7-12-12

<u>COMMISSIONERS PRESENT</u>: Simon Housman, Rod Ballance, Art Butler, John Lyon, Richard Stewart, and Paul Lewin, alternate for Greg Pettis

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Glen Holmes, Greg Pettis

#### 2.0 PUBLIC HEARING: CONTINUED CASE

## 2.1 Staff report recommended: CONSISTENT

Staff recommended at hearing: **CONSISTENT** 

ALUC Commission Action: **CONSISTENT**, as amended. Amending Condition # 1 to read as follows:

1. Any non-aviation development proposed for locations within the airport boundary (excluding federal-or state-owned property) shall be consistent with the compatibility criteria and policies indicated in the 1992 Hemet-Ryan Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan and any subsequent Airport Land Use Plan, and any non-aviation development within the airport boundary is subject to ALUC review, pursuant to California Airport Land Use Handbook guidelines.

(Vote 6-0; Absent: Holmes)

ZAP1024HR12 Riverside County **Economic** Development Agency Aviation Division (Representative: Chad Davies) - Hemet-Ryan Airport Master Plan. The Airport Land Use Commission will review the Airport Master Plan document to determine consistency with the Hemet-Ryan Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (HRACALUP), as adopted in 1992. Hemet-Ryan Airport is located northerly of Stetson Avenue, easterly of Warren Road, and westerly of Cawston Avenue and Sanderson Avenue in the City of Hemet. The Master Plan indicates that Hemet-Ryan Airport would continue to be a general aviation airport, and Capital Improvement includes а Program recommends 24 actions over the next 20 years to improve the airport, including the construction of a north side parallel taxiway. The Master Plan includes a discussion of five options for an extension of the runway to a total length of 5,300 feet. However, none of these options is proposed to be implemented within the 20-year Master Plan horizon. ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or email at jguerin@rctlma.org.

# 3.0 PUBLIC HEARING: NEW CASES

3.1 Staff report recommended: **CONSISTENT** 

Staff recommended at hearing: **CONSISTENT** 

ALUC Commission Action: CONSISTENT (Vote 6-0; Absent: Holmes)

ZAP1044BD12 – La Quinta Retirement Residence Limited Partnership (Representative: Mark Lowen, Lenity Group LLC) – City Case Nos.: GPA 11-123, ZC 11-140, SP 01-055 AMD 3, SDP 2011-921 (General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Specific Plan Amendment, Site Development Permit). The applicant proposes: (1) to amend the City of La Quinta's land use designation on a 9.5-acre site located southeasterly of Seeley Drive, easterly of Washington Street and southerly of Miles

CDS:

Avenue from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Medium High Density Residential (MHDR); (2) to change the zoning of the site from Medium Density Residential (RM) to Medium High Density Residential (RMH); (3) to adopt a Specific Plan Amendment to Centre Pointe Specific Plan to modify design criteria and development standards; and (4) to construct the La Quinta Retirement Community, consisting of a 124-suite congregate care facility (three stories) and 4 duplex cottages (8 dwelling units) in Phase 1, and a 72-suite assisted living facility and 32-bed memory care facility in Phase 2. (Zone E of Bermuda Dunes Airport Influence Area). ALUC Staff Planner: Russell Brady at (951) 955-0549, or e-mail at rbrady@rctlma.org.

# 3.2 Staff report recommended: **CONSISTENT**

Staff recommended at hearing: **CONSISTENT** 

ALUC Commission Action: CONSISTENT (Vote 6-0; Absent: Holmes)

ZAP1077MA12 - H&M Architects/Engineers. Inc. (Representative: Albert A. Webb and Associates) -Perris City Case No. SPA 12-04-0010 (Specific Plan Amendment). SPA 12-04-0010 is a proposal to amend Table 12.0-1 "Land Use Restrictions" (in the Airport Overlay Zone) of the Perris Valley Commerce Center Specific Plan, so as to allow the storage of: apparel and other finished products made from fabrics, leather, and similar materials; and, professional, scientific, and controlling instruments, photographic and optical goods, watches and clocks, within Accident Potential Zone I. (Manufacturing of such products in Accident Potential Zone I would continue to be prohibited). The proposed amendment would also prohibit the manufacturing of: food; textile mill products; rubber, plastics, stone, clay, and glass products, and primary metal products in Accident Potential Zone I. The affected area is located easterly of Interstate 215, westerly of Perris Boulevard, southerly of the Moreno Valley/Perris boundary, and northerly of Rider Street in the City of Perris. (Airport Area I of the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or e-mail at jquerin@rctlma.org.

# 3.3 Staff report recommended: **CONSISTENT**

Staff recommended at hearing: CONSISTENT

ALUC Commission Action: CONSISTENT (Vote 6-0; Absent: Holmes)

ZAP1078MA12 – Stratford Ranch Investors, LLC (Representative: Jason Keller) – City Case Nos.: DPR 11-12-004 (Development Plan Review), GPA 12-02-001 (General Plan Amendment), SPA 11-12-005 (Specific Plan Amendment) - DPR 11-12-004 is a proposal to develop two high-cube warehouse buildings totaling 1,725,411 square feet on 91.26 acres located easterly of Redlands Avenue, southerly of Oleander Avenue, northerly of Ramona Expressway, and westerly of Evans Road, within the City of Perris. The General Plan Amendment proposes to amend the Circulation Element

#### CDS:

of the General Plan to delete the segment of Harley Knox Boulevard between Redlands Avenue and Evans Road, and to delete the proposed bridge crossing of the Perris Valley Storm Channel. The Specific Plan Amendment proposes to amend the Circulation Plan of the Perris Valley Commerce Center Specific Plan by deleting the segment of Harley Knox Boulevard between Redlands Avenue and the Perris Valley Storm Channel. (Area III of the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence Area). ALUC Staff Planner: Russell Brady at (951) 955-0549, or e-mail at <a href="mailto:rbrady@rctlma.org">rbrady@rctlma.org</a>.

3.4 Staff report recommended: CONDITIONAL CONSISTENCY

Staff recommended at hearing: CONDITIONAL CONSISTENCY

ALUC Commission Action:

CONDITIONAL

CONSISTENCY (Vote 6-0;
Absent: Holmes), with the understanding that the Commission is not modifying its prior policies.

Heacock Street, northerly southerly of San Michele jurisdiction of the March Join the March Air Reserve Ba ALUC Staff Planner: Russell e-mail at <a href="mailto:rbrady@rctlma.org">rbrady@rctlma.org</a>.

3.5 Staff report recommended: CONTINUE TO 7/12/12 PENDING FAA SUBMITTAL

Staff recommended at hearing: CONTINUE TO 7/12/12
PENDING FAA SUBMITTAL

ALUC Commission Action: CONTINUED TO 7-12-12\* (Vote 6-0; Absent: Holmes)

\*Note: Staff later determined the project to be incomplete, and the continuance was extended to 9-13-12.

ZAP1079MA12 – March Inland Port Airport Authority – JPA Case Nos.: PP 10-01, PP 04-09S1 - A proposal to add general aviation facilities, including construction of a 5,000 square foot (sq. ft.) terminal building, two 10,000 sq. ft. aircraft hangars, a 150,000 sq. ft. concrete aircraft parking apron and a taxilane to Taxiway A, and to add a 10,000 gallon aboveground aircraft fuel storage tank to the existing Fuel Farm on 19.5 acres located westerly of Heacock Street, northerly of Nandina Avenue, and southerly of San Michele Road within the land use jurisdiction of the March Joint Powers Authority (Area II of the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence Area). ALUC Staff Planner: Russell Brady at (951) 955-0549, or e-mail at rbrady@rctlma.org.

ZAP1080MA12 – CT March Port I, LLC (Ken Laughlin, Evolution Fresh) – JPA Case Nos.: PP 12-02 - A proposal to establish a juice production and warehouse facility, including office, production, and warehouse areas, within an existing industrial/warehouse building on 13.96 acres, located westerly of Heacock Street and northerly of Mariposa Avenue within the land use jurisdiction of the March Joint Powers Authority (Area II of the March Air Reserve Base Influence Area). ALUC Staff Planner: Russell Brady at (951) 955-0549, or e-mail at rbrady@rctlma.org.

**CDS**: 3

3.6 Staff report recommended: **CONSISTENT** 

Staff recommended at hearing: **CONSISTENT** 

ALUC Commission Action:
1. SP00312A1, CZ07769, and TR36418 were determined to be **CONSISTENT**.

2. \*Adopted Special Findings
1 thru 7 as modified on
6/14/12, in supplement to
the conditional findings
made in 2005, and,
incorporating those
findings, found Tract Map
32289M1 CONSISTENT
pursuant to policy 3.3.6 of
the Countywide Policies of
the 2004 Riverside County
ALUCP subject to the
conditions included in the
staff report.

( Vote 6-0; Absent: Holmes)

ZAP1047FV12 - Riverside Mitland 03, LLC (Representative: T&B Planning, Inc. [Joel Morse]) -County Case Nos: SP00312A1 (Specific Plan Amendment), CZ 07769 (Change of Zone), TR 36418 (Tentative Tract Map), and TR 32289M1 (Minor Change to Approved Tentative Tract Map). French Valley Specific Plan Amendment No. 1 provides for the development of 1,671 single-family residential dwelling units (reduced from 1,793), 48.8 acres of storm water drainage and detention facilities, 32.1 acres of parks, a 10.4-acre elementary school site, 19.8 acres of natural open space, and 41.3 acres of community roadways, on 604.4 acres located westerly of Winchester Road and southerly of Keller Road in the unincorporated Riverside County community of French Valley. The change of zone proposes to amend the Specific Plan Zoning ordinance to comply with the proposed amendment. Tentative Tract Map No. 36418 proposes to divide 12.6 acres located southerly of Baxter Road, northerly of Prairie Sun Way, and easterly of Rockrose Lane into 56 residential lots, plus one 0.48-acre water quality basin lot. Tentative Tract Map No. 32289, Minor Change No. 1 proposes to divide 81.87 acres located southerly of Baxter Road and easterly of Briggs Road into 181 residential lots, 19 open space lots, and one detention basin lot. The open space and detention basin lots together include over 30 percent of the land area in Tract Map No. 32289. (Zones C, D, and E of the French Valley Airport Influence Area.) ALUC Staff Planner: John Guerin at (951) 955-0982, or e-mail at jguerin@rctlma.org.

# \*FINDINGS FOR A DETERMINATION OF CONSISTENCY PURSUANT TO POLICY 3.3.6 OF THE COUNTYWIDE POLICIES OF THE 2004 RIVERSIDE COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN:

- The proposed residential subdivisions immediately adjacent to or near the subject site to the northwest, east, and south were found consistent by the ALUC under the previous plan, the 1997 French Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The proposed residential development immediately northeast of the site was found consistent by the ALUC under the new RCALUCP for French Valley Airport.
- 2. Approximately 60% to 70% of the surrounding property adjacent or near adjacent to the site will include previously approved and fully vested or existing residential development similar to the proposed development.
- 3. The proposed site is outside the current and near future 55 CNEL noise contour for the airport.
- 4. Those residential units in Zone C adjacent to Zone D are clustered on a natural formation, preserving the existing open space for an emergency landing area.
- 5. The proposed project, as submitted, will not create an undue safety hazard to people on the ground or aircraft in flight, and is not expected to result in excessive noise exposure, in light of previously approved and fully vested, or existing, development.
- 6. Expanded buyer awareness measures have been included in the conditions of approval for the project to further ensure that prospective buyers or renters are informed about the presence of aircraft overflights.
- 7. The open space areas adjacent to TR32289M1 shall permanently remain open space as emergency landing areas.

**CDS**: 4

#### 4.0 PRESENTATION/INQUIRY: Thomas Sanhamel, J. Schafer, and/or R. Valdez:

Request for Clarification of Countywide Policy 4.2.4. (a) (1).

Countywide Policy 4.2.4 (a)(1) requires that open land 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 overhead wires." A question was raised as to whether the diameter related to the canopy or simply to the trunk. As this would affect the design of their project, staff advised that the matter be brought before the Commission as an inquiry.

Richard Valdez and John Schafer provided a 10-minute Power Point presentation of Richland Communities' proposed residential project in the City of Eastvale and inquired as to the diameter reference.

Commissioner Lyon noted that the purpose of the open area requirements of Zones B1, C, and D is to allow for emergency aircraft touchdowns. He suggested asking the question of whether one would like to run into the vegetation in an automobile traveling 60 miles per hour. Low bushes would slow the vehicle down, which would be good. On the other hand, running into an oak tree with a three-foot diameter trunk would not be good. It would stop the car too suddenly! He indicated his concern would be avoiding such major impacts; therefore, the size and location of the tree trunk would be more relevant than the size of the canopy. As to location, if the tree is near the wall at the edge of the open area, it would be less of an obstacle than a tree in the middle of the area.

Commissioner Ballance advised that one of the primary purposes of the open area is to assist the pilot in the event of an emergency. The pilot's objective is to set down safely and be able to walk away, and not to hurt anyone on the ground. Impacting any object could result in shearing that could result in a fire or, possibly, even an explosion. He noted that safety is very important to consider.

Commissioner Stewart agreed with Commissioners Lyon and Ballance, and felt that shrubbery, small saplings, and even high bushes might not be a problem, but a tree with a large trunk would be a problem.

Chairman Housman explained the provision as follows: If it's a tree big enough to have a canopy that's going to reach over 30 feet of landscaped area to the street, it's way too big. If the trunk is less than 4 inches wide and up against the wall in the outer 5 feet of the 75-foot-wide open area, it's probably not going to be a problem, because the aircraft will probably fit into the 70 feet of clear area. He asked the presenters to visualize a situation of driving a construction crane down the street at 20-40 miles per hour while sitting in a cab 60 feet above the ground. That's the situation the pilot would be encountering while trying to land without crashing into a home, school, or occupied building.

Finally, he thanked the presenters for taking the time to obtain the Commission's feedback on this matter.

Commissioner Lyon reminded the presenters that each open area needs to be at least 300 feet in length, and cautioned them that Archibald Avenue might not qualify due to power lines in the east side and presence of a center median.

The presenters noted that, while their project site is about 50 acres in area within the parcel **CDS:** 5

boundaries, it's really only about 42.8 acres of usable land, with the remainder not usable for housing due to an Edison easement. They asked whether there was any specific guidance as to whether the easement area must be included in the denominator. This second inquiry was referred to staff.

## 5.0 **ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

5.1 <u>Director's Approvals</u> - Information only

#### 5.2 California Airport Land Use Consortium Conference

Both Chairman Simon Housman and Principal Planner John Guerin attended and participated in the inaugural statewide conference of the California Airport Land Use Consortium, which was held at the former McClellan Air Force Base in Sacramento on May 14 and 15. John provided a summary of the topics addressed, and noted that electronic presentations from the conference are available for review at <a href="http://www.cal-aluc.org/2012-conference-details.html">http://www.cal-aluc.org/2012-conference-details.html</a>. Chairman Housman advised that he provided a demonstration regarding ALUC's efforts to mitigate the potential impacts of the Blythe Mesa Solar project on the Blythe Airport, and praised Mr. Guerin's presentation, which provided an introduction to the preparation of displacement analyses.

#### 5.3 <u>Issuance of Department of Defense Instruction 4165.57</u>

Ed Cooper, ALUC Director, advised that he and John Guerin met with the local Base planning representatives, who provided this document as an attachment to their letter regarding Item 3.2 on today's agenda. Up until recently, the various armed services had different standards for allowable land uses and intensities within Accident Potential Zones. Instruction 4165.57 established unified standards that are consistent across all the armed services.

Chairman Housman asked whether we should be reviewing projects in light of the 2005 AICUZ or this Instruction. Mr. Cooper advised that there is no need for ALUC to adopt either the AICUZ or the Instruction. The Instruction has been issued by the Department of Defense. It is official, and it is already being utilized by March Air Reserve Base officials.

ALUC Counsel David Huff agreed that both the AICUZ and the Instruction are federal documents. There is no requirement for ALUC to take any action to adopt or otherwise take a position regarding these documents.

Commissioner Stewart agreed, advising that differences between Navy and Air Force guidance have previously been noted in dealing with a project in the City of Perris. He noted that the Commission needs to maintain flexibility. He stated that ALUC does not need to adopt the document, but should keep it in reference, study it, and contrast it with whatever letter may be issued by the Base and/or the Joint Powers Authority, as individual projects are submitted for consideration.

Chairman Housman asked if the Commission had provided staff with adequate guidance regarding use of the document. Mr. Cooper advised that, since the Instruction was effective upon its publication (on May 2, 2011), staff would consider the provisions therein in evaluating future projects and assure that future ALUCPs are consistent with (no less restrictive than) the Instruction.

**CDS**: 6

#### 6.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The ALUC Commission by a vote of 5-0, approved the minutes for <u>April 12, 2012</u>. Abstain: Paul Lewin, alternate for Greg Pettis; Absent: Glen Holmes

#### 7.0 ORAL COMMUNICATION ON ANY MATTER NOT ON THE AGENDA

Ed Cooper, ALUC Director, advised that there are no new ALUC cases scheduled for July and that the one case continued today may be withdrawn. He asked how the Commission would like to proceed if the case is withdrawn. Chairman Housman suggested that staff contact the applicant. If the applicant has not made further progress by filing with the FAA, staff should urge them to either withdraw or continue the case to September. In either of those situations, there would be no hearing in July.\*

\*The continued case was ultimately ruled incomplete, and the July hearing was canceled.

## 8.0 **COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS**

None

Y:\ALUC Report of Actions\2012 ROA\ROA6-14-12.doc

**CDS**: 7