

# **AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION**

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

**THURSDAY, August 11, 2005**  
**9:00 A.M.**

## **MINUTES**

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on August 11, 2005 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Chambers.

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:           Sam Pratt  
  Marge Tandy  
  Simon Housman, Chairman

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

OTHERS PRESENT:                  Tim Rowntree  
  Martha Rowntree  
  Ben Parry  
  Dan Lovinger  
  Robert Ferraud

I.        CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale.

II.       SALUTE TO THE FLAG.

III.      ROLL CALL was taken.

Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale welcomed Rod Ballance new member for ALUC.

IV.      APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR: July 14, 2005

July 14, 2005: Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale called for questions from the Commissioners, hearing no response she called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Hogan made a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**\*CONSENT ITEMS:**

Beverly Coleman opened the consent items schedule for 9:00 a.m.

Beverly Coleman indicated the consent items as well as continued items would be voted for consistency/continuance unless any of the Commissioners or any one from the audience has questions on an item. The item will be pulled and addressed separately, otherwise it will be voted as one and no further discussion will be made.

Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale called for questions from the Commissioners for the consent items; BD-05-113, FV-05-107, FV-05-108, HR-05-105, HR-05-106, MA-05-120, MA-05-122, RI-05-121, RI-05-122 and for the continued items; BD-05-106, SK-05-100 and MA-05-118. Hearing no response Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale indicated items BD-05-113 and SK-05-100 will be pulled and addressed separately per the applicant's request. Hearing no response Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no reply she called for a motion to be set on the remainder of the consent and continued items.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Hogan made a motion of consistency for the consent items, subject to staff's recommendations and conditions of approval and continuance for the continued items. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

V. OLD BUSINESS

**BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

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

**CASE NUMBER:** BD-05-106 – Robert Ricciardi, Architect  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Plot Plan 19953

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*The project is a plot plan for a 7,740 sq. ft. industrial building on approximately .75 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located south of Country Club Drive, west of 42<sup>nd</sup> Street in the County of Riverside, approximately 100 to 150 ft. north of Runway 10-28 at the Bermuda Dunes Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Bermuda Dunes Airport*

*Land Use Policy: RCALUCP (Adopted Dec. 2004)*  
*a. Airport Influence Area: Zone A and B2, within the approach surface*  
*b. Noise Levels: Inside 70 dB CNEL*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: The proposal is a plot plan for an industrial building/sheet metal fabrication plant consisting of 7,740 sq. ft. on .75 acres. The proposal is within Zones A and B2. Zone A allows no obstructions, however, the building is placed away from the runway. The proposal is consistent with allowed uses within Zones A and B2 subject to noise and height restrictions.

NOISE: The proposal is within 70 CNEL as indicated by the 2003 Existing Noise Impacts Data for Bermuda Dunes Airport. The industrial use is acceptable in that noise category if noise reduction measures are utilized for any office portion of the building. That may require more than normal construction, which only attenuates about 20dB.

PART 77: Part 77 approach profiles overlie the property. The highest elevation at the site is approximately 52.4 MSL. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. Structures exceeding 70 feet in height or of a height exceeding a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway require FAA review. The height of the structure is 24 ft. An application for an FAA 7460 review of the proposed building has been submitted by the applicant to the FAA. **As of the date of this staff report (08/03/05), the applicant's response from the FAA has not been received by staff.**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff would recommend that the proposal be continued to the September 15, 2005 ALUC meeting in order to receive the FAA 7460 review.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the Bermuda Dunes Airport.
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract a large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
  - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to any operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
4. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential property purchaser or tenant.

**SKYLARK AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

- B. SK-05-100 Century American Development – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** SK-05-100 Century American Development  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** TM 31345, GPA 672 and Change of Zone 6836

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

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

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

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

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

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

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located in line with and southeasterly of the RWY. The proposed site is within the Areas III of the adopted Skylark Airport Influence Area. The project is a Tract Map for a subdivision of 50 lots on 14.9 acres. The proposal has fifty lots that range in size from 7,200 to 12,912 sq. ft. in size: and an open space linear lot reflecting the flood control facilities of the project. The general plan and zoning would be changed from RR and RLI to R-1 and 2-4 d.u. /acre.

Area III has no population limits assigned to it, but areas II has a two and one-half acre minimum lot size with no structures within the close-in areas.

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

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

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

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

**CONDITIONS:**

1. *Provide Avigation Easements for the entire proposed development to SKYLARK Airport. (951) 245-4595.*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
  - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
  - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
  - c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
  - d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*

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

**ADDENDUM: August 11, 2005** *At the last meeting the Commission continued the item in order to obtain additional information from and about the airport and Caltrans Aeronautics. Staff has visited the site and it is apparent that the majority of the operations are to and from the west but not all.*

Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale requested for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Ben Parry, Century American Development came forward in response to Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale's invitation. Mr. Parry expressed concerned about the recommendation for continuance. Mr. Parry indicated the item was continued from last month awaiting comments from Caltrans and the Airport operator. Mr. Parry then inquired on the timing expected for comments to be received. Beverly Coleman responded that comments have not been received at this time and the entities may choose not to comment. Mr. Parry indicated it being about sixty days for a comment review since the original submittal. Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale inquired on the standard procedure for

comments. Ms. Coleman responded it depends on the case and how severely it affects the outcome. With speaking with Mr. Downs he didn't seem overly concerned about not receiving those comments. The recommendation is for a finding of consistency, but with a continuance to allow time for those comments. At this point is the choice of the Commission. Commissioner Goldenbaum indicated if it's nothing controversial from Caltrans more of a routine transaction and staff has recommended consistency it seems cumbersome to wait on another state agency. If there is a way for the Commission to approve without waiting for comments he recommended the Commission go with staff's recommendation for consistency without the continuance.

Commissioner Hogan inquired if the airport operator has contacted staff. Ms. Coleman responded negatively.

Hearing no further comments Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Goldenbaum made a motion of consistency, subject to staff's recommendations and conditions of approval. Commissioner Lightsey seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## **MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE**

**9:00 A.M.**

### **C. MA-05-118 – Transcan Development – Continued item see page 2**

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

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

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

#### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

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

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

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

#### **BACKGROUND:**

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

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

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

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

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

### **MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 16,000 –16,500 feet north of the north end of Runway 14-32. The proposal consists of a specialty restaurant and attendant uses such as bowling alley, arcade, carousel and amusement rides and individual party rooms. The proposal is near the primary departure track and is within the outer horizontal surface. The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, and noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area II, which allows limited commercial, industrial and agriculture. 1984 RCALUP: The 1984 RCALUP with the 1986 map identifies the entire project as within AREA II. Area II, Policy #2 states: “Area II shall have a minimum residential lot size of two and one-half acres. Agricultural, industrial and commercial uses are acceptable.”

Density and Coverage: The project is part of a much larger center that was reviewed under MA-03-122 (see attached staff report). The original application had apartments and a theatre associated with the project and was recommended for inconsistency based upon the residential use density and noise sensitivity of the theatres. These were removed and the Commission found the balance of the project consistent. The attached analysis indicates the proponent’s estimate of the occupancy load for the various uses and the parking committed to the site. Using the parking of 319 spaces and a factor of 1.5 the occupancy would be approximately 480, but a load factor for the vehicles should be higher for this use and a factor of 2.5-3/vehicle would be more appropriate. This would result in occupancy of roughly 1,000 people. Using the occupancy from the proponent of 2,452 people, it would be approximately 480 people/acre. This use would be considered a HIGH RISK LAND USE as shown on Exhibit B of the current plan. These uses are precluded from Area I, but are not specifically inconsistent with Area II. With the recently adopted ALUCP this use would be allowed in the Countywide Zone E and possibly Zone D.

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

Noise: The site has been shown to have varying noise over the property with each of the AICUZ reports. The 1986 Map covered most of the property with 65 CNEL and the balance would have

been within the 60 CNEL 1998 AICUZ indicated the property to be below 55 CNEL. The project would not be considered a noise sensitive use.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the ALUC CONTINUE this until September 15<sup>th</sup> to obtain responses regarding this proposed use from the March JPA's, March ARB and Caltrans:

**CONDITIONS:**

1. *Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.*
2. *Lighting shall be reviewed and approved by an Airport Lighting Consultant/or the airport operator prior to placement.*
3. *No obstruction of the "FAR Part 77 Conical Surface" shall be permitted.*
4. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
  - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
  - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
  - c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
  - d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
5. *The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.*
6. *The attached NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*
7. *The usage of helium filled balloons shall be controlled so that none are released to the outside.*

**APPENDIX: August 11, 2005** This item was continued to obtain response from the March JPA, MARB and Caltrans. As of the date of the staff report July 29<sup>th</sup> none of these had been received.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

**BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**



- A. BD-05-113 – Design Build Structures Inc. – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** BD-05-113 –Design Build Structures  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Change of Zone 7156 and Plot Plan 20519

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*The project is a Change of Zone from Residential to Manufacturing and a Plot Plan for a 13,171 sq. ft. industrial/service building on approximately 2 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located north 41st Street and west of Adams Street in the County of Riverside, approximately 1,800 ft. west 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 B-1 within the approach surface*  
*b. Noise Levels: Inside 60 dB CNEL*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: *The proposal is a Plot Plan for an industrial building/sheet metal fabrication plant consisting of 13,171 sq. ft. on 2 acres. There are 36 parking spaces allowing a density of 27 per acre. With the 13,171 sq. at 10% office and 90 % warehouse the density will be 18 people per acre. Both are within the B-1 density of 25 per acre. The Change of Zone from residential is consistent with the ALUCP since the residential lot minimum for Zone B-1 is 20 acres. The proposal is within Zone B-1. The proposal is consistent with allowed uses within B-1 subject to noise and height restrictions*

NOISE: *The proposal is within 60 CNEL as indicated by Noise Impacts Data for Bermuda Dunes Airport. The industrial use is acceptable in that noise category if noise reduction measures are utilized for any office portion of the building.*

PART 77: *Part 77 approach profiles overlie the property. The highest elevation at the site is approximately 85 MSL. The airport elevation is 73 MSL. Structures exceeding 35 feet in height or of a height exceeding a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway require FAA review. The height of the structure is 20 ft. An FAA 7460 review of the proposed building has been completed by the FAA.*

**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 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.*

Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale requested for the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Robert Ferraud came forward in response to Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale’s invitation. Mr. Ferraud indicated there being an error in the information provided on the agenda and staff report. Per the planning department the zoning will not be changing to MSC as stated on the agenda, but to IP. On the staff report under Land Use the 10% office, 90% warehouse is incorrect the proposal consist of 45% office and 55% warehouse. Also the proposal is for an industrial building, but not for a sheet metal fabrication plant.

B.T. Miller indicated the item would need to be continued to the next scheduled meeting to allow staff to review the corrections.

Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale called for questions from the Commissioners, hearing no response Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale opened the floor for comments from the audience, hearing no reply she called for a motion to be set.

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

**FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

- B. FV-05-107 – The Garrett Group – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-05-107 – The Garrett Group  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** PP19437

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Plot Plan for 59,010 sq. ft., office/warehouse buildings on approximately 5.25 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located north of Technology Dr., and east of Sky Canyon Drive from approximately 2,000 to 2,600 ft., south of the ultimate Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport: French Valley  
a. Airport Influence Area: Zones B-1 and C  
b. Noise Levels: Inside the 55CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposal is for Plot Plan 19437 for 59,010 sq. ft., of office warehouse buildings on approximately 5.25 acres. Based on the site plan submitted by the applicant, and the current GIS data for the French Valley Airport, the site is located within zones B-1 and C. Structures and land uses involving petroleum, explosives or above-grade power lines, land uses involving high concentrations of people and significant obstructions are prohibited within these zones. The proposed site is located within adopted Specific Plan 213. The attached calculation indicates that the proposed uses will meet the requirements of each zone within the project.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the property to be developed is 1,323 MSL and the height of the tallest structure currently proposed is 32 ft. The site is within the horizontal surface at 1,500 MSL and the runway elevation is 1,338 MSL. The distance from the ultimate end of Runway 18/36 to the northeast corner of the proposed site is approximately 2,000 ft. Any future structures over the height of 1,358 MSL proposed on the site will require FAA review.

Noise: The ultimate noise contours indicate the site is inside the 55 to 60 CNEL

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the ALUC finds that the project is consistent with the French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

**CLUP CONSISTENCY CONDITIONS:** For County Utilization

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, prior to recordation of any map, or issuance of any permit, whichever is first for the entire map including the remainder. (951-343-5493)
2. No obstruction of any "FAR Part 77 Surface" shall be permitted.
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 a large concentration 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.
5. The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.
  6. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport must be given to each potential tenant.
  7. Schools, places of worship, day care centers, libraries, hospitals, nursing homes, critical community infrastructure facilities, noise sensitive outdoor residential activities and Hazards to Flight (see policy 4.3.7) are prohibited.

C. FV-05-108 – The Garrett Group – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** FV-05-108 – The Garrett Group  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** County of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** PP19438

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Plot Plan for 64,442 sq. ft., office/warehouse buildings on approximately 4.46 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located south of Technology Dr., and east of Sky Canyon Drive from approximately 2,700 to 3,200 ft., south of the ultimate Runway 18-36 at the French Valley Airport.

**LAND USE PLAN:**

Adjacent Airport: French Valley  
 a. Airport Influence Area: Zones B-1 and C  
 b. Noise Levels: Inside the 55CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: The proposal is for Plot Plan 19438 for 64,442 sq. ft., of office warehouse buildings on approximately 4.46 acres. Based on the site plan submitted by the applicant, and the current GIS data for the French Valley Airport, the site is located within the Traffic Pattern (TPZ). Structures and land uses involving petroleum, explosives or above-grade power lines, land uses involving high concentrations of people and significant obstructions are prohibited within these zones. The proposed site is located within adopted Specific Plan 213. The attached calculation indicates that the proposed uses will meet the requirements of each zone within the project.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the property to be developed is 1,295 MSL and the height of the tallest structure currently proposed is 34 ft. The site is within the horizontal surface at 1,500

MSL and the runway elevation is 1,338 MSL. The distance from the ultimate end of Runway 18/36 to the northeast corner of the proposed site is approximately 2,700 ft. Any future structures over the height of 1,357 MSL proposed on the site will require FAA review.

Noise: The ultimate noise contours indicate the site is inside the 55 to 60 CNEL

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the ALUC finds that the project is consistent with the French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

**CLUP CONSISTENCY CONDITIONS:** For County Utilization

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the French Valley Airport prior to sale of any property to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, prior to recordation of any map, or issuance of any permit, whichever is first for the entire map including the remainder. (951-343-5493)
2. No obstruction of any "FAR Part 77 Surface" shall be permitted.
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 a large concentration 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.
5. The above ground storage of explosives or flammable materials shall be prohibited.
6. The attached notation regarding proximity to the airport must be given to each potential tenant.
7. Schools, places of worship, day care centers libraries hospitals, nursing homes, critical community infrastructure facilities, noise sensitive outdoor residential activities and Hazards to Flight( see policy 4.3.7) are prohibited.

**HEMET/RYAN AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

D. HR-05-105 – Hemet Unified School District – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** HR-05-105– Hemet Unified School District.  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Hemet  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Elementary and Middle School

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

A 50,000 sq. ft. elementary school and 128,000 sq. ft. middle school on 35 acres.

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

The site is located south of Mustang Way and east of Fisher Way, within the City of Hemet, from approximately 5,000 to 5,400 ft. south 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  
b. Noise Levels: Outside 55 CNEL

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE AND POPULATION DENSITY: The proposal is for a 50,000 sq. ft. elementary school and 128,000 sq. ft. middle school on 35 acres. The site is located within Area III and adjacent to single family residential development. Proposed schools within Area III are subject to discretionary review of structure height, population density, nature of land use activity, noise, relevant safety factors, institutional uses and places of assembly. The proposed density (students and staff) is 800 persons at the elementary school and 1,550 at the middle school.

NOISE: The site is under or near specific traffic patterns and will experience some annoyance from over-flying aircraft. The 1989 plan indicates that the area is outside of the 55 CNEL.

PART 77. The runway elevation is 1,512 MSL. Based on the information received from the applicant, the elevation on the site is unknown and the proposed structure height of the tallest structure is 25 ft. An FAA 7460 review will be required for any structure of an elevation that would exceed a 100:1 slope from the runway. Structures at the north end of the site exceeding 1,562 MSL in elevation will require FAA 7460 Review.

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW:

Pages 35 and 37 of the Hemet-Ryan CLUP include the discretionary review procedures and require us to review: 1) structure height, 2) population density, 3) nature of the land use activity, 4) noise, 5) relevant safety factors, 6) institutional uses, and 7) places of assembly. The present proposal would be consistent with the plan, subject to the conditions outlined in this staff report.

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

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the operator of Hemet-Ryan Airport prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.

3. *The following uses shall be prohibited:*
  - a. *Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.*
  - b. *Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.*
  - c. *Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.*
  - d. *Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.*
4. *The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*
5. *An FAA 7460 review shall be completed for any structure exceeding a 100:1 slope from the end of the runway.*
6. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*

E. HR- 05-106 – Hemet Unified School District – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** HR-05-106– Hemet Unified School District.  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Hemet  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** School District Support Facility

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*School District Offices and Transportation Facilities on 15.4 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located north of Acacia and west of Lyon Street, within the City of Hemet, approximately 8,500 ft. east 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: Transition Area (Between II and III)*
- b. *Noise Levels: Outside 55 CNEL*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

LAND USE: *The proposal is for school district offices and transportation facilities. The site is located within the Transitional Area between Areas II and III. The proposed use is consistent with the CLUP standards for the Transitional Area.*

NOISE: The site is under or near specific traffic patterns and will experience some annoyance from over flying aircraft. The 1989 plan indicates that the area is outside of the 55 CNEL.

PART 77. The runway elevation is 1,512 MSL. Based on the information received from the applicant, the elevation on the site is unknown and the proposed structure height is 25 ft. An FAA 7460 review will be required for any structure of an elevation that would exceed a 100:1 slope from the runway. Structures exceeding 1,597 MSL in elevation will require FAA 7460 Review.

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

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Provide Avigation Easements to the operator of Hemet-Ryan Airport prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act.
2. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. All lighting plans should be reviewed and approved by the airport manager prior to approval.
3. The following uses shall be prohibited:
  - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
  - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
  - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
  - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
4. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.
5. An FAA 7460 review shall be completed for any structure exceeding 1,597 MSL in elevation.

**MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE**

**9:00 A.M.**

- F. MA-05-119 – Mission Hills Gymnastics – Beverly Coleman presented the case by referring to and using exhibits, staff report and recommendations.

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-05-119-Mission Hills Gymnastics  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Conditional Use Permit



**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Conditional Use Permit for a gymnastics training facility.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at 7330 Sycamore Canyon, west of Alessandro Blvd. within the City of Riverside, approximately 10,000 ft. northwest of MARB.*

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

*a. Airport Influence Area: Within Area of Influence Study Area*

*b. Land Use Policy: Influence Area I (APZ II)*

*c. Noise Levels: See Below*

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

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

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

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

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

*Land Use, Density and Coverage: The proposed site is located approximately 10,000 feet northwest of the north end of Runway 14-32. The proposal consists of a gymnastics training facility within an existing industrial park. The proposal is within Area I and is under or near the primary departure track and is within the outer horizontal surface. The 1984 Plan places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft using the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks and noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area I, which prohibits high-risk land uses. High risk land uses include places of assembly such as auditoriums, churches and schools, and high patronage services such as bowling alleys and restaurants. Strict adherence to the 1984 Plan and application of the high-risk land use examples listed in Appendix B would indicate that the proposed gymnastic facility could be considered a high-risk land use based on the type of use and the estimated number of occupants. Using the proposed number of parking spaces (56) and a factor of 1.5 persons per space, the occupancy would be approximately 84, or 32 persons per acre. The net lot coverage of the existing structure is between 45 and 50%.*

*Part 77: The elevation at the site is 1,536 MSL feet and the building height is 28 feet. At a distance of approximately 10,000 feet from the runway, structures exceeding 1,636 MSL would need an FAA 7460 review. Part 77 height issues are not a concern.*

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

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends a finding of inconsistency of the project due to the high-risk land use proposed within Area I.

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

1. *Prior to project development, recordation of the map, or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport.*
2. *Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.*
3. *The attached NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY shall be given to all prospective buyers and tenants.*

Hearing no further comments Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale called for questions from the Commissioners, hearing no response Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale requested the applicant to come forward and present the case.

Tim and Martha Rowntree, Mission Hills Gymnastics came forward in response to Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale's invitation. Mr. Rowntree gave a presentation indicating the gym was founded by Martha Rowntree and Brandy Clark in the year 2000 for gymnastics training. Over the pass years Mission Hills Gymnastics has been a contract service provider for the City of Riverside, Park and Recreation. The cities served are Moreno Valley, Perris, San Bernardino, Colton, Corona and Redlands and also have provided services to children from parents who have been part of the March Air Reserve. The facility has also provided assistance for the annual air shows. The reason for relocating has to do with economics. The present facility is located in the Mission Grove area and the lease rate back in the year 2000 was \$.50/sq. ft. by the end of this year it would triple to a \$1.45/sq. ft. and it is anticipated to be \$2.00/sq. ft. at the renewal of the lease term and its feasibly impossible to continue in this area. Gymnastics is not a high profit business it is driven out of Martha Rowntree's (wife) love for what she does. The lease rate at the new facility is \$.50/sq. ft. allowing the continuation of the practice for gymnastics. Mr. Rowntree briefed the Commission in regards to the findings stated in the staff report, which indicates it could be considered a high risk use based on occupancy. The conclusion in the staff report was arrived on an occupancy based on parking factor not facts. The parking factor supposes 1.5 people per 56 spaces equals 84 people taking the entire facility of 33,000 sq. ft. into consideration, which is incorrect since the gymnastics facility only occupies 15,000 sq. ft., 45% of the building. Using the report's calculations at 45% of the building it would be 37 people and using the parking tabulation for the Conditional Use Permit at 23 spaces would be 34 people. The Pepsi plant has 500 people, which is several yards away. There is also an existing gymnastics facility at the end of Sycamore Canyon an

operation identical to the current proposal. The Magnansin Home facility has 100, Henry's distribution has 75 thru 100, at the end of the runway Sip Cream Truck products has 205 and Ralphs plant has 1,300 people. A short video was presented to the Commission of the daily tabulations of the proposed facility. Monday's use is 4 staff, 14 students, approximately 4 parents between the hours of 4-6 p.m. Tuesday's use is 4 staff, 20 students, 7 parents. Wednesday's use is 3 staff, 11 students, 7 parents this day being one of the lowest days. Thursday's use 4 staff, 20 students, 8 parents Tuesday and Thursday are the highest occupancy on the facility. Friday's use is 1 staff, 6 students and no parents. Saturday's use is 2 staff, 14 students and 5 parents. The facility hours for Saturday are from 9-12 p.m. and closed on Sundays. Mr. Rowntree concluded his presentation and made himself available for questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Hogan inquired on the size of the existing facility. Mr. Rowntree responded approximately 6,000 sq. ft. Commissioner Hogan then inquired if the purpose is to expand since the proposed facility is triple the size. Mr. Rowntree responded negatively indicating it is strictly economics. Ms. Rowntree interjected indicating there being four other gymnastic facilities in the City of Riverside making it very difficult to expand due to the competition. In a 6,000 sq. ft. building the equipment is crammed together and other than economics that is another reason in obtaining a 15,000 sq. ft. building to allow additional space for the equipment.

Commissioner Goldenbaum inquired about other available facilities with the rate of \$.50/sq. ft. Mr. Rowntree responded there being various availability between Iowa and I-215. Ms. Rowntree interjected indicating it would place her business on top of the competition. The majority of her clients are in the Hillcrest area and areas of Mission Grove, which would not be convenient for them to drive to downtown Riverside that being the reason they chose her facility. Moving the facility to the downtown Riverside area would mean starting all over with new clients. Commissioner Goldenbaum then explained the ALUC's charter and task being to protect airports from emotional encroachment to allow airports remain open.

Commissioner Lightsey inquired about the different estimates brought forward by the applicant and taking those numbers into account would it change staff's finding. Beverly Coleman responded negatively due to being consistent in the way ALUC reviews projects. Commissioner Hogan concurred with staff's finding. Mr. Rowntree interjected indicating a gymnastics facility is an in and out use not an assembly use. Vice Chairman Van Arsdale inquired about the gymnastics facility holding performances/shows at the facility. Mr. Rowntree responded negatively indicating any type of show performances are held in an outside facility. Vice Chairman Van Arsdale inquired about the ALUC conditioning set occupancy restrictions on previous reviews for the City of Riverside to implement. Beverly Coleman responded negatively. B.T. Miller interjected indicating it might be a condition of the override. Mr. Rowntree indicated that in future reviews if the ALUC could define high risk because as applicants it was a challenge in obtain that type of information and was never able to obtain the correct answer. Prior to spending \$20,000 in application fees and in leasing of the building Mr. Rowntree inquired with the City of Riverside on whether the proposal would be supported by the City and the ALUC. The City of Riverside agreed with the proposal and believed the ALUC would since it was relatively low occupancy. Mr. Rowntree requested providing mitigations for conditions to the City of Riverside on the override if

the Commission chooses to find the proposal inconsistent although would request the Commission find it consistent based on the information provided.

Hearing no further comments Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale called for comments from the audience, hearing no response Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale called for a discussion from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Hogan concurred with staff's finding of the proposal being somewhat a high risk use, although recognizing that there might be a minor expansion were the occupancy of the building would be down to a point of comfort in determining consistency. Commissioner Hogan inquired if the Commission determines consistency based on the additional information would the conditions of override be considered the same conditions of approval. Beverly Coleman responded positively. Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale indicated the Commission struggles with these types of projects and if the Commission could find the proposal consistent only if the City would be willing to impose an occupancy limit. Beverly Coleman responded that to her recollection the ALUC has not imposed those types of conditions on the City. B.T. Miller interjected the Commission would be ~~bypassing~~ superseding the ALUC's jurisdiction. Commissioner Goldenbaum reiterated the Commission's charter and ALUC's findings are determined with the current statute and nothing more. Newly Commissioner Ballance concurred with Commissioner Goldenbaum, but it is wonderful to see the action of the Commission in trying to work with an organization for a finding of consistency.

Hearing no further comments Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale called for a motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Hogan made a motion of consistency, subject to the conditions stated on the staff report. Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale seconded with further discussion.

Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale inquired to Counsel since the Commission has never imposed limitations to the local jurisdictions could the Commission provide a discussion about the finding. B.T. Miller responded the ALUC would be overriding it self on issues of occupancy and limitations. Commissioner Hogan indicated the Commission has from time to time moved to the consistency line on projects with project bases.

Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale called for further questions from the Commissioners, hearing no response she called for the motion to be set.

**OPPOSITION:** Commissioners Goldenbaum, Butler, Lightsey and Ballance.

**MOTION FAILED.**

Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale called for another motion to be set.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Newly Commissioner Ballance made a motion of inconsistency. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion.

**OPPOSITION:** Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale and Commissioner Hogan

G. MA-05-120 – Roy Furuto – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-05-120 - Furto Rubio Associates  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO:** Design Review P05-0736

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*Two office /warehouse buildings consisting of 45,700 sq. ft. on 2.5 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at 2080 and 2180 Mt. Baldy Drive, west of Sycamore Canyon Blvd. Within the City of Riverside, approximately 10,000-11,000 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*  
c. *Noise Levels: See Below*

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

*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 March Air Reserve Base*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 10,000 -11,000 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is under a major approach and departure track. The proposal consists of two industrial buildings totaling 47,500 sq. ft. on 2.5 acres. Specific information on the type of industrial uses at the facility is currently unknown except that it would be manufacturing or warehouse. The 1984 RCALUP places an emphasis upon the type of airport, type of aircraft expected to use the airport, planned and existing approach profiles, actual flight tracks, noise levels, or a combination of these factors. The site is located in Area I. Area I allow industrial uses but prohibit certain high-risk land uses. Those uses are listed in the attached Appendix B to the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan.*

Density and Coverage: The area of the proposed structures is 47,500 sq. ft., which is less than 43% of the area. There are 103 parking spaces provided on the project which could result in 57 people per acre or using the UBC it could result in 48/acre gross.

Part 77: The highest elevation on the proposed site is 1,547 MSL feet and the height of the tallest building is approximately 26 ft. The runway elevation at the north end is 1,535 MSL. In order to be an obstruction, a structure would need to exceed 1,645 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 (951-656-7000).
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any office portions of the building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
3. 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. The High Risk Land Uses listed on attached Appendix B shall not be allowed.

H. MA-05-122 – Robert Wales – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** MA-05-122 – Robert Wales  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:** Change of Zone from R-1-65 to R-3

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*A Change of Zone from Single Family to for Multiple family on 3.64 acres.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located north of Central Ave. and east of Canyon Crest, within the City of Riverside, approximately 27,500 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 III*
- c. Noise Levels: See Below*

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

*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.*

*We utilize four resources for our review:*

- 1. The RCALUP: 1984 with Interim boundaries for March Air Force Base: 1986*
- 2. The current CalTrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook: 2002*
- 3. Draft ALUCP for Riverside County: 2004*
- 4. Noise Data from the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone Study: 1998 March Air Reserve Base*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 27,500 feet northwest of Runway 14-32. The proposal is for a change of zone from R-1-65 to R-3. The existing site is vacant. The proposal is within the outer horizontal surface. The current generalized flight tracks are described in the AICUZ report and are on Exhibit B.*

*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 III, which allows commercial, residential, industrial and agriculture a contingent upon noise and height issues.

Density and Coverage:

Part 77: The elevation at the site is approximately 1,197 MSL feet. The height of the proposed structure is approximately 28 ft. Any structures over 1,810 MSL feet in elevation will require an FAA 7460 review. 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 less than 55 CNEL, but previous AICUZ indicated higher noise levels. The site will received over flight of some annoyance.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Prior to project development or sale to an entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act, the project proponents shall convey an avigation easement to the MARB/MIP Airport (Tel. 951- 656-7000).
2. 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.
3. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into the building construction to insure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.
4. The attached Notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.

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

**RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT**

**9:00 A.M.**

- I. RI-05-121 – Cal Baptist University – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-05-121-Cal Baptist University  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**



*Minor CUP for Upgrades to Athletic Fields at a University Campus.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located at 8432 Magnolia Avenue, within the City of Riverside, approximately 4,500 ft. south of Runway 9-27 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport  
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone E  
b. Noise Levels: Outside 60 CNEL*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

*Land Use: The proposed site is located approximately 4,500 ft. south of the east end of Runway 9-27. The site is located within Zone E of the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The proposal is for upgrades to athletic fields at a university campus. Zone E has no density requirements. The proposed use is consistent with the plan.*

*Part 77: The highest elevation on the site is 883 MSL. The site is under the horizontal (966 MSL) at this location. The elevation at the west end of Runway 9-27 is 816 MSL. Any structure over 861 MSL at this location would need an FAA 7460 review.*

*Noise: The site is outside of the 60 CNEL contour for the airport and will experience some annoyance from overflying aircraft. The proposed use is an acceptable use.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** *That the ALUC find the project Consistent with the ALUCP for the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, subject to the conditions outlined below.*

**CONDITIONS:**

- 1. Provide Avigation Easements/Deed Notices to Riverside Municipal Airport (951-351-6113).*
- 2. The attached Notice regarding Proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser or lessee.*
- 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. Structures exceeding 861 MSL in elevation shall be submitted to the FAA for a 7460-1 review.

J. RI-05-122 – Ruhnau, Ruhnau, Clarke – Consent item see page 2

**CASE NUMBER:** RI-05-122-Ruhnau, Ruhnau, Clarke  
**APPROVING JURISDICTION:** City of Riverside  
**JURISDICTION CASE NO.:**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

*Design Review for a Corporate Office and Distribution Facility.*

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

*The site is located on Wilderness Avenue, South of Jurupa Avenue, within the City of Riverside, approximately 1,500 ft. north of Runway 16-34 at the Riverside Municipal Airport.*

*Adjacent Airport: Riverside Municipal Airport  
a. Airport Influence Area: Zone C  
b. Noise Levels: At or near 60 CNEL*

**MAJOR ISSUES:**

Land Use: *The proposed site is located approximately 1,500 ft. north of the north end Runway 16-34 and 2,000 ft. north of Runway 9-27. The site is located within the Zone C of the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The proposal is for a corporate office and distribution facility. Zone C allows a maximum average density of 75 persons per acre (or 150 per any single acre) and allows up to 80% lot coverage. The maximum number of persons proposed on the site is 30. The proposed density and lot coverage is consistent with the plan.*

Part 77: *The highest elevation on the site is 817 MSL and the maximum structure height is approximately 30 feet. The site is under the horizontal surface (966 MSL) at this location. The elevation of Runway 16-34 is 774 MSL and the elevation of Runway 9-27 is 762 MSL. Any structure over 789 MSL at this location would need an FAA 7460 review.*

Noise: *The site is at or near the 60 CNEL contour for the airport and will experience significant annoyance from overflying aircraft. The proposed use is an acceptable use with the appropriate mitigation for noise.*

**RECOMMENDATION:** *That the ALUC find the project Consistent with the ALUCP for the Riverside Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, subject to the conditions outlined below.*

**CONDITIONS:**

1. *Provide Avigation Easements/Deed Notices to Riverside Municipal Airport (951-351-6113).*
2. *The attached Notice regarding Proximity to the airport shall be given to each potential purchaser or lessee.*
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. *Structures exceeding 789 MSL in elevation shall be submitted to the FAA for a 7460-1 review.*

## VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

### A. ALUCP Update

Beverly Coleman indicated Keith Downs met with San Bernardino County in regards to the Chino airport and the status for the airport has not changed.

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

Beverly Coleman indicated a presentation will be given by Ken Brody, Mead & Hunt at the September hearing.

### C. Rules for ALUC Administrative Review

Beverly Coleman indicated changes need to be made and staff would like to establish some guideline with the Commission as to what type of situation would be included in the administrative process to allow staff to review administratively. A new application form has been generated that allows staff to provide recommendations with limited comments. The form has been distributed to County Planning and the City of Riverside and is currently being used as the new ALUC application for review. The current form will eventually replace the staff report in the near future making it more like bullet points rather than narrative.

VIII. ORAL COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA.  
NONE

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Commissioner Hogan indicated having the privilege of being an alternate for Sam Pratt who is resigning effective September 1<sup>st</sup>, unless he is reappointed as an alternate by Charles Washington this would be the last meeting he would be attending.

Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale indicated she would not be attending the next scheduled hearing for September 15<sup>th</sup> and would provide an alternate.

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).

B.T. Miller continued the session to the next scheduled meeting.

XI. ADJOURNMENT: Vice Chairman Van Ardsdale adjourned the meeting at 10:30 a.m.  
NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: September 15, 2005 at 9:00 a.m.,  
Riverside.