

# **AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

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

**Thursday, January 12, 2006**  
**9:00 A.M.**

## **MINUTES**

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on January 12, 2006 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Chambers.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Simon Housman, Chairman  
Charles Washington  
Mark Lightsey  
Kathy Rohm, Alternate  
Arthur Butler  
Rod Ballance  
Melanie Fesmire

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Jon Goldenbaum

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Doug Adams March ARB  
John A. Corella, Royce International  
John Curts, City of Riverside  
Dan Fairbanks, March JPA  
John Guerin, Riverside County Planning  
Les Joslin, Pyro Spectaculars Inc.  
Robert Lawless, Harvest Christian Fellowship  
Gary Martin, Grace Temecula  
Lane Peirce  
Dennis Potts  
Cindy Roth, Greater Riverside Chamber  
Jay Warner, Chapman University

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: October 13, November 10 and December 8, 2005 minutes.

**ACTION TAKEN:** October 13, 2005 minutes - Commissioner Washington made a motion to approve minutes. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Approved unanimously. Abstained by Chairman Housman and Commissioner Melanie Fesmire.

November 10, 2005 minutes – Commissioner Washington made a motion to approve minutes. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Approved unanimously. Abstained by Commissioner Lightsey, Kathy Rohm (alternate) and Commissioner Melanie Fesmire.

December 10, 2005 minutes – Chairman Housman, Commissioner Rod Ballance and Commissioner Lightsey approved December minutes and will continue to next hearing in February. Abstained by Melanie Fesmire, Arthur Butler, Kathy Rohm and Commissioner Charles Washington.

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. **(Continued from December 8)**

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-05-127- Riverside Commercial Investor’s, Inc.  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Permit P05-0922, 23 and 24

#### **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 and <b>B2</b>
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, B1 and **B2**. 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 B2 allows an average density of up to 100 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 200 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, **B2**, 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 over flight, 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: 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, **B2** and C. Above ground bulk storage of hazardous materials is prohibited in Zone B1 and **B2**.
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 presented case recommending it be pulled off calendar for length of time on Agenda and applicant being absent at this meeting for failure to provide the FAA 7460-1.

John Curts from the City of Riverside came forward in favor of continuance. He will work with applicant directly to provide information immediately. Mr. Curts prefers not to have case RI-05-127 off calendar.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Kathy Rohm alternate motioned to continue to February 9, 2006. Commissioner Rod Ballance seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

- B. 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. Riverside, Palm Springs and Jaqueline Airport. (Continued from December 8).

**CASE NUMBER:** RG-05-103 and 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 Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City, Coachella, and Palm Springs, Riverside and; 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: 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 3 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 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 February, 2006.

**Addendum: January 12:** At the last meeting the Commission approved and adopted the changes to eight of the airports. If the Commission adopts this amendment for any of these airports this year there can be no further changes at these three airports until 2007.

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 recommends continuance for the Zone 'D' change for the three airports to February 2006.

John Guerin from the Riverside County Planning Department came forward recommending continuance for Jacqueline Cochran and Riverside airports.

Emily Hemphill (Attorney) representing the Cole Ranch Property came forward in support of staff recommendations to continue with respect to Jacqueline Cochran airport and other airports.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Lightsey made a motion to continue to next meeting. Commissioner Arthur Butler seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

**ABSTAINED:** Melanie Fesmire

## VI. NEW BUSINESS

### **BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT**

- A. **BD-05-117 – Marsha Vincelette** – Plot Plan 20895 for 187,498 square feet of buildings on 19.54 acres, north of Los Montanas Road, west of El Viento Road within the County of Riverside.

<b>CASE NUMBER:</b>	<u>BD-05-117 – Marsha Vincelette</u>
<b>APPROVING JURISDICTION:</b>	County of Riverside
<b>JURISDICTION CASE NO.:</b>	Plot Plan 20895

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project is a Plot Plan for an industrial park consisting of four buildings totaling 187,498 sq. ft. on 19.54 acres.

#### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located north of Los Montanas Road, west of El Viento Road in the County of Riverside, approximately 10,500 ft. northwest 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 D
b. Noise Levels:	Outside 55 dB CNEL

## **MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposal is a Plot Plan an industrial park consisting of four buildings totaling 187,498 sq. ft. on 19.54 acres. The proposed use will include office/warehouse and manufacturing. The proposed site is located within Zone D. Zone D allows up to 90% lot coverage and an average non-residential density of 100 persons per acre with clustering on a single acre of 300 persons. The proposal is consistent with allowed density and land use within Zone D.

NOISE: The proposal is outside 55 CNEL as indicated by Noise Impacts Data for Bermuda Dunes Airport. The proposed use is acceptable in that noise category.

PART 77: The highest elevation of any object, terrain or structure at the site is approximately 160.53 MSL and the height of the tallest structure is 34.33 ft. 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.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff would recommend that the proposal be found Consistent with the ALUCP.

## **CONDITIONS:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the office portions of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. 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.

Keith requests commissioners approval for consent item BD-05-117.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Washington made a motion to approve consent item BD-05-117. Commissioner Rod Ballance seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

- B. BD-05-118 Mirasera - Specific Plan 338, EIR, General Plan Amendment, and Change of Zone for 545,300 square feet of commercial/office and 1,764 residential units on 189.8 acres, north of Varner Road, south of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue within the County of Riverside.

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**CASE NUMBER:** BD-05-118 – Mirasera  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Notice of Preparation, Draft EIR, Specific Plan 338, General Plan Amendment and Change of Zone

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A retail/office/hotel center consisting of approximately 545,000 sq. ft. and 1,764 dwelling units on 190 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located north of Varner Road and south of 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue from approximately 10,000 to 14,000 feet northwest of the runway at Bermuda Dunes Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport  
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone C, D and E  
b. Noise Levels: From Inside 55CNEL to less

## **MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE AND DENSITY: The proposed site is located from approximately 10,000 to 14,000 feet northwest of the runways. The proposal is for a mixed use center consisting of approximately 545,000 sq. ft. of office, retail, hotel and 1,764 dwelling units of various types on 190 acres. According to the application there could be 10,569 people on site or an average density of over 56 people per acre gross or 61 per net acre.

Approximately half of the proposed site (the westerly and northerly portion) of the site with two large buildings and 4 smaller retail buildings are located within Zone E. Zones D and C are in the southeasterly sector of the plan. An analysis within the plan in section 4.1.8 pages 4.67-70. As the EIR states, the plan does not meet density for Zone C. Based on the proposed building layout within the safety zones, the proposed density and use is **inconsistent** subject to noise and height issues. Wildlife hazards attractant have not been discussed.

NOISE: The site will get significant over flight and the eastern portion of the project is inside of the current and near future 55 CNEL. The RNAV GPS 10 approach ( see exhibit B) for runway 10 brings aircraft approximately 400AGL at this location, but is not described in the text.

PART 77. The highest elevation of any structure or terrain on the site is 157 MSL and the near runway elevation is 73 MSL. FAA 7460 review is required by the plan for structures exceeding a height of 35 ft. in Zone B1, 70 ft. in Zones C and D, or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway. An FAA 7460 analysis will likely be required for some structures, but none are proposed to exceed the Part 77 criteria for obstructions.

**NOTICE OF PREPARATION:** We received the NOP from the county after the document was filed by the applicant. The document does not recognize the 2004 adoption of the current ALUCP and only refers to the old document on page 23 and 28. On page 28 it also fails to include the noise contours from the 2004 plan.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a CONTINUANCE to the next hearing date (February 9, 2006) in order to: 1) obtain the text of the Change of Zone, 2) obtain comments from the airport manager, 3) obtain comments from Caltrans Aeronautics, 4) have the specific plan address the RNAV GPS 10 approach, 5) obtain a more complete Specific Plan document including more detailed mitigation measures and direct staff to send the attached response to the Notice of Preparation.

SECTIONS TO READ: Comment

Introduction and Summary: ALL

Section 1.4	ALUC review not an approval
Section 3.0	Absent
Section 4.2	Development Standards
Section 4.6	Open Space does it meet standards of 4.2.4 of ALUCP
Section 4.1.8	RCALUC compatibility. Attempts to meet Special Condition of ALUCP 3.3.6 ( see attached Exhibit C)
Section 5.3.10	Noise
Section 5..1.11.2.3	Page 5.257 at 6,550 people differs from application page number of 10,569
Section 5.3.14.2	Page 5.290-307 Existing Condition relating to airport (Good Description)
Section 6.0	ALUCP not referenced
Section 8.399	RCALUC not referenced

Keith Downs presented case by referring to exhibits/maps, special conditions, approving agency, Section 3 and Handbook.

John Corella from Royce International came forward in agreement with staff recommendations for continuance to the next hearing date.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Lightsey made a motion of continuance to the next scheduled meeting. Rod Ballance seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

### **FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT**

- C. FV-05-113 Grace Temecula Partners– 50,000 square feet of office buildings on 4.83 acres at 38605, 38615 and 38625 Calistoga Drive, within the County of Riverside.

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-05-113 – Grace Temecula Partners  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Design Review

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A proposal to build 50,000 sq. ft. of office buildings on 4.83 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located at 38605, 38615 and 38625 Calistoga Drive within the County of Riverside, approximately 4,800 feet south of the runway at French Valley Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:**

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

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE AND DENSITY: The proposed site is approximately 4,800 feet south of the runway. The proposal is for 50,000 sq. ft. of office buildings on 4.83 acres.

The proposed buildings are located within Zone B1. Zone B1 allows up to 70% lot coverage and an average non-residential density of up to 25 persons per acre, with allowable clustering on a single acre of up to 50 persons. Based on the occupancy information submitted by the applicant, the estimated density for the project is approximately 54 persons per acre. The proposed density is inconsistent with the non-residential density standards for Zone B1.

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

PART 77. The highest elevation of any object or terrain on the site is 1326.6 MSL and the runway elevation is 1347 MSL. The tallest proposed building on the site is 35.5 ft. An FAA 7460 review is required for structures exceeding a height of 70 ft., or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of inconsistency for the project, based on the inconsistency of the proposed density with the standards for Zone B1.

The following conditions should be utilized in the event the County plans to overrule the project. The use of these conditions will not make the project consistent.

**CONDITIONS:**

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 the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
4. Children's schools, day care centers, libraries, hospitals, nursing homes and above ground storage of hazardous materials are 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. Structures exceeding a height of 35 feet, or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway require FAA 7460 review.
7. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.

Beverly Coleman presented staff report and recommends inconsistency for the project, based on the inconsistency of the proposed density with the standards for Zone B1.

Gary Martin from Grace Temecula came forward addressing a few mistakes in preparing application. 1) \$4 million into construction, 2) Approve Parcel Map 3) Did not calculate UBC 4) Inconsistent density to be calculated. Mr.

Martin also requested that commissioners find project consistent with standards of Section E1.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Mark Lightsey made a motion of inconsistency. Commissioner Rod Ballance seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

## **JAQUELINE COCHRAN AIRPORT**

- D. TH-05-104 – Royce International – GPA 712, EIR 474, Change of Zone 7027 and Tract Maps 32693 and 32694 for 990 units on 559 acres at the southwest corner of Harrison Street and 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, within the County of Riverside.

**CASE NUMBER:** TH-05-104-Royce International  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** GPA 712, EIR 474, Change of Zone 7027 and Tract Maps 32693 and 32694

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** A General Plan Amendment, Change of Zone, Tract Maps and Environmental Impact Report for 990 residential units and a school site on 559 gross acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The site is located at the southwest corner of Harrison Street and 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue within the County of Riverside, approximately 9,000 feet west of Runway 17-35 at the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport (Formerly Thermal Airport)

- a. Airport Influence Area: Zones D and E  
b. Noise Levels: Outside current 55 CNEL

### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposal is for a 990-unit residential development and a school site on 559 gross acres located approximately 9,000 ft. west of Runway 17-35. A large portion of the site, approximately 320 acres, falls within Zone E of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport. The proposed school site is located within Zone E. A smaller portion of the site, approximately 30 acres, falls within Zone D and includes thirteen (13) lots with lot sizes of 1 to 1.5 acres based on information provided by the applicant. Zone E has no residential density standards and schools are an acceptable use in this zone. Zone D allows residential density less than or equal to .2 units per acre (minimum 5 acre lot size) or greater than or equal to 5 units per acre. The residential density proposed for the portion of site within Zone D does not meet the density standards for Zone D.

NOISE: The site is outside the current 55 CNEL contour for the airport.

PART 77. The highest object or terrain at the proposed site is -71 MSL and the height of the tallest structure is 40 ft. The north runway end is at -115 MSL. The site is located within the horizontal surface. Structures exceeding -15 MSL ft. at this location would require FAA 7460 review. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern.

**CONCLUSION**: The portion of the project that falls within Zone D does not meet the applicable residential density standards for that Zone. The portion of the project that falls within Zone E is consistent with the applicable standards for Zone E. Therefore, the project as submitted is inconsistent with the applicable density standards, unless the applicant revises the project layout and density to meet the Zone D density standards.

**RECOMMENDATION**: Staff recommends that the Commission find the project inconsistent with the ALUCP for Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport based on the inconsistency of the residential density standards within Zone D.

Should the County wish to overrule the ALUC findings the following conditions should be utilized, and PUC 21670(a) should be followed regarding the overruling of Airport Land Use Commission decisions. The use of these conditions does not make the project consistent.

**CONDITIONS (For County Use):**

1. Provide Deed Notices to the Desert Resorts Airport prior to any development of the project, recordation of the map, or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
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 (lights must be downward facing).
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - (a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.

- (b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - (c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
  - (d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to 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 exceeding 70 ft. or a 1:100 slope from the end of the runway.
  6. The school site shall be evaluated by the State Department of Transportation, pursuant to Section 17215 of the Education Code.
  7. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.

Beverly Coleman presented staff report and recommends inconsistency within Zone D. Staff concludes that the project is inconsistent primarily because of the 12 or 13 lots within Zone D and does not appear to meet the special condition section 3.3.6.

John Corrella from Royce International came forward presenting graphics on the project 13 lots. If the commission finds the project consistent they will drop 6 lots.

Chairman Housman addressed issues whether to 1) Continue project 2) Approve, based on the reduction of the number of lots or 3) Approve under special conditions 3.3.6. (open space).

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Charles Washington made a motion of consistency based on adding three additional conditions Commissioner Arthur Butler seconded the motion. **SPECIAL CONDITION:** 1) In order to find consistent we need to employ the 3.3.6 specific findings. 1) Also applicant is willing to comply with our open space standards and set conditions (additional open space Zone D). 2) Noise not an issue in the site due to the terrain or terrestrial noise. 3) They have design restrictions to prevent them from putting up a sound wall. 4) Project subject to Architectural Design by local community. 5) The project is part of a much larger project with considerable open space. 6) During initial sales of properties within the subdivision, large airport related informational signs shall be installed and maintained by the developer. These signs shall be



installed in conspicuous locations and shall clearly depict the proximity of the property to the airport and aircraft traffic patterns. 7) An informational brochure shall be provided to prospective buyers or renters showing the locations of aircraft flight patterns (Exhibit TH-7 of RCALUCP shall suffice). The frequency of over flights, the typical altitudes of the aircraft, and the range of noise levels that can be expected from individual aircraft over flights shall be described. 8) To qualify as open land, an area should be free of most structures and other major obstacles such as walls, large trees or poles (greater than 4 inches in diameter, measured 4 feet above the ground), and no overhead wires. Approved 5 to 2. Opposed by Kathy Rohm (alternate) and Commissioner Mark Lightsey.

### **MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE**

- E. MA-05-149 – Western Municipal Water – For the addition of modular offices north of Alessandro Boulevard and east of Mission Grove Parkway, within the City of Riverside.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA 05-149 Western Municipal Water District (WMWD)

**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside (WMWD)

**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Design Review and Permits

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Additional Office Space

### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located at the northeast corner of Alessandro Blvd. and Mission Grove Parkway, within the City of Riverside, approximately 15,500 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 15,500 feet northwest of north end of Runway 14-32. The project is an addition of 1,440 sq. ft. to existing 16,826 sq. ft. office on a 3.6 acre site. 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 3.6 net acres. The structural coverage of the site is less than 13% of the total acreage. Using the provided 72 parking spaces of the site would have 27 people per acre. Using building code it would have 27 people per net.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 1,645 MSL and the maximum building height is 14 feet. The runway elevation is 1,535 MSL. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1,690 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.

Keith Downs requested approval for consent Item MA-05-149 and MA- 05-151. Staff recommends consistency for both.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Washington made a motion to approve consent item MA-05-149. Commissioner Rod Ballance seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

- F. MA-05-151 Thienes Engineering – Two lot parcel map south of Eastridge Avenue, and West of Sycamore Canyon Blvd., within the City of Riverside.

<b>CASE NUMBER:</b>	<u>MA-05-151-Thienes Engineering</u>
<b>APPROVING JURISDICTION:</b>	City of Riverside
<b>JURISDICTION CASE NO:</b>	PM 34336 Previous case MA-05-108 for Bldg.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Two parcels on 17.77 acres.

## **PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located south of Eastridge Avenue and west 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 Realignment: However, no changes were made to the Interim Influence Zone adopted in 1986.

In 1990 the ALUC was able to obtain Department of Defense funding for a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) that resulted in the 1994 Draft. This was about the time that the second base realignment was announced and it was consequently never adopted. The 98/99 Draft CLUP efforts were prepared utilizing the 1998 AICUZ in conjunction with the superseded 1993 Caltrans Handbook.

We 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 13-14,000 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is under a major approach and departure track. 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 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 336,000 sq. ft., which is less than 40% of the area.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,528 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 1,658 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 avigation 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.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Charles Washington made a motion to approve consent Item MA -05-151. Rod Ballance seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

G. MA-05-152 – Chapman College – CUP P05-1180 for a college with 300 students at 6275 Valley Springs Parkway, within the City of Riverside.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA 05-152-Chapman College  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** CUP P05-1180

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** A Conditional Use Permit for a vocational school.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The sites located at 6275 Valley Springs Parkway, within the City of Riverside, approximately 15,500 ft. 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:**

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 15,500 feet north of Runway 14-32. The project is a vocational school/college for up to 300 students, to be located on the second floor of a 3-story office building. According to the proposal, the classes will be held Monday through Friday 6-10 P.M. The proposal is under or near the major approach and departure track and within the horizontal surface. The 1984 ALUP 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 agricultural, commercial and industrial uses and prohibits residential lot sizes less than 2/12 acres. Places of assembly, such as churches and schools are not specifically prohibited in Area II, although they are listed as a high-risk land use in the attached Appendix B of the 1984 Plan.

Density and Coverage: The structural coverage of the site is less than 35% of the total acreage. The applicant estimated occupancy for the proposed school is 351. The proposed hours of operation of the school are 6-10 P.M., and the proposed use and occupancy of the remainder of the three-story, 72,000 sq. ft. building is currently unknown. Based on calculations using the Uniform Building Code (UBC) occupant load for an office building, the estimated occupancy of the entire building is 360 persons (72,000 Sq. ft. per occupant x 50% adjustment factor). However, with the proposed school use occupying two-thirds of one floor, and assuming all remaining uses in the building are office uses, the estimated occupancy using the applicable UBC occupancy loads is 680 persons, if the building is occupied by the proposed school use and all remaining uses at the same time.

Part 77: The finished floor elevation of the proposed office building is 1,556 MSL and the building height is 58 feet. The runway elevation is 1,535 MSL. Structures at the project would have to exceed 1,888 MSL feet in elevation to be an obstruction. 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 outside 55 CNEL and the 2005 AICUZ shows the property outside 60 CNEL.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a continuance of this case in order to obtain responses regarding this proposed use from March JPA.

**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. Any additional or subsequent uses at the proposed site shall be submitted to the ALUC for review.

Beverly Coleman presents staff report and recommends continuance in order to obtain responses from March JPA.

Dan Fairbanks from March JPA came forward in response to Beverly Coleman. Mr. Fairbanks briefly looked at application and sent a letter to the City of Riverside. Looked at four issues (1) Draft Joint Land Use Plan was found consistent with our plan. 2) 2005 Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study, believes there is no conflict 3) Have no concerns with building height 4) Only question that create a grey area pertains to the ALUC 1984 Airport Land Use Plan.

Commissioner Rod Ballance questions that this a high risk land use and would like to get more information. Mr. Fairbanks replies based on the review of the four plans, only one of these four creates a grey area and that is the County Airport Land Use Plan, which is the plan that you administer. Mr. Fairbanks feels comfortable with ALUC making a decision. Decision should be based on the Commissioners review of the 1984 plan.

Jay Warner from Chapman University came forward discussing classes, facility load, and their current facility falls within the influence area.

Cindy Roth from Greater Riverside Chambers came forward to represent applicant. Ms. Roth indicated they received a letter from March Air Force who is here today and would like him to come forward to comment. Doug Adams planner for March Air force came forward and feels project is safe and good for the community. Cindy Roth came forward to ask for Commissioners support on project.

John Curts Riverside planner says reasonable project, urges approval of project.

Staff recommends inconsistency based on the school and the number of people on site, time use, and density.

Commissioner Rod Ballance thanks everyone who showed support for project and feels comfortable to move to find project consistent.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Rod Ballance made a motion for a finding of consistency. Commissioner Charles Washington seconded the motion.

Chairman Houseman agrees with motion above but has not heard from staff if this use is consistent with the plan for this location.

Keith Downs replies and recommends inconsistency based on the number of people on school site, time use and density issue.

Keith Downs response to the A.L.C.U.Z. report is a federal Department of Defense document and not the basis of California Land Use Planning and PUC 21670.

The 1984 text offers little guidance for Zone II, but all (10) plans issued since then discourage or disallow the more intense commercial uses.

The commission has found similar or less dense uses inconsistent in the past.

Utilizing anything from an administrative draft plan such as the March JLUS, particularly an administrative one is inappropriate.

Commissioner Lightsey motions and finds consistent, no second to the motion so Chairmain Housman reopened testimony. Chairman Housman and Kathy Rohm (alternate) vote no because of concerns of shifting daylight hours.

Commissioner Rod Ballance moves again to motion a finding of consistency. Commissioner Charles Washington seconded the motion. Melanie Fesmire has further discussion based on Chairman Housman comments and would like to make a motion that the issues to look into are the high concentration of people in the area and its danger to the people in this zone.

**FINAL ACTION TAKEN:** Chairman Housman calls for vote for a motion of consistency. Approved 6 to 1. Opposed by Melanie Fesmire.

- H. MA-05-153 – March JPA – A General Plan Amendment to create Land Use Policy 1.11 that would allow, as an interim use of three years, existing facilities within the Weapons Storage Area for storage, inventory, transfer, and shipment of fireworks and pyrotechnics, south of Alessandro Blvd., and east of Barton Road within the March JPA.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA 05-153 March JPA  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** March Joint Powers Authority  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** General Plan Amendment

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Textual change to allow site to allow pyrotechnics storage

## **PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located at the south of Alessandro Blvd. and east of extended Barton Road, within the March JPA, approximately 12-13,000 ft. west 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 12-13,000 feet west of north end of Runway 14-32. The project change is in the general plan to allow a 1,187 acre site. 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 limited commercial, industrial and agricultural uses. If the use were part of the airport and an airport usage it would not require review by the ALUC. Since the usage is not aeronautical, it cannot be considered a part of the airport. At this time we have no response from MARB regarding this proposal. This usage is described on the attached description from the lessee (Pyrospectaculars).

Density and Coverage: The proposed property area is 1187 acres. The existing structural coverage of the site is unknown, but is a former weapons storage area with numerous bunkers.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 1,761 MSL and the maximum structure height is 15+ feet. The runway elevation is 1535 MSL. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1665 MSL feet in elevation and the

terrain exceeds the FAA review criteria, but no structures are proposed. Part 77 obstruction criteria are not a concern with this project, since no structures are proposed.

Noise: The site has been shown to have some noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1998 AICUZ indicated that portions of the property to have over 60 CNEL, the 2005 shows less than 60CNEL. The use is not a noise sensitive usage.

The issue is as always, whether the proposed usage is consistent with the adopted CLUP or ALUP and the Handbook. Appendix B clearly lists **flammable or explosive materials** as high risk uses and that they must be avoided in Zone I. Zone II does not list them, but all other plans list them in a manner that continues the concern over the additional zones of those plans. The question is whether the nature of the bunker storage is sufficient to allay fears or actual hazards from the interaction of any potential accident that could happen on site and cause an actual or perceived hazard. Needless to say, the interaction at the times when the materials are outside of the bunkers would be much greater than when they are inside.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a continuance to February 9, 2006 to obtain comments from March Air Reserve Base.

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 or outside 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.

Keith presented staff notes and recommends continuance.

Dan Fairbanks of March JPA came forward presenting application. Worked with neighborhood and they do not oppose.

Keith Downs and staff recommend the project be consistent.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Rod Ballance made a motion of consistency. Commissioner Arthur Butler seconded the motion. Approved 4 to 3. Opposed by Commissioner Lightsey, Chairman Housman and Kathy Rohm (alternate).

## **RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT**

- I. RI-05-134 – Harvest Christian Fellowship – CUP 1337 and 1339 to add additional facilities to church campus on 14 acres, north of Arlington Avenue, west of Adams Street, within the City of Riverside.

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-05-134-Harvest Christian Fellowship  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** CUP P05-1377 and 1339

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A Conditional Use Permit for additional facilities at a church campus.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located at 6115 Arlington Avenue, west of Adams Street within the City of Riverside, approximately 700 ft. south of Runway 9-27 at Riverside Municipal Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport:	Riverside Municipal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area:	Zone B2
b. Noise Levels:	At or within 60 CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposed site is located approximately 700 feet south of Runway 9-27. The proposal is for additional facilities at a church campus, including a children’s ministry building, multipurpose building/gymnasium and support facilities/maintenance building. Based on seating and parking information provided by the applicant, the maximum number of persons on the entire site is expected to be 4,200 on approximately 12.5 acres, or 336 persons per acre. The proposed building additions on the site are located within Zone B2, although the existing church sanctuary, administration building and children’s ministry building are located within Zone D.

Prohibited uses within Zone B2 include children’s schools, day care centers, and places of worship. For other, non-prohibited uses, Zone B2 allows an average density of up to 100 persons per acre and clustering on a single acre of up to 200 persons. The proposal does not appear to meet the infill policy under the Special Conditions section (Section 3.3.1) of the ALUCP because at least 65% of the site’s perimeter is not bounded by existing uses similar to, or more intensive than those proposed. For consideration under Section 3.3.6 (Other Special Conditions) of the ALUCP the burden for demonstrating that special conditions apply to the development rests with the project proponent and/or the referring agency.

NOISE: The site will get significant over flight, and is at or within 60 CNEL.

PART 77. The highest elevation of any object or terrain on the site is 842 MSL and the height and MSL elevation of the multipurpose building are 38 ft. and 836 MSL respectively. The children’s ministry building is 32 ft. in height and 835 MSL in elevation. The runway elevation is 815.6 MSL. An FAA 7460-1 review is required for structures exceeding 35 ft. in height or a 100:1 slope from the runway. At a distance of 700 ft. from the runway, structures exceeding 822.6 MSL in elevation require FAA review. An FAA 7460-1 application has been submitted by applicant to the FAA, however, as of the date of the staff review (12/29/05) the applicant had not received the FAA determination letter.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of inconsistency of the proposed project as submitted based on the inconsistency of the proposed uses within Zone B2.

Should the City wish to overrule the ALUC findings the following conditions should be utilized, and PUC 21670(a) should be followed regarding the overruling of Airport Land Use Commission decisions. The use of these conditions does not make the project consistent.

**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. 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. A FAA 7460-1 review shall be completed for any structure of a height that would exceed 781 MSL or a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway.

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

Beverly Coleman presented case and exhibits and recommends inconsistency.

Applicant Mr. Wallace came forward to answer any questions from the commissioners. Harvest Christian Fellowship did look into moving entire campus but cost were extremely prohibited, so they are living with property currently owned.

John Curts from the City of Riverside came forward to speak on behalf of applicant. City is undergoing a zone change west of site. This particular site is not being rezoned.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Charles Washington made a motion of inconsistency. Kathy Rohm (alternate) seconded the motion. Approved 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 November meeting. Your staff has asked that additional information be supplied and a response from the San Bernardino ALUC is available prior to the hearing of the Master Plan 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 3<sup>rd</sup> and the consultant has finished the plan at this time. It has been placed on the website at this time and has been scheduled for public hearing on February 9, 2006. The staff report for that is included in this agenda package.

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).

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 20<sup>th</sup>, 2004.

Meetings of the MOATF were held on November 1, 2004, December 13<sup>th</sup>, February 14<sup>th</sup> and April 4<sup>th</sup>. As of December 29, 2005 no meeting has been scheduled for the MOATF.

The effort is dependant upon noise contours being developed by the Air Force as part of a new AICUZ, which was released September 20<sup>th</sup>. An internal Draft of the plan was given out in April and the planning staff (TAC) of the affected jurisdictions met on April 26<sup>th</sup> and as recently of August 30<sup>th</sup>. The attached April 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 may occur in late January. The attached December letter was sent this month.

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

Keith Downs went over staff report. Hemet Ryan had no changes; March is still at TAC level.

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

NONE

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Rod Ballance reports that Mark Kranenberg left the City of Riverside to go to Will Rogers Airport in Oklahoma. We will have interviews for a new airport manager for the City of Riverside next week.

Charles Washington questioned if alternates are eligible for Vice Chairman?

Chairman Housman requested a new vote be put on next agenda for Vice Chairman.

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).

Continue to the next hearing date on February 9, 2006

XI. ADJOURNMENT: Commissioner Charles Washington adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m., seconded by Commissioner Mark Lightsey, all in favor, none opposed.  
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: February 9, 2006 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside.