

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION
RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER
4080 Lemon St., Board Room (14th Floor)
Riverside, California

THURSDAY, MAY 16, 2002
9:00 A.M.

MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on May 16, 2002 at Riverside County Administration Center, Board Room (14th Floor).

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: William Cobb, Chairman
Allen Graff, Vice Chairman
Rick Stephens
Marge Tandy
Paul Bell
Walt Snyder
B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

OTHERS PRESENT: Leeanne Brock, Del Webb California Corp.
Richard Teller, Albert Webb & Associates
John Sabatello, Airport Manager, Riverside Municipal Airport
Al Frank
Bill Smith
Mary Ellis Carbajal
David Dawson, Warner Engineering

STAFF PRESENT: Beverly Coleman, Development Specialist III
Pat Moore, Office Assistant

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairman Cobb.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG.
- III. ROLL CALL was taken. Chairman Cobb announced and welcomed the appointment of Rick Stephens as an ALUC Member.

Chairman's Tandy and Stephens abstained from voting on case on Minutes for March 21st and April 18th.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MARCH 21, 2002:

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to approve the minutes. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR APRIL 18, 2002:

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Graff made a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Snyder seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Due to the meeting running ahead of schedule the Administrative Items were covered.

V. OLD BUSINESS

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

9:15 A.M.

A. BD-02-103 – Del Webb – (Continued from April 18th). Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER:	<u>BD-02-103 - Del Webb California Corp.</u>
APPROVING JURISDICTION:	County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.:	Change of Zone 6766
PREVIOUS CASES	Specific Plan 281 A5 and Change of Zone 6579

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a proposal to change the allowed uses in Planning Areas 15 & 16 to allow nursing homes, congregate care and assisted living uses to Area 15 and allow automobile sales to Area 16 on two separate parcels totaling 49 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated easterly of Washington Street north of Varner Road and west of Adams St., in the County of Riverside and northwesterly of the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

Adjacent Airport:	Bermuda Dunes Airport
a. Airport Influence Area:	Area III
b. Land Use Policy:	Influence Area
c. Noise Levels:	Outside 60 dB CNEL (February 1996)

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located approximately 4,000-9,000 feet northwest of the west end of the runway near flight tracks 2, 3 and 4 and is within Area III of the Airport Influence Area. Policies in the CLUP indicate that commercial uses would be allowed. The present proposal would be consistent with the plan if the commercial uses were not residential in nature.*

NOISE: The site will be subject to intermittent aircraft noise of some annoyance. The entire site is outside of the 60CNEL (1996), but those noise projections considered less traffic than is now being experienced and were annualized over the entire year. Ultimate traffic with seasonal and weekend peaking will likely produce noise of some annoyance on the site. The uses proposed in Area 16 are all noise sensitive uses and as such will require an acoustical study.

PART 77: The highest elevation on the site is 97MSL and the height of structures is unknown at this time. The airport elevation is 73MSL and at a distance of 5,000 feet any structure exceeding 26 feet in height would require an FAA 7460 review. At 8,000 feet any structure over an elevation of 153 MSL will require an FAA review.

LIGHTING: Lighting intensity and patterns can adversely affect pilot visibility near airports. Any light that would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber other than an FAA approved system can cause confusion. Bermuda Dunes currently has a VASI system.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Bermuda Dunes Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels and assure a total NLR reduction of 25dba. Any noise sensitive uses in Planning Area 16 shall have an acoustical analysis.
3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
4. Any subsequent permit shall have ALUC review.
5. Any structure over 20 feet in height in Planning Area 15, or 35 feet in Area 16 shall have an FAA 7460 review completed and any conditions recommended shall be completed and adhered to prior to construction.
6. 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.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff would recommend a finding of consistency of this project subject to the conditions of approval noted above.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. Hearing no response, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Leeanne Brock, Del Webb California Corp. came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation, and made herself available for any questions from the Commissioner's.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners for the applicant. Commissioner Bell inquired if the project consisted of a nursing home. Ms. Brock responded that it was congregate care center, and that a FHP Facility was pre-existing. Chairman Cobb then called for questions from the Commissioners for the applicant, hearing no response or reply, he asked for discussion or comments from the Commissioner's.

A discussion then ensued between Commissioner Bell, Beverly Coleman and Chairman Cobb pertaining to the nursing home and any other subsequent permits or uses on the site would come back for review by the ALUC.

Commissioner Snyder then interjected that this site is located in Palm Desert, Sun City area on the other side of the airport and that Del Webb had been most cooperative and accommodating when he sat on the Board of Supervisor's for the Desert Area.

Chairman Cobb then called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's. Vice Chairman Graff then voiced his concerns with future property, and advised of adding another Condition of Approval that covered notification of noise and overflight issues, along with an avigation easement.

Another discussion then ensued between B.T. Miller, Vice Chairman Graff and Commissioner Snyder, which resulted in Condition of Approval #7 being added to read as: "All prospective purchasers and lessees shall be given a notice explaining the noise from the airport and/or overflight, and sign a notice informing them of the annoyance and that traffic will most likely increase significantly in the future." B.T. Miller advised that the Condition item could be added, however, enforcement would lie with the approving jurisdiction and landowner.

Upon hearing no further comments or discussion from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval and addition of Condition of Approval #7 to read as: "All prospective purchasers and lessees shall be given a notice explaining the noise from the airport and/or overflight, and sign a notice informing them of the annoyance and that traffic will most likely increase significantly in the future". Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Stephens abstained from voting on cases B. HE-02-100 and, C. FV-02-103.

HEMET/RYAN AIRPORT

9:15 A.M.

B. HE-02-100 – AEI-CASC Engineering – (Continued from March 21st). Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: HE-02-100 - AEI-CASC (Peppertree)
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Hemet
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Specific Plan 01-03 and Vesting Map 29843

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: *The project is a Specific Plan and Vesting Tentative Map for Senior Oriented Development. The residential project will include 458 dwelling units and a hotel on 84.79 acres.*

PROJECT LOCATION:
The site is situated northerly of Menlo Ave. and west of Cawston Avenue, within the City of Hemet and 8,000-10,000 feet northerly of the of Runway 5-23 for Hemet/Ryan Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Hemet-Ryan Airport
Land Use Policy: CLUP 1989: Adopted by City of Hemet and County of Riverside

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

MAJOR ISSUES:

LAND USE: *The proposed site is located approximately 8,000-10,000 feet north of the of Runway 5-23. The proposed site is within Area III (Area of Moderate Risk) of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Influence Area. The total site is approximately 84.79 acres and the lot coverage is XX% for buildings with additional structures occupying XX% of the site. Area III has no population density limits assigned to it, but requires a 'discretionary' review for legislative items such as the Specific Plans.*

NOISE: *The site is not underlying any specific traffic pattern but will experience annoyance from over flying aircraft. The 1989 plan indicates that the area is outside of the 55CNEL.*

PART 77. *The surface elevation varies from 1,510 to 1,840 and the Hotel site is approximately 1,610 MSL and the height of that facility (30') is over the level (1,592MSL) at which it needs an FAA Review. The site is within the Horizontal Surface of 1,662MSL. Staff*

has requested that the applicant submit a Notice to Construct review to the FAA for a response.

The text and plan in its current version does not discuss the CLUP and the mitigations necessary to be consistent with the plan.

CONDITIONS: For the City to Utilize

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Hemet-Ryan Airport prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any 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.
5. That the document and any environmental documents be adjusted to include references and mitigations to the CLUP.
5. That an FAA 7460 review be completed prior to action on this proposal.

RECOMMENDATION: At this time staff recommends a continuance in order for the applicant and City to: 1) revise the text, and 2) obtain the Caltrans review.

This item was continued from the last hearing in order for the applicant to revise the text to reflect and implement the C.L.U.P. The applicant's representative has indicated that a continuance to June 20, 2002 is in order.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response from the Commissioners, he requested the applicant to come forward and present the case. Upon hearing no response or reply, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case, and after hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's, and upon hearing no reply or response, he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Graff made a motion to continue the project, subject to staff's recommendations for a continuance to the next scheduled meeting of June 20th. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

9:15 A.M.

- C. FV-02-103 – Riverside County – (Continued from April 18th). Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY:

CASE NUMBER: FV-02-103 – Riverside County

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: PP17666

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A request for PP 17666 for construction of a 240,000 sq. ft. Business Park with multiple buildings for offices, restaurants, health and exercise center, mini-warehouse, nursery, trailer, boat storage, blueprinting and duplicating services on approximately 61.75 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at the northeast corner of Briggs Road and Auld Road, southerly of Benton Road in the County of Riverside, 460 – 2,600 ft. north of the north end of Runway 18/36 at the French Valley Airport.

LAND USE PLAN

Adjacent Airport: French Valley
a. Airport Influence Area: Inner Safety Zone (ISZ), Emergency Touchdown Zone (ETZ), Outer Safety Zone (OSZ) and Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ)
b. Noise Levels: Inside 55 and 60 CNEL for year 2013

MAJOR ISSUES:

Noise: *The current CLUP analysis was based upon flight tracks in the 1992-93 period of time. Newer contours indicate that a portion of the property is currently inside of the 55db CNEL, with a smaller portion inside of the 60 CNEL. The CLUP indicates that noise sensitive commercial uses in the 60 CNEL are compatible with the appropriate mitigation for noise.*

Land Use:

The site is located 460 – 2,600 ft. north of the north end of Runway 18/36, and 1200 ft. north of the north end of the proposed runway, to be located 600 ft. east of Runway 18/36. The proposed land use is commercial, and consists of a 240,000 sq. ft. business park with multiple buildings for offices, restaurants, health and exercise center, mini-warehouse, nursery, trailer, boat storage, blueprinting and duplicating services on approximately 61.75 acres.

The site consists of six Planning Areas, zoned Manufacturing Service Commercial (M-SC), as shown on the attached exhibit. Planning Area 1 (4.93 ac.) is located within the Inner Safety Zone (ISZ) and Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ). Planning Area 2 (15 ac.) is within the ISZ for Runway 18/36 and is also within the ETZ and Outer Safety Zone (OSZ) for the proposed runway. Planning Area 3 (8.59 ac.) is primarily within the OSZ of the proposed runway, although the southeast corner is within the TPZ. Planning Area 4 (7.86 ac) is within the ISZ of Runway 18/36, and is also within the ETZ and OSZ for the proposed runway. Planning Areas 5 (9.4 ac.) and 6 (13.4 ac.) are within the ISZ and ETZ for Runway 18/36. The proposed buildings on the site or a portion of the proposed buildings are either within the ISZ for Runway 18/36, the ETZ for the proposed runway, or the OSZ for the proposed runway.

A portion of the building within Planning Area 1 is in the TPZ, with the remaining portion in the ISZ.

Prohibited and Discouraged Uses

Structures and land uses involving petroleum, explosives or above-grade powerlines are prohibited within the ISZ. Structures, land uses involving concentrations of people, and significant obstructions are prohibited within the ETZ. Prohibited land uses within the OSZ include residences, public assembly uses, hotels, restaurants, bars, schools, hospitals, government services, public utility stations, plants, public communication facilities and uses involving, as the primary activity, manufacture, storage or distribution of explosives or flammable materials. Discouraged uses within the TPZ include schools, auditoriums, amphitheaters, stadiums, churches, and uses involving, as the primary activity, manufacture, storage or distribution of explosives or flammable materials.

Building coverage for Planning Areas 2, 3 and 4 is less than 25% (net), which is below the OSZ standard of 25% (net). The maximum population density within the OSZ is 25 persons per acre for uses in structures.

There is a GPS approach over the site (non-precision). A 34:1 approach would typically place an approaching aircraft 200 feet \pm over the proposed site.

Height: The highest elevation on the site is 1354 MSL. The building, signs and lighting at the proposed site are not expected to exceed 35 feet. The proposed site is located within the Part 77 approach surface overlying this area at 1,350 – 1,410MSL. The runway elevation is 1,347MSL. The distance from Runway 18/36 to the closest building on the proposed site is approximately 950 ft.

Planning Areas 5 and 6, and the western portion of Planning Area 4 lie to the west of the Building Restriction Line (BRL) established in accordance with FAR Part 77 criteria. Buildings to be constructed within Planning Areas 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 on the proposed site are restricted to those portions of the site east of the BRL. The BRL does not extend into or lie adjacent to Planning Area 1.

The applicant has submitted a 7460 Notice to Construct to the FAA at the request of staff, and as of the date of this staff report (May 7th) is awaiting a response.

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff recommends continuance of the item until June in order to obtain the 7460 review and any comments from Cal Trans Aeronautics.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Bell asked for clarification of the plant by asking whether it meant a nursery for plants or people. Beverly Coleman indicated it was a plant nursery.

Hearing no further responses Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case, and upon hearing no reply, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's, and upon hearing no reply or response, he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to continue the project, subject to staff's recommendations for a continuance to the next scheduled meeting of June 20th. Vice Chairman Graff seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

9:15 A.M.

- A. RI-02-123 – Sierra Towing – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: RI-02-123 – Sierra Towing
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: CUP 067-012

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Conditional Use Permit for a Towing Service.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located east of Rutland Avenue and south of Arlington Avenue, within the City of Riverside, and 6,000 feet southwest of Runway 16-34 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport

- a. Airport Influence Area: TPZ
b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 6,000 feet southwest of Runway 16-34 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for a conditional use permit for a towing service in an existing 1125 sq. ft. building on approximately 1.2 acres.*

Part 77: *The elevation at this site is approximately 744 MSL feet and height of the building is approximately 25 feet. The site is within the horizontal surface at this location, and is well below the horizontal surface elevation of 966 MSL. Part 77 is not a concern.*

Noise: *The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed.*

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. *Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the conditions outlined above.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Upon hearing no response he requested the applicant to come forward and present the case, after hearing no reply, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's, and upon hearing no reply or response he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Tandy made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's and Conditions of Approval and recommendation. Commissioner Stephens seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

B. RI-02-124 – T.G. Properties – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: RI-02-124 – T.G. Properties, LTD
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: CUP 079-012 and GP 008-012

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Conditional Use Permit and General Plan Amendment for a 90-Unit Assisted Living Facility and 141 Apartment Units on 7.5 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 5236 Central Avenue, east of Streeter Avenue, within the City of Riverside, and approximately 6,000 feet east of Runway 9/27 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area: TPZ
b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 6,000 feet east of Runway 9-27 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The project is a Conditional Use Permit and General Plan Amendment for a 90-Unit Assisted Living Facility and 141 Apartment Units on 7.5 acres. The TPZ has no population limits assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% of the net lot. The lot coverage of the buildings at the site is approximately 31 to 33% of the net area.*

Part 77: *The elevation at this site is approximately 783 MSL feet and the maximum building height is 40 feet. The site is well below the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966MSL. Part 77 is not a concern.*

Noise: *The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. The site is under an approach and departure flight track and will experience annoyance from overflying aircraft. This is a noise sensitive use, which is acceptable as proposed with the appropriate mitigation for noise.*

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. *Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.*
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.*
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. *All prospective tenants shall be given a notice explaining the noise from the airport and all tenants shall sign a notice informing them of the annoyance and that traffic will likely increase significantly in the future.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the conditions outlined above.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Tandy inquired if there was senior facility in the area, to which Beverly Coleman replied that there was another facility on Streeter that was adjacent to the proposed project site. Hearing no further questions from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Richard Teller, Albert Webb & Associates came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation, and voiced his concurrence with staff's Conditions of Approval. Chairman Cobb then called for questions from the Commissioners, and upon hearing no response or reply, he opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case

John Sabatello, Airport Manager at Riverside Municipal Airport came forward and expressed his concerns and issues with the project, involving close proximity of it to the airport, his opposition to the Goldware project, and referred to a disclosure

similar to the one previously mentioned by Vice Chairman Graff, which is outlined in Condition of Approval #5. Mr. Sabatello remarked that there is a 60% increase resulting in one hundred thousand flight operations, which are directly beneath the approach. He added that an aviation easement mitigates the airports responsibility and would resolve the individual complaints and issues.

Mr. Sabatello added that the airport has been in existence for some sixty years and is a corporate aviation business center. He voiced his concern with the project creating a lot of problems both noise, safety and traffic related.

Chairman Cobb inquired about the Goldware project, in which Mr. Sabatello replied that it is two-thirds complete and currently under construction. Mr. Sabatello added that he has voiced his complaints with the City of Riverside pertaining to this project.

A discussion then ensued between Commissioner Stephens, John Sabatello, B.T. Miller and Commissioner Tandy relative to enforcement of Condition of Approval #5, noise and frequency increases, noise attenuation measures, and traffic increases.

Al Frank, resident, came forward and voiced his concern with the project, by both recalling an accident that occurred at the project site area and the issue of noise.

Mr. Frank gave an example of the latter by mentioning the Open House in which 40,000-60,000 persons attend and which generates a great deal of noise, but is good for the community. Mr. Frank's opposition as it relates to noise is extended toward the senior citizen residents of the proposed project.

Chairman Cobb interjected his appreciation of having the Airport Manager, Mr. Sabatello appear before the Commission to voice his concerns with the project.

Bill Smith, resident, came forward and voiced his opposition to the project by mentioning noise, location and flight pattern, along with reiterating Mr. Sabatello's comments. He continued by bringing up the concerns of wind and approach, stating that the area is accident prone, and denoting that there is only one access road onto the project. Mr. Smith further added that it is a condensed area, which consists of safety issues, landing and takeoff. He also mentioned the possibility of combustible fuels from the aircraft in case of an accident, and that emergency vehicles entering the site will be impeded due to lack of emergency access.

Mary Ellis Carbajal, resident. Ms. Carbajal came forward and voiced her opposition of the project by noting concerns with child safety and the existence of two schools located off Central and Streeter. She added that the senior housing project would impact traffic due to service trucks and emergency vehicles that will need access into the site or facility. Ms. Carbajal suggested a conduction of a study or analysis.

Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's. Commissioner Tandy voiced her opposition to staff's finding of consistency, to which Commissioner Stephens responded that based upon the Comprehensive Land Use Plan the finding of consistency is correct. Vice Chairman Graff agreed with

Commissioner Stephens comment and stated the 31-33% square foot is non-problematic though the 500 persons and vehicles might be, he then advised amending Condition of Approval #5. B.T. Miller interjected that the 'or' in Condition of Approval #5 should be stricken.

Commissioner Snyder commended John Sabatello, Airport Manager at Riverside Municipal Airport on his presence and recognition of airport safety issues.

A discussion then ensued between John Sabatello, Vice Chairman Graff and Commissioner Snyder relative to curfews imposed at Burbank and Fullerton and former ownership of Burbank by Lockheed. Mr. Sabatello stated that he understood the ALUC's role and responsibilities, as he is a former member.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval, with the modification to Condition of Approval #5 reading as: "All prospective tenants shall be given a notice explaining the noise from the airport and overflights and all tenants shall sign a notice informing them of the annoyance and that traffic will likely increase significantly in the future." Commissioner Bell seconded the motion. Vice Chairman Graff and Commissioner Tandy opposed the project by a No vote. The Motion was carried by a 4/2 vote in favor of the project.

Chairman Cobb applauded and advised members of the audience who had voiced their opposition to the project to declare their concerns and issues to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

- C. RI-02-126 – Adrian Bernal – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER:	<u>RI-02-126 - Adrian Bernal</u>
APPROVING JURISDICTION:	City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.:	RZ 019-012

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Change of Zone RZ 019-012 from R165 to RO on approximately 2.1 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 4922, 4942 and 4948 Arlington Ave east of Madison St. and south of Arlington Ave., within the City of Riverside, southeast of Riverside Municipal Airport.

<i>Adjacent Airport:</i>	<i>Riverside Municipal Airport</i>
<i>a. Airport Influence Area:</i>	<i>TPZ</i>
<i>b. Noise Levels:</i>	<i>Outside 60 CNEL</i>

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 7800 feet south east of Runway 9-27 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is a change of zone from Residential (R165) to Restricted Office (RO) on approximately 2.1 acres to conform with the OLR (Office Low Rise) General Plan designation.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 814 MSL feet and the proposed RO zoning allows a maximum building height of 40 ft. The site is well below the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966MSL.

Noise: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.
2. Any subsequent permits on the property shall be submitted to the ALUC for review prior to construction.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the conditions outlined above.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no response from the Commissioners, he requested the applicant to come forward and present the case. Upon hearing no response or reply, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case, and after hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's, and upon hearing no reply or response, he called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Graff made a motion to approve the project, subject to staff's Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Stephens seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- D. RI-02-127 – Wishard Architects – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER:	<u>RI-02-127 – Wishard Architects</u>
APPROVING JURISDICTION:	City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.:	DR-095-012

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Construction of a Two-Story Industrial Building on 25,374 sq. ft.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is located at 6400 Columbus Ave., east of Jasmine St. and 3,900 ft. northeast of Runway 9/27 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.

Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport
a. Airport Influence Area: TPZ
b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 3,900 ft. northeast of Runway 9-27 and is within the TRAFFIC PATTERN ZONE of the Riverside Municipal Airport Influence Area. The proposal is for the construction of a two-story industrial building on 25,374 sq. ft. The TPZ has no population limits assigned, but has a lot coverage standard of 50% of the gross or 65% on the net lot. The lot coverage of the buildings at the site is 35.82% of the gross area.

Part 77: The elevation at this site is approximately 811 MSL feet and the maximum building height is approximately 31 feet. The site is well below the horizontal surface at this location, which is approximately 966MSL.

Noise: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport. This is acceptable for the usage proposed with the appropriate mitigation for noise.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Provide Avigation Easements to Riverside Municipal Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
4. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky.
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.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff would recommend a finding of consistency for the project, subject to the conditions outlined above.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Tandy inquired if there was another two-story building involved, to which Beverly Coleman replied that one-story buildings were adjacent.

Hearing no further responses from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case. Upon hearing no response or reply, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case, and after hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's. Vice Chairman inquired about the type of industrial building being constructed, number of employees, and hours of operation (24 hour vs. standard). Beverly Coleman responded by saying that she had no answers to his inquiries because usage of the facility was not included by the applicant on his application.

Since there was no information available and the applicant was not present, Vice Chairman Graff recommended continuing the case to the next scheduled meeting in order to have the applicant present and able to answer the questions.

Commissioner Stephens concurred with having the applicant present. Staff was advised by B.T. Miller and Chairman Cobb to apprise the applicant of their attendance at the next meeting.

Upon hearing no further comments or discussion from the Commissioner's, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Vice Chairman Graff made a motion to continue the case for the next scheduled meeting of June 20th in order to have the applicant present to answer Vice Chairman Graff's inquiries and any other questions that the Commission might have. Commissioner Stephens seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

9:30 A.M.

- E. BD-02-104 – Warner Engineering – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER: *BD-02-104 - Warner Engineering*
APPROVING JURISDICTION: *County of Riverside*
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: *CZ 6679, TRM 30483*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a 29-lot Residential Tract on 10.46 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The site is situated 650 feet southeast of the runway northeast of Adams St. and 42 Avenue in the County of Riverside, south of the Bermuda Dunes Airport.

*Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport
Land Use Policy: Area III*

- a. Airport Influence Area: Area III*
- b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area*
- c. Noise Levels: 60 dB CNEL (February 1996 future forecasts)*

MAJOR ISSUES:

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately, 500 feet south of the center of the runway and is within Area III of the Airport Influence Area. Land uses within Area III that produce glare, direct illumination, vapor, smoke and dust which may affect airport operations shall be discouraged. Likewise, uses which would conflict or potentially conflict with the airport in terms of noise sensitivity and safety hazards are discouraged.*

Noise: *The project is partially within the 60 CNEL as indicated in the 1996 Noise Report for the airports (see Exhibit A). The residential use is acceptable in that noise category if noise reduction measures are incorporated into the construction in order to achieve an interior annual noise level attributed to exterior sources, not to exceed 45 CNEL. That will likely require more than normal construction, which only attenuates up to 20dB.*

Height: *The elevation on the site ranges from 72 to 83 MSL, and the structures are not expected to exceed 35 feet. The runway ground elevation is from 49-73 feet. The Part 77 horizontal surface is overlying this area at 219 MSL, and no portion of the project intrudes upon that airspace. Any homes on this project will need an FAA 7460.*

RECOMMENDATION: *Staff would recommend a finding of consistency of this project subject to the following conditions of approval.*

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act and prior to recordation of the map, whichever is first.*
- 2. An acoustical study should include analysis that will yield a noise reduction level of 25.*
- 3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
- 4. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky (lights must be downward facing).*

5. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
 - (a) *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
 - (b) *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
 - (c) *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
 - (d) *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
6. *An FAA 7460 shall be filed and any resultant conditions shall be incorporated into the project.*

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Tandy inquired if an area adjacent to the site depicted on the exhibit was zoned commercial. Beverly Coleman replied that it was unknown, and she referred the Commissioner's to the handout from Caltrans dated May 10th in which there was a discrepancy in the Tract Map number. Ms. Coleman advised the Commission that the handout calls for an Environmental Document from CEQA and would therefore change staff's recommendation to continuation versus consistency in order to review said letter or documentation.

Upon hearing no further responses from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case.

David Dawson, Warner Engineering came forward in response to Chairman Cobb's invitation and indicated that the area questioned by Commissioner Tandy is a lake and the surrounding area is residential. Mr. Dawson stated that he had not received the Caltrans letter, and that a continuance would be problematic since a Planning Meeting was scheduled in Indio and voiced a preference for a non-continuance for his project.

Beverly Coleman replied that there was an issue of future 60 CNEL and the area was of significant concern especially since the Caltrans letter required Environmental Documentation from CEQA.

Chairman Cobb added that the project indicates a 29-unit lot while the Caltrans letter depicts 20 units on 10 acres, and per the Planning Handbook one unit per 2-1/2 acres is only allowed.

Mr. Dawson responded that the perimeter dimension is not within the area, and therefore is outside of the area and zoning appropriate.

Chairman Cobb advised that staff will have to study the project and will subsequently need to continue the project in order to do so.

Upon hearing no further responses or replies from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no reply from the audience, he called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's.

Vice Chairman Graff voiced his concerns with discrepancies in the Tract Map and land use measurements. Commissioner Stephens stated that the ALUC's focus should be in the CEQA document requested addressing the Environmental Impact Report. Beverly Coleman added that since this information is currently unknown staff would have to review or access this requirement. Chairman Cobb asked David Dawson if owner or resident's will be taxiing out to or from their homes. Mr. Dawson responded with a negative.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Stephens made a motion to continue the case for the next scheduled meeting of June 20th, subject to staff's change of recommendation from consistency to continuation in order to review Caltrans letter requesting CEQA Environmental Documentation. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

BLYTHE AIRPORT

9:30 A.M.

- F. BL-02-101 – Blythe Energy Project – Phase II – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

CASE SUMMARY

CASE NUMBER

BL-02-101 – Blythe Energy Phase II

APPROVING JURISDICTION:

California Energy Commission

JURISDICTION CASE NO.:

CEC: Docket #02-AFC-1, Related Cases BL-02-106, BL-00-102, BL 01-100 and BL-02-100

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

An expansion of an additional 520-Megawatt (MW) natural gas-fired combined-cycle power plant utilizing 30 acres for the plant and switchyard and 16 acres for evaporating ponds. The total size of the additional area is 76 acres. (See Attached Summaries)

PROJECT LOCATION:

The project is located north of Hobsonway west of Buck Boulevard, from 3,900-5,400 feet easterly of the east end of RWY 8/26 and approximately five miles west of Downtown.

BACKGROUND: 1999-2002

This project, an Application For Certification (AFC) was submitted to the California Energy Commission (CEC) on December 9, 1999 and the CEC distributed the application to the public on December 14, 1999. None were sent to this Commission or to CalTrans Aeronautics. In June 2000, Staff was made aware by the City of Blythe Staff of an energy plant to be permitted 'east of the airport' and on July 5th the precise site was depicted. A copy of the 4 Volume permit was sent by the CEC to Staff on July 25th. A cursory review of the documents was made by Staff and the letter of July 31st was sent to the CEC. On August 9th an initial response to the letter was received along with some components of an application to ALUC. A complete application was received as of August 21st. A review of the response and complete document was completed and the request for additional information was sent on August 22nd. Additional information requested was received on September 11th. The CEC sent the staff a copy of their Preliminary Staff Assessment (PSA) on September 12th.

On October 19, 2000 the ALUC found the original project consistent with the plan. In March of this year the ALUC found the amendment for this property (BL-01-100) to the original project inconsistent with the CLUP.

ENVIRONMENTAL:

The proposal is being processed by the California Energy Commission and as such is the Lead Agency. The Zoning and General Plan Amendment was processed by the City of Blythe and was on the March 2002 agenda (BL-02-106).

LAND USE PLAN:

The current Land Use Plan (CLUP) designation for the expansions for the site includes the Extended Runway Centerline (ERC), the Outer Safety Zone (OSZ), Emergency Touchdown Zone (ETZ) and Traffic Pattern Zone (TPZ).

Text within the adopted CLUP specifically states that power plans and landfills are inherently incompatible with the airport (See Page 7.3.2f, Page 7.6).

NOISE:

The area is outside of the 55 CNEL for 1992. The 2000 plan contours for long-range capacity do cover the site with 55CNEL and 60CNEL. The project is by its nature a source of noise and not a sensitive receptor.

PART 77: OBSTRUCTION

The applicant obtained an FAA 7460 Obstruction Review for the original proposal the brine separator does not need an FAA review (See Attached).

APPROACH

ILS Approach: The existing approach is illustrated on the Master Plan for Runway 26.

ILS Potential: The Master Plan (See item BL-00-101) envisions an Instrument Approach for Runway 26 as either an ILS or GPS.

GPS Approach: The Master Plan for the airport assumes that Runway 26 will be the recipient of a straight-in GPS low angle approach.

Other Issues:

Wildlife Attractant: See letter USDA February 13, 2002. See request dated April 19, 2002. No response has been received as of May 7th.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE: Chapter I, Paragraph 1.1 states the purpose of the plan:

“The Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Blythe Airport is intended to protect and promote the safety and welfare of residents of the airport vicinity and users of the airport while ensuring the continued operation of the airport. Specifically, the plan seeks to protect the public from the adverse effects of aircraft noise, to ensure that people and facilities are not concentrated in areas susceptible to aircraft accidents, and to ensure that no structures are activities encroach upon or adversely affect the use of navigable airspace.”

While this project does not adversely affect the public with aircraft noise, the site is in an area with higher incidences of aircraft accidents and the activity or structure may encroach upon or adversely affect the use of navigable airspace. The degree that it does is not likely to be high with the conditions as required, but that is not clearly insignificant.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the ALUC continue the item until the June 20 meeting for any new commissioner to review any minutes that they wish. Staff Recommends a finding for consistency for any portion of the project on the original (eastern) property in conformance with the ALUC approval of October 2000, but a recommendation of inconsistency for that portion of the project on the westerly parcel in conformance with ALUC’s (March 2002) previous rulings.

CONDITIONS: (DRAFT) OVERRIDE OR APPROVAL

The following condition shall apply to this project:

1. *Prior to the development of the above project, 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 Blythe Airport for all portions of the project including offsite power lines within the Airport Influence Area.*
2. *All outdoor lighting shall be hooded or shielded to prevent either spillage of lumens shall be reflections into the sky (downward facing).*
3. *Incorporate noise attenuation measure into any office portion of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
4. *Signs for this project should be approved by the City of Blythe prior to any development of the site.*
5. *Lighting plans for any additional development shall be reviewed and approved by an airport lighting consultant and the Airport Operator prior to placement.*
6. *No obstruction of the “FAR Part 77 Conical Surface” shall be permitted.*

7. *The following conditions shall be required with this application:*
- 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 and 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. All plans for construction surfaces shall be reviewed by the airport operator and their appointed consultant for this concern prior to construction and any recommended changes or condition adhered to and monitored over the life of the permit.*
 - 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.*

B.T. Miller interjected that a connection and relationship of amendment to project was necessary. Beverly Coleman briefed the Commission on both the current project and its specifications along with denoting former phases or items that were previously approved or unapproved. Ms. Coleman reiterated that staff's recommendations are for continuance.

Chairman Cobb called for questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Tandy inquired with Commissioner Snyder about his previous review of the site, after which time she inquired if part of the project was built out. Beverly Coleman responded that the eastern portion of the stacks had been approved, and evaporation ponds are proposed.

Hearing no further responses from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb requested the applicant to come forward and present the case. Upon hearing no response or reply, Chairman Cobb opened the floor for comments from the audience on the case. After hearing no reply from the audience, Chairman Cobb called for comments or discussion from the Commissioner's.

Commissioner Stephens suggested adding a Condition of Approval based upon the letter received from USDA dated September 5th, referencing Wildlife Mitigation. Vice Chairman Graff advised staff to submit exhibits for all prior ALUC cases related to BL-02-101, including BL-02-106, BL-00-102, BL-01-100 and BL-02-100 for the new Commissioners prior to submission of the Agenda packet for the June 20th meeting. B.T. Miller concurred and Chairman Cobb also concurred and added that said documentation should be submitted to all Commissioners. Beverly Coleman agreed and confirmed that documentation would be submitted.

After hearing no further comments from the Commissioners, Chairman Cobb called for a motion to be set.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Snyder made a motion to continue the project, subject to staff's recommendations for a continuance to the next scheduled meeting of June 20th. Commissioner Tandy seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. Terms of Office/Reappointments

Beverly Coleman briefed the Commission on the Airport Manager and Board of Supervisors Letter dated April 18th and Form 11, along with noting that on May 13th the Board of Supervisors had approved the appointment of Paul Bell. Ms. Coleman also verified Clerk of the Board's approval/reappointment of Allen Graff.

B. County of Riverside Letter

Beverly Coleman advised that no referral has yet to be received from the letter submitted, and stated that the attachment is included as a handout for the Commissioner's.

C. City of Murrieta Letter

Ms. Coleman also advised of the letter submitted to Lori Moss, Assistant City Manager at the City of Murrieta.

Letter to Board of Supervisors, Attention Bob Buster. Commissioner Bell noted a typo with the spelling of his last name as Bell prior to Chairman Cobb's signature.

Beverly Coleman also noted a handout passed out from the 'Observer' newspaper.

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

None

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Vice Chairman Graff welcomed Rick Stephens and noted his appointment from alternate to full-fledged member.

Commissioner Stephens inquired if the ALUC was participating in the RCIP review. Both Ms. Coleman and Chairman Cobb responded positively and noted letter depicting scheduling, and milestones for cities.

Chairman Cobb inquired if any of the Commissioners's had a scheduling conflict with the next meeting scheduled for June 20th. No objections were heard, at which time Chairman Cobb inquired if the meeting location noted as Riverside, meant the Riverside County Administration Center to which Beverly Coleman and Pat Moore responded positively.

Commissioner Tandy noted an address correction to the handout by indicating that the City of Hemet's address should read as 445 E. Florida vs. 450 E. Latham. Commissioner Stephens noted a correction for the City of Hemet, Planning Director as Richard Masyczek, and City of San Jacinto, Tim Hults. He stated that Deanna is no longer with them and Brad [Last Name unknown] should be updated.

Chairman Cobb then suggested to staff that the first publicized case commence at 9:05 a.m. vs. 9:15 a.m. Beverly Coleman confirmed.

- X. Adjournment: Chairman Cobb adjourned the meeting at 10:45 a.m.
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: June 20, 2002 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside.