



AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND PILOTS ASSOCIATION

421 Aviation Way • Frederick, MD 21701-4798
Telephone (301) 695-2000 • Fax (301) 695-2375
www.aopa.org

September 12, 2007

The Honorable Jan McDonald
Mayor
City of Camarillo
601 Carmen Drive
Camarillo, CA 93010

RE: City of Camarillo General Plan Amendment 2004-2
Springville Site Specific Plan

Dear Mayor McDonald:

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) represents the general aviation interests of 414,000 members nationwide, over two-thirds of the nation's pilots – including more than 50,000 who live in the state of California. On behalf of our members, AOPA is committed to ensuring the continued viability, growth and development of general aviation and airports in California and the United States as part of a balanced, national transportation system.

For the past year, we have been following and reviewing available information relating to the proposed Springville development, a roughly 170 acre project that is to include a mix of residential densities up to 1,500 homes. Our research shows that the project is located north of U.S. Highway 101 between Las Posas Road and Central Avenue. Additionally, the project sits within the Camarillo Airport's (CMA) airport traffic pattern.

We are writing to express our serious concerns related to approval of the Site Specific Plan for the Springville project.

It is our understanding that the Ventura County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) has determined that the Springville project is "conditionally compatible" with the existing Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) for CMA. However, that does not necessarily mean that residents of the proposed development will not feel the impacts of an extremely busy airport (over 153,000 operations/year) that operates 24 hours a day, 7-days a week and 365 days each year. However, a determination of conditional compatibility does not necessarily indicate that such a massive development project so close to an active airport is actually in the best interest of future residents or the airport. Comments made by the Ventura County Airport Director before the Camarillo Airport Advisory Commission on July 2, 2007 speak to that fact. There should be no doubt that these potential new residents will be impacted by airport operations.

Unfortunately, developers submit plans to local government organizations with promises of increased revenues and amenities accruing to the government agency. In reality though, the developer gains approval, constructs the project, realizes significant profits and moves on to the next project only to leave local government officials with the problems created by their project and to solve on their own.

We have reviewed the city's "2006 General Plan Annual Report." The Noise Element, adopted August 16, 1996, beginning on page 54 includes a Goals Review which states:

Noise and land use conflicts should be avoided by properly considering noise issues during the planning, design, approval and permitting process for new development.

It is our view that approval of the Springville Site Specific Plan is generally counter to this stated goal although we are pleased that the goal does require developers to both study noise impacts and to implement noise mitigation measures.

Under the Transportation System Noise Control Goal and Policies Goal 2 (page 55), the plan indicates that the city should require practical measures to reduce noise impacts from transportation system noise surfaces. This section also indicates that the city works closely with the county to identify noise sensitive areas and encourage aircraft to avoid over flying these areas. Additionally, the county is asked to discourage flight operations between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. We feel very strongly that it simply is not appropriate to force aircraft noise impact mitigation on a publicly funded airport when those impacts were created in the name of development. AOPA would strongly oppose any attempt to implement mandatory restrictions at Camarillo Airport.

While AOPA encourages our members to be sensitive to the needs of the community surrounding an airport, it is important to note that the above measures defined in the General Plan are considered voluntary by the federal government and cannot be enforced.

We fully understand the pressures on local government today to serve the needs of their constituents and overall community demands for housing. The challenge comes in the fact that these needs must be weighed against other competing and often conflicting interests. Airports are every bit as important to our national transportation system and economy as is the Interstate Highway system.

It is our belief that the proposed density of residential units proposed for the site is excessive and the new residents will be impacted by the airport's operations. With this in mind, and since the ALUC has issued a conditionally compatible determination, we urge the city to include the measures proposed by the Ventura County airport administration which include 1) additional residential insulation, 2) Avigation easements, 3) full and fair

The Honorable Jan McDonald


Page 3

September 12, 2007

written real estate disclosure at the absolute minimum. Additionally, any noise complaints generated in Springville as a result of the approval of this project by the city should be mitigated solely by the city.

We appreciate your consideration of our views on this important issue. Should you wish to discuss this matter, please feel free to call my office at 301-695-2205.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bill Dunn", followed by a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Bill Dunn
Vice President
Airports

cc: Vice Mayor Charlotte Craven
Councilmember Kevin Kildee
Councilmember Mike Morgan
Councilmember Don Waunch
Mr. Jerry Bankston, City Manager
Mr. Robert Burrows