

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

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

Thursday, April 13, 2006
9:00 A.M.

MINUTES

A regular scheduled meeting of the Airport Land Use Commission was held on April 13, 2006 at the Riverside County Administration Center, Board Chambers.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Simon Housman, Chairman
Charles Washington
Mark Lightsey
Jon Goldenbaum
Arthur Butler

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Rod Ballance
Melanie Fesmire

STAFF PRESENT: John J. G. Guerin, Senior Planner
B.T. Miller, Legal Counsel
Barbara Santos, Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Brad Adams – Whitewater Energy Corp
Grant Bascom – GMID Architecture
Victor Borcheros- Church of Jesus Christ
Ken Brody – Mead and Hunt
John Corella – Mirasera
William Dieterle – Property Owner
Leo Garcia – Church of Jesus Christ
Michael Harrod – Riverside County Planning Dept
Gary Levinski – Pacific Pointe Partners, Inc.
John D. Lyon – Flabob Airport
Mike Massaro – Pacific Pointe Partners
Gary Miller – GMID – Architecture
Kenneth Steele – Land Owner
Steve Tancredi – Mastercraft Development
Gabriel Ybarra

- I. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairman Housman.
- II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG
- III. ROLL CALL was taken
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR: February 9, 2006

Chairman Simon Housman made a change in the February 9, minutes on page 11 under ACTION TAKEN. Parcel for the Mirasera Project should read 16.0 replacing 16.3 and 9.3 replacing 7.8.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Arthur Butler made a motion to approve the February 9, 2006 minutes. Commissioner Mark Lightsey seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

- V. OLD BUSINESS

RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

- A. RG-05-103 ALUC – An Amendment to the ALUCP – The proposed change would utilize net acreage rather than gross acreage as the basis on which compliance with the high density option in Zone “D” is measured. Riverside, Palm Springs and Jacqueline Airport. (Continued from March 9, 2006, February 9, 2006, January 12, 2006, December 2005)

CASE NUMBER: RG-05-103 and RI-05-141, TH-05-103 and PS-05-100

APPROVING JURISDICTION: Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

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

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that; 1) The ALUC continue to take testimony from the jurisdictions and the public for Riverside,

Jacqueline and Palm Springs airports, leave open and continue those airports until the next meeting of April 13, 2006.

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

Addendum: February 9: At the last meeting the County requested a continuation until this meeting in order to return with a more comprehensive proposal for the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport ALUCP. Since this case is only to adjust the Zone D density, plan, any other proposal will necessitate a separate and newly advertised item. These could then be joined prior to the end of the year for the singular allowed change. Any proposal from any airport or local jurisdiction must use the current Airport Land Use Planning Handbook for guidance.

Addendum: March 9: These were continued to this meeting in order to allow more time for any companion proposed changes.

Addendum: April 13: Again, this item was continued so that allows any other changes for these airports to be considered this calendar year. This language is proposed to be added to the Chino proposal which is on a separate hearing today.

Exhibit A: Amendment to ALUCP

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ron Goldman Assistant Planning Director indicated as of March 30, 2006 the ALUC will be transferred from the Economic Development Agency to the Planning Department due to the retirement of Keith Downs. John Guerin will now be handling all ALUC functions.

John Guerin came forward indicating staff would like the commission to consider adopting plan for the Palm Springs Airport. Staff recommended Riverside and Jacqueline Cochran Airport be continued to next month.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum made a motion to continue all 3 airports (Riverside, Palm Springs and Jacqueline Airport) for one month. Seconded by Commissioner Mark Lightsey. Approved unanimously.

FLABOB AIRPORT

- B. FL-06-100 Mastercraft Development – Tract 31503, Change of Zone 6921 and GPA 00688 for 85 lots on 40.1 acres, west of Loring Ranch Road and south of Capary Road, within the County of Riverside. (Continued from March 9, 2006)

CASE NUMBER:	<u>FL-06-100 – Loring Ranch (Revised)</u>
APPROVING JURISDICTION:	County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.:	TM 3150, Change of Zone 6921 and GPA 00688

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Tract Map for subdivision of 85 (was 93) lots on 41 (was 39.3) acres ranging in size from 5,000 to 12,284 (was 135,000) sq. ft. and General Plan Amendment from EDR (2-5) to MHDR (5-8) and Change of Zone.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of Inconsistency for the project, but recommends a CONTINUANCE in order to obtain comments from the airport operator.

ADDENDUM April 13: The applicant requested a continuance in order to provide additional information for the project and to obtain comments from the airport operator. The applicant and Flabob airport have come to some agreement and their letter is attached. Due consideration should be given to their request for special conditions. The item was readvertised to include the Change of Zone that was not included in the last submittal.

John Guerin came forward presenting staff report, exhibits and recommended finding the project consistent under special conditions.

John Lyon Corporate Secretary from Flabob Airport came forward presenting exhibits, 3.3.6 special conditions, development charts, hangar layouts, noise determination and handed out drafted proposed findings for the commission.

B.T. Miller indicated that a change in GPA needs special attention and what ever motion the commissioners implement Mr. Miller would like to review the proposed findings.

Chairman Housman would like the item continued so staff can further review the proposed resolutions presented by the applicant.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum made a motion recommending that staff develop resolutions that are consistent with the proposal of April 13, 2006. Commissioner Arthur Butler seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

BERMUDA DUNES AIRPORT

- C. BD-06-100 – Marsha Vincelette – Plot Plan 21072 for 90,000 sq. ft. office building, at 38752 El Cerrito Road, within the County of Riverside. (Continued from March 9, 2006)

CASE NUMBER: BD-06-100 – Marsha Vincelette

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Plot Plan 21072

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Plot Plan for an office building totaling 90,000 sq. ft. on 4.68 acres.

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

ADDENDUM April 13: The application was continued at the request of the applicant. Staff met with the applicant.

John Guerin came forward presenting staff report and charts and recommended that the item be continued to next month.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Charles Washington made a motion of continuance. Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

- D. BD-06-101 GMID Architecture – Plot Plan 21408 for a church east of Washington Street and north of 41st Avenue, within the County of Riverside. (Continued from March 9, 2006)

CASE NUMBER: BD-06-101 – GMID Architecture
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO.: Plot Plan 21408

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is a Plot Plan for a church consisting of one building totaling 16,558 sq. ft. on 4.36 acres net (5.41 gross).

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

ADDENDUM April 13: The applicant requested continuance to the next meeting. Staff met with the applicant and they supplied additional information that indicates the gross size of the parcel to be 5.41 acres, which changes the overall density to 63/acre, but retains the single acre density of 312-338.

John Guerin presented staff report, charts and recommended inconsistency but would not object for a continuance for more information.

Chairman Housman would like staff to contact airport operator regarding land use and how it affects the airport. If we are going to address a finding of consistency based on exceptions, Mr. Housman would like staff to look at the 3.3.1 infill process and 3.3.6. If exceptions apply, Mr. Housman would like staff to return with the findings.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Charles Washington made a motion to continue to next month. Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

- E. BD-05-118 – Mirasera – Specific Plan 338, EIR, General Plan Amendment, and Change of Zone for 545,300 square feet of commercial/office and 1,764 residential units on 189.8 acres, north of Varner Road, south of 38th Avenue within the County of Riverside. (Continued from March 9, 2006, February 9, 2006, January 12, 2006)

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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

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

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a CONTINUANCE to the next hearing date (April 13, 2006) in order to: 1) Obtain a corrected text of the Change of Zone, 2) Obtain comments from the airport manager, 3) Obtain comments from Caltrans Aeronautics, 4) Have the specific plan address the RNAV GPS 10 approach, 5) Obtain a more complete Specific Plan document including more detailed mitigation measures and direct staff.

SECTIONS TO READ: Comment

Introduction and Summary: ALL

Section 1.4 ALUC review not an approval

Section 3.0 Absent

- Section 4.2 Development Standards
- Section 4.6 Open Space does it meet standards of 4.2.4 of ALUCP
- Section 4.1.8 RCALUC compatibility. Attempts to meet Special Condition of ALUCP 3.3.6 (see attached Exhibit C)
- Section 5.3.10 Noise
- Section 5.1.11.2.3 Page 5.257 at 6,550 people differs from application page number of 10,569
- Section 5.3.14.2 Page 5.290-307 Existing Condition relating to airport(Good Description)
- Section 6.0 RCALUCP not referenced
- Section 8.399 RCALUC not referenced

ADDENDUM: February 9, 2006: We have since the hearing received a response from Caltrans Aeronautics and it is attached. Staff met with the project proponent on January 24 and as of February 1 has not received any additional information.

ADDENDUM: February 8, additional material was received February 2 and sent to the Commissioners. These are portion supplementing the original document that was distributed for the January meeting. Staff has discussions with Bermuda Dunes Airport and their letter is attached. Staff attempted in the little time available to put together some findings regarding the proposal, but a fully assembled document from the applicant is not available at this time.

Staff has discussed with the applicant that any document such as an avigation easement/and deed notice be recorded at the time that the local jurisdiction receives approval for the specific plan and not at later times when the project may be sold or fractured.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Commission should duly consider all the factors in the proposal and if it decides to find the normally incompatible use acceptable then make specific findings regarding the project.

ADDENDUM: March 9, 2006: At the last meeting the Commission reviewed the proposal and found that two areas of the project could be consistent, but that one was inconsistent with the ALUCP. The applicant has modified the proposal and submitted newer maps and calculations of

the densities and they are attached. Due to the very short time staff has not been able to review those charts at this time. More information should be available by the hearing date.

ADDENDUM #2: March 8, 2006: If the proposed changes are acceptable, staff recommends that the Commission tentatively find the project consistent with special conditions and: 1) Leave the hearing open and continue the case to the next hearing on April 13, 2) Send a letter to the County so indicating that direction and ask staff 3) To prepare findings and conditions for the next hearing. This assumes a complete adjusted document with the changes will be available at that time.

ADDENDUM: April 13, 2006: At the last meeting the Commission directed staff to send a letter to the County indicating that the Commission would find the revised proposal acceptable and continued the item to receive a complete updated version of the plan. As of March 29 we have not received the update. The item should be continued until we do.

John Guerin came forward recommending continuance

John Corella (Mirasera) came forward indicating that they made all modification adjustments and are complete. Mr. Corella is requesting to move forward and get a finding of conformance, but would not object to a continuance.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Charles Washington motioned to continue case. Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

THERMAL AIRPORT

- F. TH-06-102 – Kohl Ranch – Specific Plan Amendment SP 303 A-2 for various changes on 2,172 acres, west of Polk Street, east of Harrison (Continued from March 9, 2006)

CASE NUMBER: TH-06-102 - Kohl Ranch
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: SP 00303A2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A Specific Plan Amendment for various changes to the Kohl Ranch Specific Plan (see attached description).

RECOMMENDATION: At this time staff recommends a finding of Inconsistency due to the density not meeting the current requirements of Zone D.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Charles Washington motioned to continue case. Commissioner Mark Lightsey seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

- G. TH-06-103 – Kohl Ranch – Tract Map 33487 for 883 lots on 279 acres with lake and recreation center, east of Tyler Street and south of 64th Avenue, within the County of Riverside. (Continued from March 9, 2006)

CASE NUMBER: TH-06-103 - Kohl Ranch
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Tract 33487

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A tract map for 883 lots with a 22 acre man made lake with open space, a recreation center on a 279 acre site.

RECOMMENDATION: At this time staff recommends a continuance to April 13, 2006 at the request of the applicant.

ADDENDUM April 13, 2006: The item was continued at the request of the applicant. Without the amendment to Zone D the project is INCONSISTENT.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Charles Washington motioned to continue case. Commissioner Mark Lightsey seconded the motion. Approved unanimously.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

REGIONAL

- A. CH-06-101, RG-06-100, Chino Airport – Airport Land Use (ALU) Compatibility Plan The Airport Land Use (ALU) Compatibility Plan will update and revise noise and safety compatibility criteria used by the ALUC in reviewing proposed land use actions near airports in Riverside County as indicated on the attached map. These criteria may include restrictions on the heights of structures, limitations on the intensity of new land use development, requirements for sound insulation in new buildings, and establishment of real estate disclosure policies addressing aircraft over flights. The (ALU) Compatibility Plan is concerned only with proposed new development and has no authority over existing land uses.

CASE NUMBER: RG-06-100 and CH-06-101 Chino Airport

APPROVING JURISDICTION: Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

An update to the 2004 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for Chino Airport. Jurisdictions affected are: The County of Riverside and any special districts within that Influence Area.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that; 1) The ALUC take testimony from the jurisdictions and the public, 2) Close the hearing or continue to hold the hearing open, and continue the proposal until the next meeting of May 11, 2006 and 3) Direct staff and the consultant to review any responses and to respond to those comments, and prepare a Resolution for adoption. Staff also recommends that the Change to Zone D be included for Chino Airport.

Ken Brody presented exhibits and maps and requested staff prepare a resolution to adopt Chino.

Mike Harrod, Riverside County Planning Department, came forward requesting that the Commission make a finding that the County's General Plan is consistent with the Chino Plan.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum motioned to continue case so staff can prepare an amended resolution to adopt the Chino Plan next month. Seconded by Commissioner Mark Lightsey. Approved unanimously.

PALM SPRINGS AIRPORT (AREA)

- B. PS-06-100 – Wind Energy Partnership – For two 411 ft. high wind turbines and Change of Zone from W-2 to W-E north of I-10 and west of SR 62, within the County of Riverside.

CASE NUMBER: PS-06-100 – Wind Energy Partnership

APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside

JURISDICTION CASE NO: Commercial WECS Permit No. 115 (WCS00115), Change of Zone Case No. 7251 (CZ07251), and Variance Case No. 1781 (VAR01781)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Construct and operate two (2) 411-foot high wind turbines (wind energy conversion systems, a.k.a. WECS). Change of zoning from W-2 (Controlled Development Areas) to W-E (Wind Energy Resource Zone). Variance to permit WECS to exceed maximum height of 400 feet.

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

CONDITIONS:

1. Each of the two WECS shall be marked and/or lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1 K, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, a med-dual system – Chapters 4, 8 (Med-Dual), and 12.
2. Within five (5) days after the construction reaches its greatest height, FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, shall be completed by the project proponent or his/her designee and submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration Air Traffic Airspace Branch, ASW-520, 2601 Meacham Blvd., Fort Worth TX 76137-0520.
3. The specific coordinates, heights, and power shall not be amended without further review by the Airport Land Use Commission and the Federal Aviation Administration; provided, however, that reduction in height shall not require further review by the Airport Land Use Commission.
4. Temporary construction equipment used during actual construction of the structure shall not exceed the height of the proposed structure.
5. The proposed WECS shall not generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
6. Other than FAA-approved lighting and marking as specified above, no lighting shall be installed that would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with aircraft operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb during takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport.
7. Rotor blades shall utilize a flat or matte (non-glossy) finish so as to

minimize the reflection of sunlight towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb during takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport.

8. The WECS and any accessory uses shall not generate smoke or water vapor and shall be designed so as not to attract large concentrations of birds.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Mark Lightsey made a motion to approve consent agenda for Item VI. B. PS-06-100 and Item VI. D. MA-06-107. Seconded by Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum. Approved unanimously.

FRENCH VALLEY AIRPORT

- C. FV-06-106 – Pointe Murrieta Partners – Plot Plan 21352 and Parcel Map 34461 for 170,000 square ft. of commercial/service industrial buildings, west of Town View Avenue, north of Murrieta Hot Springs Road, within the County of Riverside.

CASE NUMBER: FV-06-106 – Pointe Murrieta Partners, LLC
APPROVING JURISDICTION: County of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Plot Plan No. 21352 (PP21352)/Parcel Map No. 33461 (PM 33461)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Development of 13.28 net acres (15.65 gross acres including adjoining street half-widths) as a light industrial business park comprised of approximately 170,000 square feet of floor area in a total of nineteen (19) buildings, and divide the property into six commercial/industrial parcels.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of inconsistency for this project as presently designed, but would be amenable to a continuance to allow for redesign or for further elaboration that would indicate that the one person per 500 square feet standard is appropriate for the “all other” space in the multi-tenant, service industrial, and showroom industrial buildings. Alternatively, the applicant may wish to consider a continuance for not less than 60 days to allow consideration following consideration of the County’s proposal for amendments to the allowable nonresidential intensities in Airport Zones B1 and C. In the event that the Commission chooses to find this proposal consistent with the ALUCP pursuant to Policy 3.3.6, or in the event that the Commission finds the proposal inconsistent with the French Valley ALUCP but is overruled by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors or its successor-in-interest, staff would recommend that the following conditions be applied:

John Guerin came forward with staff recommendations of Inconsistency as presently designed, but indicated that staff would be amenable to a continuance.

B. T. Miller of County Counsel advised of concerns regarding the wording of conditions relating to review of occupancy permit requests following ALUC actions, noting that this function should be undertaken by the applicable regulatory jurisdiction in this case, the County.

Gary Levinski of Pacific Pointe Partners came forward in agreement with continuance to allow for further study.

Mike Massaro from Pacific Pointe Partners came forward indicating he would like both Planning and ALUC in agreement .

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Charles Washington motioned to continue case. Seconded by Commissioner Mark Lightsey. Approved unanimously.

MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE

- D. MA-06-107 – Murrieta Madison – A Design Review for 261,000 square ft. of commercial buildings, south of Nuevo Road, east of Murrieta Road, within the City of Perris.

CASE NUMBER: MA-06-107 Murrieta Madison
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Perris
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Design Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Design Review for 61,330 sq. ft. of a mixed-use commercial retail on 9.3 acres.

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

CONDITIONS:

1. Provide Avigation Easements/Deed Notice to March ARB/MIP prior to any permits being issued or sale to any entity exempt from the Subdivision Map Act. (951) 656-7000
2. Incorporate noise attenuation measures into any office portions of the

building construction to ensure interior noise levels are at or below 45-decibel levels.

3. Install hooded or shielded outdoor lighting measures to assure that no lights are above the horizontal plane.
4. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
 - b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
 - c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor, or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
 - d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
5. The attached notice shall be given to all prospective buyers or tenants.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Mark Lightsey made a motion to approve consent agenda for Item VI. B. PS-06-100 and Item VI. D. MA-06-107. Seconded by Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum. Approved unanimously.

- E. MA-06-108 – Murrieta Madison – A senior residential facility for 433 units on 19.5 acres, south of Nuevo Road and east of Murrieta Road, within the City of Perris.

CASE NUMBER:	<u>MA-06-108 Murrieta Madison</u>
APPROVING JURISDICTION:	City of Perris
JURISDICTION CASE NO:	Design Review

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A Design Review for 433 residential units on 19.5 acres.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of Inconsistency for the project.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Mark Lightsey made a motion of Inconsistency. Seconded by Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum. Approved unanimously.

- F. MA-06-110 – Perris Investments – General Plan Amendment and Change of Zone from R-14,000 to MFR-14 west of Perris Blvd., north of Orange Avenue within the City of Perris.

CASE NUMBER: MA-06-110 Perris 15 Investments
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Perris
JURISDICTION CASE NO: Change of Zone and GPA

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

A General Plan Amendment and Change of Zone from Commercial to MFR 14 on 15 acres.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends a finding of Inconsistency for the project.

Kenneth Steele came forward in opposition to project.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Charles Washington made a motion of Inconsistency. Seconded by Commissioner Jon Goldenbaum. Approved unanimously.

RIVERSIDE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

- G. RI-06-104- Action Surveys – P04-0914 for 113,844 square ft. of office/warehouse on 8.21 acres south of Central Avenue and west of Essex Street, within the City of Riverside.

CASE NUMBER: RI-06-104 – Action Surveys
APPROVING JURISDICTION: City of Riverside
JURISDICTION CASE NO: P-04-0914

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends Continuance to the meeting of May 11, 2006 to allow for possible redesign that may include reduction in the number of parking spaces, modifications to structural layout to move Building C farther from the runway and to provide open area and to allow additional time for staff to address whether the structures may constitute obstructions requiring aeronautical review by the Federal Aviation Administration and to receive comments from the Riverside Municipal Airport manager. (Staff will endeavor to resolve the latter concerns between the date of this staff report and the April 13 meeting.) At this time, the project exceeds maximum allowable intensity levels in Airport Zone B1 based only on the number of parking spaces provided, an issue that can be addressed by the applicant simply by deleting parking spaces. In the event that the Commission chooses to find this proposal consistent with the ALUCP based on the use of the Building Code method, or in the event that the Commission finds the proposal inconsistent with the Riverside Municipal Airport ALUCP but is overruled by the Riverside City Council, staff would recommend that the following conditions be applied:

John Guerin came forward and recommended a continuance to May 11, 2006.

Gabriel Ybarra came forward requesting to work with staff for project requirements and to answer any questions Commission may have.

William Dieterle, property owner, came forward indicating he is willing to work with staff.

Commissioners commented on the open area and extended runway centerline issues.

Chairman Housman requested a continuance for: a) A change in the proposed conditions on the override, b) Part 77 FAA and c) The open space issue.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Charles Washington motioned to continue case. Seconded by Commissioner Mark Lightsey. Approved unanimously.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

AGENDA ITEM: VII. A.

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

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

RECOMMENDATION: Continue to follow the progress with updates at each meeting. The schedule and procedure assumes that the ALUC will be last to review the plan. It is unclear whether some of the concerns expressed in the previous letters to the agency will be cleared up by that time.

AGENDA ITEM: VII. B.

SUMMARY: ALUCP Update

RECOMMENDATION: Information only

AGENDA ITEM VII. C.

SUMMARY: Stipend for Commissioners

RECOMMENDATION: The Commission requested staff including counsel to investigate the possibilities of reinstating the stipend. This will need to be continued, since it will require more research to respond.

AGENDA ITEM: VII. D.

SUMMARY: County Request for changes to plan

CASE SUMMARY: County request for amendments to FVALUCP and JCRA

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: County letters, French Valley January 21 plan and March 9 regarding Jacqueline Cochran Regional plan requesting amendments to adopted plan.

Recommendation: That the Commission rejects the proposals to add residential in the approach and Departure Zone C and continue the request until the County has identified funds to process the balance of the request.

Attachments: January 21, letter FVAP
March 9 letter regarding JCRA
Board of Supervisors Minute order for July 28, 2005

AGENDA ITEM: VII. E.

SUMMARY: Wildlife attractant mitigation study for Coachella Valley airports.

RECOMMENDATION: Status Report only.

AGENDA ITEM: VII. G.

SUMMARY: Commissioner Resume on Website

BACKGROUND: Commissioner's Résumés have been on the website since inception. There are various styles and lengths. If the new Commissioners' would like theirs on please submit one. If you include your telephone number it will be their.

RECOMMENDATOION: Submit any information you wish

ACTION TAKEN: Chairman Housman made a motion to pass on the Administrative Items until the next meeting due to the late hour. Approved unanimously.

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

NONE

IX. COMMISIONER'S COMMENTS

Commissioner Charles Washington informed the commission that he was absent on March 9, 2006 due to attending jury duty. Mr. Washington will not be present for next months meeting on May 11th, but will appoint an alternate.

Commissioners vote on new officers next month.

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

Continue to the next hearing date on May 11, 2006

XI. ADJOURNMENT: Commissioner Charles Washington adjourned the meeting at 12:30 p.m., seconded by Commissioner Mark Lightsey. Approved unanimously.

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING: May 11, 2006 at 9:00 a.m., Riverside.