

***REVISED 12/15/10***



**SAN DIEGO COUNTY  
REGIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY  
Airport Land Use Commission  
STAFF REPORT**

**Item No.**

**1**

**Meeting Date: DECEMBER 20, 2010**

**Subject:**

**Adoption of an Amendment to the Brown Field Municipal Airport - Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and Addendum to the Previously Adopted Negative Declaration**

**Recommendation:**

Adopt Resolution No. 2010-0057 ALUC, approving an amendment to the Brown Field Municipal Airport Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and adopting an Addendum to the Previously Adopted Negative Declaration for the Brown Field Municipal Airport Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and/or other appropriate action as determined by the ALUC.

**Background/Justification:**

The Airport Authority was designated as the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for San Diego County, effective January 1, 2003 (Pub. Util. Code §21670.3(a)). Acting in its capacity as the ALUC, the Airport Authority is required to prepare and adopt an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for each of the public use and military airports within its jurisdiction (Pub. Util. Code §21674(c)).

The purpose of the proposed ALUCP is to protect the public health, safety and welfare by ensuring the orderly expansion of airports and the adoption of land use policies that minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards within areas around airports located in the county that are not already devoted to incompatible land uses (Pub. Util. Code §21674).

In accordance with this mandate, the ALUC adopted an ALUCP for Brown Field Municipal Airport at a special meeting on January 25, 2010. This ALUCP replaced one adopted in 1981 as a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) in its predecessor role as the ALUC. In 2004, the Airport Authority, acting as the ALUC, made minor technical revisions to the CLUP and renamed the CLUP an ALUCP, consistent with revisions to State law.

C00001

Since the adoption of the Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP on January 25, 2010, ALUC staff, as well as staff at affected local agencies, have encountered processing issues when applying the ALUCP to land use projects requiring consistency determination review.

At the November 4, 2010 meeting, the ALUC directed ALUC staff to pursue several proposed revisions to the ALUCP and bring a proposed amendment reflecting these revisions to the ALUC for consideration at its next meeting. ALUC staff has accordingly prepared an amendment to the ALUCP which revises the affected policies for ALUC consideration. It is important to note that amending the Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP before the end of 2010 will preserve the opportunity to amend the ALUCP in 2011. The ALUC is restricted to amending an ALUCP only once per calendar year (Pub. Util. Code §21675(a)).

As part of preparing the amendment, ALUC staff hosted a meeting on November 9, 2010, with staff from the affected local agencies to inform them about the proposed revisions to the ALUCP and solicit their input to the revisions. Written comments were received from the City of San Diego and are noted below. An additional meeting was held on December 9, 2010 with City of San Diego Development Services staff to discuss the proposed amendments as they relate to the City's draft implementation plan. The discussion resulted in City staff expressing no ongoing concerns with the proposed amendments.

**Policy Issues and Staff Recommendations:**

**1. Revise the Regional Shopping Center and Community/Neighborhood Shopping Center categories in the safety matrix so that they better correspond to the policy language already included in the ALUCP.**

Regional Shopping Centers and Community/Neighborhood Shopping Centers are currently written as if eating/drinking establishments are a required component in the safety matrix.

*Staff Recommendation:*

The proposed amendment would change the matrix so that eating and drinking establishments may or may not be a part of shopping centers.

Use	Category	Height	Area	Volume	Other	Notes
Regional Shopping Centers ≥300,000 s.f. with mixture of uses <del>that could include</del> eating/drinking establishments [approx. 110 s.f./person]	M	A 0.18	0.33 0.66	0.33 0.66	0.51 1.01	2 - 5: FAR limits as indicated 2, 5: No room with capacity ≥300 people allowed; auto parking preferred See Policy 3.4.5(f)(1)
Community/Neighborhood Shopping Centers <300,000 s.f. with mixture of uses <del>that could include</del> eating/drinking establishments [approx. 120 s.f./person]	M	A 0.19	0.36 0.72	0.36 0.72	0.55 1.10	2 - 5: FAR limits as indicated 2: Max. 10% of floor area or 3,000 s.f., whichever is less, devoted to eating/ drinking uses 2, 5: No room with capacity ≥300 people allowed; auto parking preferred See Policy 3.4.5(f)(2)

**Local Agency Comment:**

The City of San Diego staff has not expressed any ongoing concerns regarding this amendment. MCAS Miramar supports this change.

2. Clarify that existing nonconforming uses would be allowed to make alterations to comply with life safety code upgrades, including accessibility requirements, without having to upgrade the entire site to reach conformity.

The ALUCP does not allow for any increase in FAR or height for nonconforming structures under any circumstances, including upgrades to structures in order to comply with life safety requirements (e.g., ADA accessibility such as elevators).

**Staff Recommendation:**

ALUC staff proposes to modify the language to permit changes for life safety code upgrades or accessibility requirements that would still allow the uses to retain nonconforming status, provided that any necessary height increase would not be deemed a hazard by the FAA. Policy language would clarify that such upgrades can only be made for that purpose and only to the extent necessary. These revisions would still allow the nonconforming uses to retain nonconforming status from an ALUC perspective.

2.11.2 *Nonconforming Uses:* Existing uses (including a parcel or building) not in conformance with this *Compatibility Plan* are subject to the following restrictions:

- (d) *ALUC review* is required for any proposed expansion of a *nonconforming use* that would increase the ~~site size, the floor area of the structure, the number of dwelling units,~~ increase the number of people on the site for nonresidential uses, or increase the height of the structure such that it would be deemed a hazard by the FAA.

**Local Agency Comment:**

The City of San Diego recommended changes to this amendment in a memo dated December 1, 2010. ALUC staff concurs with their changes. No other local agencies have any issues with this proposal.

**3. Quantify ancillary uses to be consistent with other local agencies' definition.**

The ALUCP defines an ancillary use, when proposed as part of a mixed-use project, as occupying no more than 10 percent of the floor area of a given project. Other local agencies use anywhere from 10 to 49 percent as a figure for such uses, alternatively called accessory uses by some agencies.

*Staff Recommendation:*

**ALUC staff proposes to remove this element from consideration due to variations in how local agencies define and quantify ancillary use.**

*Local Agency Comment:*

The City of San Diego staff supports removing this amendment from consideration.

**4. Clarify the method of calculating maximum use of a site for projects with a mixture of nonresidential uses.**

The ALUCP, as adopted, requires projects with a mixture of nonresidential uses to calculate its floor area ratio (FAR) for each component use as a proportionate share of the entire project site area. Such calculations do not yield meaningful maximum FARs.

*Staff Recommendation:*

The proposed revision would specify that each use would be allotted a proportionate share of that use's allowed FAR, as depicted in the Safety Matrix.

(b) Where proposed development will contain a mixture of nonresidential uses listed separately in Table III-2, each component use must comply with the applicable criteria listed in the table.

(1) The FAR for each component use shall be calculated ~~as being equal to the FAR for the total project~~ as a proportion of the FAR specified for that use. That is, each component use shall be calculated as occupying a proportionate share of the total project site equal to its proportionate share of the total floor area of the project. For example, if 70% of a project's total square footage is office and 30% is retail, the allowable FAR for the office component would be 70% of the office FAR in Table III-2 and the allowable FAR for the retail component would be 30% of the retail FAR in Table III-2. Each component use must ~~meet the~~ not exceed the proportionate FAR limit applicable to that use in order for the use to be allowed as part of the project.

*Local Agency Comment:*

The City of San Diego staff has not expressed any ongoing concerns regarding this amendment. No other local agencies have any issues with this proposal.

**5. Clarify the applicability of the ALUCPs to existing buildings that have a change in use (e.g., tenant improvements).**

Existing uses are not subject to ALUC review, but there is no guidance in the ALUCP on how new uses within existing structures are to be treated. Because tenants change often within office and commercial buildings, there should be some means of addressing the compatibility of uses while still respecting the existing structure status.

*Staff Recommendation:*

Proposed revisions to the ALUCP would treat proposed uses as "existing land uses" provided they remain within the same or reduced level of occupancy as the most recent use that occurred on site. Such a change would not require ALUC review. Changes from one occupancy to a wholly different one (e.g., a religious assembly or day care facility replacing a former retail suite) would be subject to review to ensure compatibility with applicable ALUCP compatibility factors.

2.2.18 *Existing Land Use:* A project shall be considered an "existing land use" when ~~a "vested right" is obtained, as follows:~~

(a) A "vested right" is obtained, as follows:

- (1) A vesting tentative map has been approved pursuant to California Government Code section 66498.1, and has not expired; or
- (2) A development agreement has been executed pursuant to California Government Code section 65866, and remains in effect; or
- (3) A valid building permit has been issued, substantial work has been performed, and substantial liabilities have been incurred in good faith reliance on the permit, pursuant to the California Supreme Court decision in *Avco Community Developers, Inc. v. South Coast Regional Com.* (1976) 17 Cal.3d 785,791, and its progeny.
  - (i) A proposed modification to an *existing land use* that will result in an increase in height, a change of use, or an increase in density or intensity of use that is not in substantial conformance with the *project* entitled by the *local agency* shall be subject to this *Compatibility Plan* (see Policy 2.10.4).
  - (ii) Any proposed reuse or reinitiation of an *existing land use*, even if the reuse/reinitiation of the *existing land use* will not modify the previously *existing land use*, will be subject to this *Compatibility Plan* if the previously *existing land use* has been discontinued for more than 24 months.
  - (iii) The determination of whether a *project* meets the criteria of an "existing land use" shall be made by the *local agency* and the *ALUC*.

(b) A new occupancy is proposed within an existing building, provided the new occupancy remains within the same or reduced level of occupancy as the most recent one. A new occupancy which increases intensity shall not qualify as an existing land use.

*Local Agency Comment:*

The City of San Diego staff has not expressed any ongoing concerns regarding this amendment. No other local agencies have any issues with this proposal.

**6. Clarify which projects within an AIA Review Area 2 require review.**

Review Area 2 consists of those areas within FAA airspace or overflight notification areas, but outside of all noise contours and safety zones. The ALUCP currently requires ALUC review of all projects located within Review Area 2. The ALUCPs for the rural airports and MCAS Miramar only require ALUC review of projects within Review Area 2 when certain circumstances are met, such as structures which penetrate FAA airspace or which feature glare, bright light, wildlife attractants, etc.

*Staff Recommendation:*

ALUC review of projects within Review Area 2 would only be required when certain circumstances are met (e.g., structures which penetrate FAA airspace or which feature glare, bright light, wildlife attractants, etc.). This proposed change would eliminate unessential referral to ALUC staff by local agencies of Review Area 2 projects which do not trigger any ALUCP compatibility factors or the circumstances of potential concern, as well as make the ALUCP consistent with other adopted ALUCPs.

2.6.1 *Actions that Always Require ALUC Review:* As required by state law, even if a *local agency's general plan* is consistent with the current compatibility plan, the following types of actions shall be referred to the *ALUC* for determination of consistency with this *Compatibility Plan* prior to their approval by the *local agency*:

- (a) The adoption, approval or amendment of any *general plan* (Pub. Util. Code §21676(b)) that affects lands within the *AIA* and involves:
  - (1) Noise and safety, ~~airspace protection, or overflight~~ concerns within Review Area 1; or
  - (2) Land use actions that have been determined to be a hazard by the FAA in accordance with Part 77 ~~Airspace protection or overflight concerns within Review Area 2~~ the AIA.

2.6.2 *Other Land Use Actions Subject to ALUC Review:* Other types of *land use actions* are subject to review under these circumstances:

(a) Until such time as the *ALUC* finds that a *local agency's general plan* is consistent with this *Compatibility Plan*, or the *local agency* has overruled the *ALUC's* determination of inconsistency, state law allows *ALUCs* to require that *local agencies* submit all *land use actions* involving land within an *AIA* to the *ALUC* for review (Pub. Util. Code §21676.5(a)). Only those actions that an *ALUC* elects not to review are exempt from this requirement.

(1) Within Review Area 1, all *land use actions* are subject to *ALUC* review, except as provided in Section 2.6.3.

(2) Within Review Area 2, only the following *land use actions* require *ALUC* review:

(i) Any object which has received a final notice of determination from the *FAA* that the project will constitute a hazard or obstruction to air navigation, to the extent applicable.

(ii) Any proposed object in a *High Terrain Zone* or in an area of terrain penetration to airspace surfaces which has a height greater than 35 feet above ground level.

(iii) Any project having the potential to create electrical or visual hazards to aircraft in flight, including electrical interference with radio communications or navigational signals; lighting which could be mistaken for airport lighting; glare or bright lights (including laser lights) in the eyes of pilots or aircraft using the *Airport*; certain colors of neon lights- especially red and white- that can interfere with night vision goggles; and impaired visibility near the *Airport*. The local agency should coordinate with the airport operator in making this determination.

(iv) Any project having the potential to cause an increase in the attraction of birds or other wildlife that can be hazardous to aircraft operations in the vicinity of the *Airport*. The local agency should coordinate with the airport operator in making this decision.

(3) On *Airport* property, proposed nonaviation development shall also be subject to *ALUC* review (see Section 2.2 for definition of *aviation-related use*).

~~(4)~~ Any project located in the *runway protection zone*.

*Local Agency Comment:*

The City of San Diego staff has not expressed any ongoing concerns regarding this amendment. No other local agencies have any issues with this proposal.

**7. Quantify how much change to a project is considered to be "substantive," requiring new ALUC review.**

The ALUCP does not provide sufficient detail to measure a "substantive" change to projects.

*Staff Recommendation:*

Staff proposes to use a threshold of 10 percent above the original project area or lot coverage as a measure of "substantive" change. Cumulative project changes which do not increase 10 percent or greater would not be subject to new or subsequent ALUC review. Both the City of San Diego and the County of San Diego use 10 percent as a measurement for evaluating changes to a project.

2.10.4 Subsequent Review: Even after a *project* has been found consistent or conditionally consistent with this *Compatibility Plan*, it may still need be submitted for review in later stages of the planning process if any of the following are true:

- (a) At the time of the original *ALUC* review, the project information available was only sufficient to determine consistency with compatibility criteria at a planning level of detail, not at the project design level. For example, the proposed land use designation indicated in a *general plan* may have been found consistent, but information on site layout, maximum density and intensity limits, building heights, and other such factors may not have yet been known that affect the consistency determination for a *project*.
- (b) The design of the *project* subsequently changes in a manner that affects previously considered compatibility issues and could raise questions as to the validity of the earlier finding of consistency. Proposed changes warranting a new review may include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - (1) An increase in the density of use (number of dwelling units) ~~or~~ intensity of use (more people on the site), ~~floor-area-ratio, or lot coverage;~~
  - ~~(2)~~ Any cumulative increase in the total building area or lot coverage for non-residential uses in excess of 10% of the previous project.
  - ~~(3)~~ An increase in the height of structures ~~or modification of other design features~~ which has been deemed a hazard by the FAA; and
  - ~~(4)~~ Major site design changes (such as incorporation of clustering or modifications to the configuration of open land areas proposed for the site).

*Local Agency Comment:*

The City of San Diego staff has not expressed any ongoing concerns regarding this amendment. No other local agencies have any issues with this proposal.

**8. Clarify which version of an ALUCP governs when a project with a "substantive" change comes back to ALUC for additional review.**

As currently written, the ALUCP is vague about whether the current or preceding ALUCP should apply to a project that has changed.

*Staff Recommendation:*

**ALUC staff proposes to remove this element from consideration due to lack of support by affected agencies.**

*Local Agency Comment:*

The City of San Diego staff supports removing this amendment from consideration.

**9. Clarify whether staff review alone is sufficient for projects which comply with all ALUCP consistency factors and no conditions are required.**

At present, the ALUCP requires ALUC review for all projects that are consistent with all ALUCP compatibility factors.

*Staff Recommendation:*

Eliminate the need to send projects which are consistent with all ALUCP compatibility factors to the ALUC for review, allowing staff review to suffice. This is the policy of many other California ALUCs, and staff review of consistent projects is already provided for in existing Airport Authority Policy 8.30. A list of projects found to be consistent by ALUC staff would be provided as an information item to the ALUC at each meeting.

2.6.3 *Land Use Actions Subject to Discretionary ALUC Staff Review:* ALUC staff has the authority and discretion to make a consistency determination without formal ALUC review of the project ~~until such time as the ALUC finds that a local agency's general plan is consistent with this Compatibility Plan, or the local agency has overruled the ALUC's determination of inconsistency~~ if the land use action:

~~(a) Is "compatible" with both noise and safety compatibility policies; and~~

~~(a) Involves land located within Review Area 2 of the ALE; and~~

(b) Has received a final notice of determination from the FAA that the project will not constitute a hazard or obstruction to air navigation, to the extent applicable; and

(c) Has been conditioned by the local agency to require an *overflight notification* consistent with the requirements of Policy 3.6.3, to the extent applicable.

*Local Agency Comment:*

The City of San Diego staff has not expressed any ongoing concerns regarding this amendment.

**Fiscal Impact:**

This program is funded through the Airport Planning FY11 operating budget.

**Environmental Review:**

- A. CEQA Review: In accordance with CEQA, the ALUC adopted a Negative Declaration (ND) for the Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP on January 25, 2010, pursuant to Resolution No. 2010-0004R ALUC. For the proposed amendment to the adopted Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP, an Addendum to the previously adopted ND has been prepared for ALUC consideration.

B. California Coastal Act Review: This Board action does not constitute a "development," as defined by the California Coastal Act. (Pub. Res. Code §30106)

**Equal Opportunity Program:**

Not applicable.

**Prepared by:**

KEITH WILSCHETZ  
DIRECTOR, AIRPORT PLANNING

000010



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

December 1, 2010

Chairperson Gleason and Members of the  
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Board  
P.O. Box 82776  
San Diego, CA 92138-2776

Chairperson Gleason and Members of the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Board:

Subject: Amendments to Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans for Brown Field (Item 6),  
Montgomery Field (Item 8), and MCAS Miramar (Item 10)—December 2, 2010  
ALUC Agenda

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed amendments to the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCP) for Brown Field (Item 6), Montgomery Field (Item 8), and MCAS Miramar (Item 10). We appreciate the efforts of you and your staff to try to address some of the processing issues that have been raised during the initial implementation phase. The City had previously indicated some reservations regarding the timing of these ALUCP amendments because the City's implementation plan is currently in process, and would effectively address these types of processing concerns for development projects within the City of San Diego.

In particular, Amendments #3 (ancillary uses) and #8 (subsequent review) would create additional implementation concerns and should be removed from the amendment package in accordance with the staff recommendation. Amendment #2 (Staff Report Item Nos. 6, 8, 10) also is of concern. As drafted, the proposed language would not adequately address concerns related to implementation of the existing policy for nonconforming uses. The City respectfully requests that the ALUC consider revising Amendment #2 (Item Nos. 6, 8, 10) as follows:

2.11.2 (d) ALUC review is required for any proposed expansion of a nonconforming use that would ~~increase the site size, the floor area of the structure,~~ increase the number of dwelling units, ~~or~~ increase the number of people on the site for nonresidential uses, or increase the height of the structure such that it would be deemed a hazard by the FAA. ~~The FAR and height for all nonconforming uses can be increased only to the extent~~



Development Services  
1222 First Avenue, MS 501 • San Diego, CA 92101-4155  
Tel (619) 446-5460

000011

December 1, 2010  
Chairperson Gleason and Members of the  
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Board  
Page 2

~~necessary to meet current life safety code standards (e.g. accessibility requirements).  
Such modifications must not result in an increase in height such that it would be deemed  
a hazard by the FAA.~~

As revised, the other ALUCP amendments (#1, #4, #5, #6, #7, and #9) do not appear to conflict with the City's proposed implementation plan. Thanks for the opportunity to comment and for all your staff's hard work. We look forward to engaging you and your staff in the City's effort to complete our implementation proposal for City Council and Airport Land Use Commission consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'K' followed by a long, sweeping horizontal line that ends in a small upward curve.

Kelly G. Broughton  
Development Services Director

mtf

000012



# SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY

## ALUC Communication

**Date:** December 14, 2010  
**To:** Airport Land Use Commission Members  
**From:** Angela Shafer-Payne, Vice President, Planning and Operations Division  
**Subject:** Update on Agency Comments to Proposed Urban ALUCPs Amendments

---

As part of the process for preparing possible amendments to the Urban ALUCPs, staff has been coordinating with the impacted agencies. This memo serves to provide you a recap of the coordination.

### Background

- October 18 - Authority staff met with City of San Diego Development Services representatives to discuss the proposed amendments.
- October 26 - An e-mail was sent to the agencies explaining the potential amendments and requesting their comments.
- Only two agencies, MCAS Miramar and the City of San Diego Development Services Department, provided comments. The comments are summarized below:

#### MCAS Miramar

MCAS Miramar submitted three comments, which pertain to Amendments 2, 3, and 6:

- The comment on Amendment 2 was a simple request for clarification.
- The comment regarding Amendment 3 pointed out that the city of El Cajon uses 15% as a threshold for ancillary use, as opposed to San Diego's 25% and the current Urban ALUCPs' 10% threshold.
- The comment on Amendment 6 suggested specific language that could be used in the ALUCPs to help accomplish our objective.

#### City of San Diego, Development Services Department

The comments submitted by the City of San Diego, Development Service Department, stated that they are only able to support three of the possible amendments, and only if specific changes were made. The amendments that they could support with changes are Amendments 4, 5, and 6:

- Amendment 4 could be supported if the term "mixed use" is removed.
- Amendment 5 could be supported if all references to "building code classification" are removed.

000012.1

**SUBJECT: Update on Agency Comments to Proposed Urban ALUCPs Amendments**

- Amendment 6 could be supported if there is clarification that ALUC review is only required for noise and safety concerns or for development that would be determined to be a hazard in Review Area 2.
- The comments stated that they are unable to support Amendments 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8.
- November 8 – ALUC staff transmitted a strikeout/underline draft of proposed language to all impacted local agencies.
- November 9 – ALUC staff met with impacted local agencies, including City of San Diego staff, to discuss proposed amendments.
- November 16 – City of San Diego Development Services sent an email expressing concerns over proposed amendments; ALUC staff made three attempts to follow-up with City staff.
- December 1 – City of San Diego Development Services sent a letter to the ALUC suggesting minor changes to one of the amendments and stated that the other amendments did not appear to conflict with their proposed implementation plan.
- December 2 – City of San Diego Development Services requested a continuance of the proposed amendments; ALUC directed staff to meet with City of San Diego staff to discuss City concerns.
- December 9 – Commissioner Robinson, General Counsel, and ALUC staff met with City Development Services staff to discuss proposed amendments as they relate to the City draft implementation plan. The discussion resulted in City staff expressing no ongoing concerns with the proposed amendments. Therefore, staff will present the amendments to the ALUC for deliberation at the December 20 Special ALUC Meeting.

**Potential Amendments to Urban ALUCPs**

General Counsel has also advised staff that it may be unnecessary to amend the Airport Authority policy to accomplish the objective in Amendment 9.

000012.2

Memo to the Board  
December 14, 2010  
Page 3 of 3

**SUBJECT: Update on Agency Comments to Proposed Urban ALUCPs Amendments**

Therefore, in response to both agencies' comments as well as those from General Counsel, staff has eliminated Amendments 3 and 8 from ALUC consideration on December 20. Staff also revised Amendments 4, 5, and 6 to address the City's comments.

1. Revise Regional Shopping Center categories in the safety matrix to allow optional eating/drinking establishments, and correct Safety Matrix regarding Bed and Breakfasts (Miramar ALUCP only)
2. Clarify that non-conforming uses can be upgraded for life/safety (ADA) without having to upgrade entire site to reach conformity
- ~~3. Quantify Ancillary Uses to be up to 25% of site~~
4. Clarify the methodology used to calculate Maximum Use of multiple-use projects
5. Clarify when ALUC review is required for existing buildings that have a change in use
6. Clarify that only Review Area 2 projects that have been deemed a hazard by the FAA or have other specific potentially hazardous circumstances require ALUC review
7. Quantify that a 10% increase in the use of a site is "substantive" and requires additional ALUC review
- ~~8. Clarify which version of an ALUCP governs when a changed project comes back to the ALUC~~
9. Clarify that staff review alone is sufficient for 100% consistent projects

City Staff will be present at the December 20 ALUC meeting but at the time of this writing both Authority and City staff are in agreement with the proposed amendments. If you have any questions, please contact me at Ext. 2455 or on my cell phone at 619-890-5733.

ASP/nas

000012.3

**RESOLUTION NO. 2010-0057 ALUC**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION FOR SAN DIEGO COUNTY APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE BROWN FIELD MUNICIPAL AIRPORT - AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN AND ADOPTING AN ADDENDUM TO THE PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED NEGATIVE DECLARATION.**

**WHEREAS, on January 25, 2010, the Board of the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, acting in its capacity as the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for San Diego County, pursuant to Section 21670.3 of the Public Utilities Code, adopted an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for Brown Field Municipal Airport; and**

**WHEREAS, the ALUC concurrently adopted the Negative Declaration (ND) (State Clearinghouse No. 2009051034) prepared for the adopted Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP, which concluded that there was no substantial evidence that the ALUCP would result in significant environmental impacts (Resolution No. 2010-0004R ALUC); and**

**WHEREAS, the ALUC is required to prepare, adopt, and amend (as necessary) an ALUCP for each of the airports in its jurisdiction (Public Utilities Code, §§21674, subd. (c); 21675, subd. (a)); and**

**WHEREAS, the adopted Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP, as required by State law, is based on the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and airport-related forecast and background data approved by the California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, which reflects the anticipated growth of the airport for the next 20 years; and**

**WHEREAS, the amendment to the adopted Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP is consistent with the primary objectives of the State Aeronautics Act (Cal. Pub. Util. Code §§21001, et seq.) and the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook and does not diminish the protection provided by the previously adopted ALUCP for Brown Field Municipal Airport; and**

**WHEREAS, on November 4, 2010, ALUC staff presented a list of issues and concerns to the ALUC that have been encountered when applying the Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP to land use projects requiring consistency determination review; and**

000013

WHEREAS, on November 9, 2010, ALUC staff held a meeting with all of the affected local agencies to inform them about the proposed revisions to the Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP as well as to solicit their input; and

WHEREAS, the ALUC finds it appropriate to amend the adopted Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP, as requested by ALUC staff, so as to provide clarity on the following: 1) revise the Regional Shopping Center and Community/Neighborhood Shopping Center categories in the safety matrix so they better correspond to the policy language already included in the Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP; 2) clarify the applicability of the Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP to nonconforming structures for upgrades that are necessary in order to comply with life/safety requirements; 3) clarify how to calculate Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for mixed-use projects; 4) clarify how to evaluate new uses within existing structures for compatibility with the Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP; 5) clarify the need for ALUC review of certain projects that are within Review Areas 1 and 2; 6) quantify how much change would be considered "substantive" with respect to project changes and the need for new or subsequent ALUC review; and

WHEREAS, the amendment to the adopted Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP will ensure that the ALUC and the affected local agencies have the most accurate technical data regarding the proposed clarifications and revisions before them when rendering consistency determinations and/or implementing the Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP; and

WHEREAS, ALUC staff has prepared and revised the safety matrix and affected policies to reflect these clarifications; and

WHEREAS, in compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; Pub. Resources Code, §2100, et seq.), the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15000 et seq.), and the Airport Authority's own CEQA Procedures, ALUC staff has evaluated the environmental ramifications of the proposed amendment to the adopted Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP; and

WHEREAS, ALUC staff has prepared an Addendum to the previously adopted ND (State Clearinghouse No. 2009051034); and

WHEREAS, the Addendum concludes the previously adopted ND addresses all impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed amendment to the adopted Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP; and

WHEREAS, the Addendum also concludes that any potential environmental impacts associated with the corrections to the safety matrix and revisions to the affected policies were identified within the scope of the previously adopted ND, and that the environmental ramifications associated with the proposed amendment is the same as or less than that identified in the previously adopted ND; and

WHEREAS, the Addendum further finds that no new or substantially more severe environmental effects would result from the ALUC's decision to amend the adopted Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP; and

WHEREAS, the Addendum concludes that no new information has been presented regarding the adopted Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP's environmental effects that gives rise to any new or more severe environmental effects than were previously identified in the adopted ND; and

WHEREAS, the ALUC considered the Addendum for the proposed amendment to the adopted Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP, along with the previously adopted ND, and the ALUC, based on its independent judgment and analysis, agrees with the conclusions reached in the Addendum.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the ALUC adopts the Addendum (Attachment A) to the previously adopted ND (State Clearinghouse No. 2009051034), as described therein, and orders that ALUC staff prepare and file a Notice of Determination within five (5) days of the certification of this Resolution; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ALUC approves an amendment to the Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP, as previously adopted by the ALUC on January 25, 2010, so as to include corrections to the safety matrix and revisions to affected policies as outlined within the Staff Report, to be effective immediately upon certification of this Resolution; and

BE IT FUTHER RESOLVED that this ALUC action is not a "development" as defined by the California Coastal Act, Pub. Res. Code Section 30106.

**PASSED, ADOPTED AND APPROVED** by the ALUC at a special meeting  
this 20<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2010, by the following vote:

**AYES:** Commissioners:

**NOES:** Commissioners:

**ABSENT:** Commissioners:

**ATTEST:**

---

**TONY R. RUSSELL**  
**DIRECTOR, CORPORATE SERVICES/**  
**AUTHORITY CLERK**

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

---

**BRETON K. LOBNER**  
**GENERAL COUNSEL**

000016

**ADDENDUM TO THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION  
FOR THE BROWN FIELD MUNICIPAL AIRPORT ALUCP  
(STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2009051034)**

---

December 20, 2010

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

This document is an Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2009051034) for the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan ("ALUCP") prepared for Brown Field Municipal Airport ("approved Project"). The Negative Declaration evaluated the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP, and concluded that there was no substantial evidence that the approved Project would result in significant environmental impacts. On January 25, 2010, after a public hearing, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority ("Airport Authority"), acting in its capacity as the Airport Land Use Commission ("ALUC") for the County of San Diego, certified the legal adequacy of the Negative Declaration, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA;" Pub. Resources Code, §21000 et seq.), the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15000 et seq.), and the Airport Authority's CEQA Procedures.

This Addendum examines the environmental effects of proposed minor amendment to the approved Project. The minor amendment is being made in response to comments and input provided by ALUC staff as well as staff at local agencies affected by the Project regarding processing issues that have been encountered since the Project was adopted by the ALUC in January 2010. The proposed amendment contemplated in this Addendum would:

1. Revise the Regional Shopping Center and Community/Neighborhood Shopping Center categories in the safety matrix so that they better correspond to the policy language already included in the Project for both categories;
2. Clarify the applicability of the Project to nonconforming structures for upgrades that are necessary in order to comply with life/safety requirements;
3. Clarify how to calculate Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for projects with a mixture of nonresidential uses;
4. Clarify how to evaluate new uses within existing structures for compatibility with the Project;
5. Clarify the need for ALUC review of certain projects that are within Review Areas 1 and 2; and
6. Quantify how much change would be considered "substantive" with respect to project changes and the need for new or subsequent ALUC review.

As discussed in greater detail in the Addendum below, the proposed amendment to the approved Project would reduce the amount of potential displacement of future development identified in the previously adopted Negative Declaration for the approved Project, such that potential displacement would be less than previously anticipated.

## **2.0 PURPOSE OF AN ADDENDUM**

Under CEQA, a lead agency may prepare an addendum to a previously adopted Negative Declaration if minor technical changes or additions are necessary, or none of the conditions calling for the preparation of a subsequent environmental impact report ("EIR") or negative declaration have occurred. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15164, subd. (b).) Here, the proposed amendment is of the type of "minor technical change" highlighted in the CEQA Guidelines as the appropriate subject of an addendum.

Notably, when a Negative Declaration already has been adopted for a project, no subsequent environmental review is required for that project unless the lead agency determines, based on substantial evidence in the record before it, that one or more specified circumstances has occurred. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15162, subd. (a).) Those circumstances are:

- (1) Substantial changes to the project are proposed that will require major revision of the previously adopted negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken, such that major revisions to the prior negative declaration are required due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
  - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous negative declaration;
  - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown;
  - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

(Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15162, subd. (a).)

This Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration for the approved Project has been prepared because ALUC staff has concluded, following an evaluation of the environmental effects of the proposed minor amendment, that the proposed amendment does not give rise to any of the circumstances requiring preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration, as identified above. The evidence supporting ALUC staff's determination is contained in **Section 4.0, Environmental Analysis**, below.

000018

### **3.0 BACKGROUND**

#### **3.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE APPROVED PROJECT**

The approved Project is an airport land use compatibility plan, which is inherently regulatory in nature and designed to promote compatibility between Brown Field Municipal Airport and the surrounding land uses, to the extent that these areas are not already devoted to incompatible uses. (Pub. Util. Code, §21674, subd. (a).) The Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP accomplishes this, in part, by regulating the future development of new residential dwellings, commercial and industrial structures, and other noise- or risk-sensitive land uses within the Airport Influence Area ("AIA"), based upon multiple factors established in the ALUCP. Accordingly, the Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP serves two complementary purposes: (i) the ALUCP provides for the orderly growth of the area surrounding Brown Field Municipal Airport in a manner that is compatible and consistent with the Airport's operations; and (ii) the ALUCP safeguards the general welfare of the inhabitants within the Airport's vicinity and the public in general. (*Id.* at §21670, subd. (a)(1)-(2).)

The Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP contains compatibility criteria applicable to land lying within the AIA. The boundaries of the AIA, which establish the jurisdictional boundaries of the Airport Authority, acting in its capacity as the ALUC, and the ALUCP, are set, on a cumulative basis. Specifically, the AIA's geographic coverage is established by the four factors/layers of land use planning related to aeronautical activities: (i) noise; (ii) safety; (iii) airspace protection; and (iv) overflight. The ALUCP's compatibility criteria identify whether a particular land use is compatible, conditionally compatible, or incompatible with the Airport's operations based on the proximity of the land uses to the Airport and the four factors/layers. These criteria are then used by the ALUC to determine whether development projects and local plans lying within the AIA for Brown Field Municipal Airport are consistent with the ALUCP. In addition, these criteria are used by local agencies during the preparation or amendment of general plans and/or other land use plans and ordinances, and by landowners during the design of new development projects.

The previously adopted Negative Declaration, as discussed above, evaluated the environmental impacts of implementation of the Brown Field Municipal Airport ALUCP. As adopted by the Airport Authority on January 25, 2010, the Negative Declaration found that there was no substantial evidence in the record that the approved Project would result in significant environmental impacts on a direct, indirect, or cumulative basis.

#### **3.2 CURRENT PROPOSED ACTION**

The specific amendment to the approved Project contemplated in this Addendum includes:

1. Revise the Regional Shopping Center and Community/Neighborhood Shopping Center categories in the safety matrix so that they better correspond to the policy language already included in the Project for both categories. Regional Shopping Centers and Community/Neighborhood Shopping Centers are currently written as if eating/drinking establishments are a required component of shopping centers in the safety matrix. The proposed amendment would change the text in the safety matrix so that eating and drinking establishments may or may not be a part of shopping centers.

2. Clarify the applicability of the Project to nonconforming structures for upgrades that are necessary in order to comply with life/safety requirements. The Project, when adopted in January 2010, did not allow for any increase in FAR or height for nonconforming structures under any circumstances, including upgrades to structures in order to comply with life/safety requirements (e.g., accessibility). Policy language would be added to allow for such upgrades, but only for that purpose, and only to the extent necessary. These revisions would still allow the nonconforming uses to retain nonconforming status from an ALUC perspective.
3. Clarify how to calculate Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for projects with a mixture of nonresidential projects. The Project, as adopted, required projects with a mixture of nonresidential uses to calculate FAR for each component use as a proportionate share of the entire project site area. Resulting calculations did not yield meaningful FARs. The proposed revision would specify that each use would be allotted a proportionate share of that use's allowed FAR as depicted in Table III-2.
4. Clarify how to evaluate new uses within existing structures for compatibility with the Project. The Project did not provide policy language regarding how to evaluate a change of use, such as a tenant improvement, within an existing structure. Revisions to the Project would treat proposed uses as "existing land uses" provided they remain within the same or reduced level of intensity of occupancy as the most recent use that occurred onsite and would not require ALUC review. Changes from one occupancy to a wholly different one (e.g., a religious assembly or day care facility replacing a former retail suite) would be subject to review to ensure compatibility with applicable ALUCP compatibility factors.
5. Clarify the need for ALUC review of certain projects that are within Review Areas 1 and 2. Proposed changes would eliminate the need to send projects that are consistent with all ALUCP compatibility factors to the ALUC for review and allow staff review to suffice. Additional revisions would only require ALUC review of projects within Review Area 2 when certain circumstances are met (e.g., structures which penetrate FAA airspace or which feature glare, bright light, wildlife attractants, etc.). This proposed change would eliminate unessential referral to ALUC staff by local agencies of Review Area 2 projects which do not trigger any ALUCP compatibility factors or the circumstances of potential concern.
6. Quantify how much change would be considered "substantive" with respect to project changes and the need for new or subsequent ALUC review. The Project previously defined what would constitute a substantive change, but did not provide enough detail in terms of measuring or quantifying the amount of the change that would be considered substantive. By clarifying that a 10 percent increase in either lot coverage or total building area would constitute a substantive change, ALUC staff and local agency staff have a measurement factor to rely upon when it is necessary to determine whether or not new or subsequent ALUC review is required. Changes in a project's attributes (total building area, lot coverage) which do not increase more than 10 percent would not be subject to new or subsequent ALUC review.

#### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

As discussed further below, the proposed amendment to the approved Project would not alter the conclusions reached in the previously adopted Negative Declaration regarding the potential environmental impacts associated with the approved Project; the potential impacts resulting from the approved Project, as amended, would be the same as or less than those previously identified. (The previously adopted Negative Declaration is hereby incorporated by reference and is available for public inspection during regular business hours at the Airport Authority's offices, which are located at 3225 North Harbor Drive, Third Floor, Commuter Terminal, San Diego, California 92101.)

First, the proposed amendment, like the approved Project, does not propose or entail any new development, construction, or physical changes to existing land uses or the environment. Therefore, proposed amendment would not directly impact the environment or result in any direct impacts to any of the environmental impact categories contemplated in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, as identified in the previously adopted Negative Declaration.

Second, while the proposed amendment may indirectly influence future land use development in the vicinity of the Airport by facilitating development in some locations and constraining development at other locations, any potential indirect effects that may arise are uncertain from a timing and location standpoint. Therefore, it is speculative to anticipate the specific characteristics of any development with which it would be associated. As discussed in the previously adopted Negative Declaration, one possibility is that land uses in much of the Airport's environs would remain unchanged when compared to existing conditions. Another possibility is that implementation of the proposed amendment may indirectly result in shifting future residential, agricultural, open space, commercial, industrial, or public land uses to other locations designated or zoned to allow for such uses. Since such potential shifts cannot be accurately predicted, particularly as to the rate, timing, location, and extent, it is not considered reasonable to conclude that any potential shifts would be significant. Absent information to the contrary, any such shifts are reasonably considered less than significant.

Such conflicts also are considered less than significant under CEQA because state law (Gov. Code §65302.3) requires that the applicable local planning document(s) be consistent with an adopted ALUCP; and, in the event of an inconsistency, such document(s) must be amended promptly (or go through the special process required to overrule the ALUC pursuant to section 21676 of the Public Utilities Code). The ALUC finds that, by adopting the proposed amendment, any such conflicts can be avoided or substantially lessened by local agency action. The ALUC further finds that such action is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the respective local agencies, and not the ALUC.

Importantly, the proposed amendment is *less* restrictive than the existing compatibility criteria and policies adopted on January 25, 2010. As such, the environmental analysis for the approved Project represents the worst-case scenario, such that the environmental effects of the proposed amendment is less than that previously studied and reported in the adopted Negative Declaration.

000021

## **5.0 CONCLUSION**

After reviewing the previously adopted Negative Declaration, ALUC staff finds that: (i) the Negative Declaration, previously adopted by the Airport Authority on January 25, 2010, addresses all impacts associated with implementation of the approved Project; (ii) any potential environmental impacts associated within the proposed amendments were identified within the scope of the previously adopted Negative Declaration; (iii) no new or substantially more severe environmental effects would result from the Airport Authority's decision to adopt the proposed amendments; and (iv) no new information has been presented regarding the approved Project's environmental effects that gives rise to any new or more severe environmental effects than were previously identified in the adopted Negative Declaration. Therefore, the legal requirements for preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration are inapplicable, and preparation of an addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration is appropriate under the present circumstances.

This Addendum relies on the previously adopted Negative Declaration and the related administrative record, in addition to the new documentation that has been prepared to support the Addendum.

000022

**NOTE**

***THE ATTACHED PRESENTATION:***

Amendments To ALUC's For Brown Field  
Municipal Airport, Gillespie Field, MCAS  
Miramar, Montgomery Field, and Oceanside  
Municipal Airport

***RELATES TO ITEMS 1 THROUGH 5***



**Amendments to ALUCPs  
for Brown Field Municipal  
Airport, Gillespie Field,  
MCAS Miramar,  
Montgomery Field, and  
Oceanside Municipal  
Airport**

**Revised 12/15/10**

**Angela Shafer-Payne**

**Vice President, Planning and  
Operations**

**December 20, 2010**



# Scope of Proposed Amendments

- Purpose of Amendments
  - Clarify policies and define thresholds for review
  - Streamline project review procedures
- Affected ALUCPs
  - McClellan-Palomar not included due to previous amendment in March; ALUC restricted to 1 amendment per calendar year
  - Maintains ability to amend affected ALUCPs in CY2011
- Coordination with affected agencies
  - Meeting on November 4 with all affected agencies invited
  - Received comments from City of San Diego & MCAS Miramar
  - Meeting on December 9 with City of San Diego- City staff expressed no ongoing concerns regarding proposed amendments



# 1. Safety Clarifications for Two Land Uses

**ISSUE:** 1) *Shopping Centers* are described as always including eating/drinking establishments; 2) *Small Indoor Assembly* policy language does not match matrix

**RECOMMENDATION:** Correct text and change matrix to match policy language in each ALUCP



# 1. Safety Clarifications for Two Land Uses

## Urban Airport ALUCPs Only:

standing building (capacity <300 people)							See Policy 3.4.5(f)(1)
Regional Shopping Centers ≥300,000 s.f. with mixture of uses <u>that could includinginclude</u> eating/drinking establishments [approx. 110 s.f./person]	M		A 0.18	0.33 0.66	0.33 0.66	0.51 1.01	2 - 5: FAR limits as indicated  2, 5: No room with capacity ≥300 people allowed; auto parking preferred See Policy 3.4.5(f)(1)
Community/Neighborhood Shopping Centers <300,000 s.f. with mixture of uses <u>that could includinginclude</u> eating/drinking establishments [approx. 120 s.f./person]	M		A 0.19	0.36 0.72	0.36 0.72	0.55 1.10	2 - 5: FAR limits as indicated 2: Max. 10% of floor area or 3,000 s.f., whichever is less, devoted to eating/ drinking uses 2, 5: No room with capacity ≥300 people allowed; auto parking preferred See Policy 3.4.5(f)(2)
Detail Stores (stand alone buildings <25,000 s.f.)				0.54	0.54	0.78	

## MCAS Miramar ALUCP Only:

- (5) Indoor Small Assembly Rooms (capacity of 50 to 299 people) are not compatible in the CZ or APZ I. In APZ II and the TZ, these uses are conditionally compatible provided that they do not exceed the FAR limits as indicated in Table MIR-2 and are restricted to a maximum intensity of 50 people/acre in APZ II or 300 people/acre in the TZ.



## 2. Upgrades for Non-Conforming Structures

**ISSUE:** ALUCPs do not allow non-conforming structures to be modernized for life safety code upgrades, such as accessibility requirements

**RECOMMENDATION:** Amend ALUCPs to allow non-conforming structures to be upgraded to the extent necessary to meet code requirements without losing non-conforming status, *provided any height increase would not be deemed a hazard by the FAA*

*\* Language changed as suggested by City of San Diego*



## 2. Upgrades for Non-Conforming Structures

2.11.2 *Nonconforming Uses*: Existing uses (including a parcel or building) not in conformance with this *Compatibility Plan* are subject to the following restrictions:

- (d) *ALUC* review is required for any proposed expansion of a *nonconforming use* that would ~~increase the site size, the floor area of the structure, or~~increase the number of dwelling units, ~~or~~increase the number of people on the site for nonresidential uses, or increase the height of the structure such that it would be deemed a hazard by the FAA.



### 3. Quantifying “Ancillary” Uses

**ISSUE:** ALUCPs currently define “ancillary” uses as no more than 10 percent of a project. Affected local agencies have wide variation in the range and definition of these uses.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Due to the differences among local agency application of “ancillary” uses, ALUC staff proposes no change to existing ALUCP limitation of 10 percent.



## 4. Method of Calculating Maximum Use of Site


**ISSUE:** ALUCPs require complex Floor Area Ratio\* (FAR) calculation by dividing proportions of each use by the proportionate share of project site; does not yield meaningful maximum FAR

**RECOMMENDATION:** Determine the maximum use of a site by multiplying the proportion of each use by the allowable FAR in the ALUCP (see illustration on following slide)

\* *FAR = square feet of building / square feet of entire site*



## 4. Method of Calculating Maximum Use of Site



ALUCP FAR for  
Office: 0.64

Max Allowed FAR  
 $75\% \times 0.64 = 0.48$

ALUCP FAR for  
Retail: 0.51

Max Allowed FAR  
 $25\% \times 0.51 = 0.13$



## 4. Method of Calculating Maximum Use of Site

- (b) Where proposed development will contain a mixture of nonresidential uses listed separately in **Table III-2**, each component use must comply with the applicable criteria listed in the table.
- (1) The *FAR* for each component use shall be calculated ~~as being equal to the *FAR* for the total project~~ as a proportion of the *FAR* specified for that use. ~~That is, each component use shall be calculated as occupying a proportionate share of the total project site equal to its proportionate share of the total floor area of the project~~ For example, if 70% of a project's total square footage is office and 30% is retail, the allowable *FAR* for the office component would be 70% of the office *FAR* in **Table III-2** and the allowable *FAR* for the retail component would be 30% of the retail *FAR* in **Table III-2**. Each component use must ~~meet the~~ not exceed the proportionate *FAR* limit applicable to that use in order for the use to be allowed as part of the *project*.



## 5. Evaluating New Uses within Existing Structures

**ISSUE:** ALUCPs do not apply to existing land uses. However, when a new use is proposed inside an existing building (e.g., tenant improvement), ALUCPs do not provide guidance regarding when review is required.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Interior improvements that maintain or reduce previous occupancy intensity should not be subject to ALUC review; projects proposing a *higher* occupancy (e.g., retail to assembly) should be subject to ALUC review



# 5. Evaluating New Uses within Existing Structures

2.2.18 *Existing Land Use*: A project shall be considered an “existing land use” when ~~a “vested right” is obtained, as follows:~~

(a) A “vested right” is obtained, as follows:

- (1) A vesting tentative map has been approved pursuant to California Government Code section 66498.1, and has not expired; or
- (2) A development agreement has been executed pursuant to California Government Code section 65866, and remains in effect; or
- (3) A valid building permit has been issued, substantial work has been performed, and substantial liabilities have been incurred in good faith reliance on the permit, pursuant to the California Supreme Court decision in *Avco Community Developers, Inc. v. South Coast Regional Com.* (1976) 17 Cal.3d 785,791, and its progeny.
  - (i) A proposed modification to an *existing land use* that will result in an increase in height, a change of use, or an increase in density or intensity of use that is not in substantial conformance with the *project* entitled by the *local agency* shall be subject to this *Compatibility Plan* (see Policy 2.10.4).
  - (ii) Any proposed reuse or reinitiation of an *existing land use*, even if the reuse/reinitiation of the *existing land use* will not modify the previously *existing land use*, will be subject to this *Compatibility Plan* if the previously *existing land use* has been discontinued for more than 24 months.
  - (iii) The determination of whether a *project* meets the criteria of an “existing land use” shall be made by the *local agency* and the *ALUC*.

(b) A new occupancy is proposed within an existing building, provided the new occupancy remains within the same or reduced level of occupancy as the most recent one. A new occupancy which increases intensity shall not qualify as an existing land use.



## 6. ALUC Review for Review Area 2 Projects


**ISSUE:** Urban airport ALUCPs require unessential ALUC review of Review Area 2 projects that do not trigger FAA review nor have other unique circumstances of concern, such as bright lights, glare, or wildlife attractants

**RECOMMENDATION:** Revise urban airport ALUCPs to reflect that ALUC review is only required for Review Area 2 projects that trigger FAA review or have other unique circumstances of concern

*(ALUCPs for MCAS Miramar and the rural airports are already written this way)*



# 6. ALUC Review for Review Area 2 Projects





## 6. ALUC Review for Review Area 2 Projects

2.6.1 Actions that Always Require *ALUC* Review: As required by state law, even if a *local agency's general plan* is consistent with the current compatibility plan, the following types of actions shall be referred to the *ALUC* for determination of consistency with this *Compatibility Plan* prior to their approval by the *local agency*:

- (a) The adoption, approval or amendment of any *general plan* (Pub. Util. Code §21676(b)) that affects lands within the *ALA* and involves:
  - (1) Noise ~~or~~ safety, ~~airspace protection, or overflight~~ concerns within Review Area 1; or
  - (2) Land use actions that have been determined to be a hazard by the FAA in accordance with Part 77 ~~Airspace protection or overflight concerns within Review Area 2~~ the ALA.
- (b) Adoption or modification of the *airport master plan* for the *Airport* (Pub. Util. Code §21676(c)).
- (c) Any proposal for expansion of the *Airport* if such expansion will require an amended Airport Permit from the State of California (Pub. Util. Code §21664.5).
- (d) Any proposal for construction of a new airport or heliport (Pub. Util. Code §21661.5).



# 6. ALUC Review for Review Area 2 Projects

2.6.2 Other *Land Use Actions* Subject to *ALUC* Review: Other types of *land use actions* are subject to review under these circumstances:

(a) Until such time as the *ALUC* finds that a *local agency's general plan* is consistent with this *Compatibility Plan*, or the *local agency* has overruled the *ALUC's* determination of inconsistency, state law allows *ALUCs* to require that *local agencies* submit all *land use actions* involving land within an *ALA* to the *ALUC* for review (Pub. Util. Code §21676.5(a)). Only those actions that an *ALUC* elects not to review are exempt from this requirement.

(1) Within Review Area 1, all *land use actions* are subject to *ALUC* review, except as provided in Section 2.6.3.

(2) Within Review Area 2, only the following *land use actions* require *ALUC* review:

(i) Any object which has received a final notice of determination from the *FAA* that the *project* will constitute a hazard or obstruction to air navigation, to the extent applicable.

(i) Any proposed object in a *High Terrain Zone* or in an area of terrain penetration to airspace surfaces which has a height greater than 35 feet above ground level.

(ii) Any project having the potential to create electrical or visual hazards to aircraft in flight, including: electrical interference with radio communications or navigational signals; lighting which could be mistaken for airport lighting; glare or bright lights (including laser lights) in the eyes of pilots or aircraft using the *Airport*; certain colors of neon lights- especially red and white- that can interfere with night vision goggles; and impaired visibility near the *Airport*. The local agency should coordinate with the airport operator in making this determination.

(iii) Any project having the potential to cause an increase in the attraction of birds or other wildlife that can be hazardous to aircraft operations in the vicinity of the *Airport*. The local agency should coordinate with the airport operator in making this decision.

(3) On *Airport* property, proposed nonaviation development shall also be subject to *ALUC* review (see Section 2.2 for definition of *aviation-related use*).

(4) Any project located in the *runway protection zone*.



## 7. Threshold of Change for ALUC Review

**ISSUE:** ALUCPs require ALUC review of projects when substantive changes are made, without quantifying what “substantive” means.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Adopt 10 percent (of total building area or lot coverage) as a measurable threshold above which projects would be subject to ALUC review; this is the standard used by City of San Diego & County of San Diego



# 7. Threshold of Change for ALUC Review

2.10.4 Subsequent Review: Even after a *project* has been found consistent or conditionally consistent with this *Compatibility Plan*, it may still need be submitted for review in later stages of the planning process if any of the following are true:

- (a) At the time of the original *ALUC* review, the project information available was only sufficient to determine consistency with compatibility criteria at a planning level of detail, not at the project design level. For example, the proposed land use designation indicated in a *general plan* may have been found consistent, but information on site layout, maximum density and intensity limits, building heights, and other such factors may not have yet been known that affect the consistency determination for a *project*.
- (b) The design of the *project* subsequently changes in a manner that affects previously considered compatibility issues and could raise questions as to the validity of the earlier finding of consistency. Proposed changes warranting a new review may include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - (1) An increase in the density of use (number of dwelling units) or intensity of use (more people on the site), ~~floor area ratio, or lot coverage;~~
  - ~~(1)~~(2) Any cumulative increase in the total building area or lot coverage for non-residential uses in excess of 10% of the previous project.
  - ~~(2)~~(3) An increase in the height of structures ~~or modification of other design features~~ which has been deemed a hazard by the FAA; and
  - ~~(3)~~(4) Major site design changes (such as incorporation of clustering or modifications to the configuration of open land areas proposed for the site).



## 8. ALUCP Applicability to Amended Projects

**ISSUE:** For projects that changed “substantively” after local agency approval, ALUCPs are vague on which version of an ALUCP would govern for subsequent reviews.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Due to lack of support by affected agencies, ALUC staff proposes no change to the ALUCPs.



## 9. ALUC Review of Projects that are Entirely Consistent

**ISSUE:** Applicants for projects that are entirely consistent must wait for monthly ALUC hearing to reaffirm staff findings, presenting hardship for some applicants

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff review is sufficient for projects that are consistent with all ALUCP compatibility factors (same as other California ALUCs and already provided for in existing Airport Authority Policy 8.30)



## 9. ALUC Review of Projects that are Entirely Consistent

2.6.3 *Land Use Actions Subject to Discretionary ALUC Staff Review:* *ALUC staff* has the authority and discretion to make a consistency determination without formal *ALUC* review of the *project* ~~until such time as the *ALUC* finds that a local agency's general plan is consistent with this *Compatibility Plan*, or the local agency has overruled the *ALUC's* determination of inconsistency~~ if the *land use action*:

~~(a) Involves land located within Review Area 2 of the *ALA*; and~~  
(a) Is “compatible” with both noise and safety compatibility policies; and

~~(a) Involves land located within Review Area 2 of the *ALA*; and~~

(b) Has received a final notice of determination from the *FAA* that the *project* will not constitute a hazard or obstruction to air navigation, to the extent applicable; and

(c) Has been conditioned by the *local agency* to require an *overflight notification* consistent with the requirements of Policy 3.6.3, to the extent applicable.



# Recommendation

- Adopt the Amendments to the Brown Field Municipal Airport, Gillespie Field, MCAS Miramar, Montgomery Field, and Oceanside Municipal Airport ALUCPs
- Adopt each Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declarations for each of the urban airports
- Adopt the Addendum to the previously certified Environmental Impact Report for MCAS Miramar