI. ADJOURNMENT: Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum adjourned the meeting at 10:35 a.m.
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: January 12, 2006 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside.