



---

DATE: April 3, 2025  
TO: Airport Commission  
FROM: Dan Cohen, Airport & Marina Manager  
SUBJECT: Review of Conceptual Hangar Layouts for the Hangar Feasibly Study

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Airport Commission review conceptual hangar layouts which have been prepared for the Hangar Feasibly Study, and provide feedback on the types of hangers, sizes, accessibility that would be best suited for current and future demand.

### **BACKGROUND**

Funded for FY25, the Hangar Feasibility Study was requested by the Airport Commission, and fully supported by City Leadership, as a first step in planning for future hangar development at the Airport. This study is being conducted by Mead & Hunt and is focused primarily on generating information on the physical limitations of the proposed development area, the market for hangars, and estimated costs for a hangar development.

### **DISCUSSION**

With the goal of expanding aircraft storage opportunities for local aircraft owners and sustainable revenue for the Airport Enterprise Fund, the City and Airport Commission have been working closely to determine if a hangar project will be feasible. A secondary goal is to provide permanent facilities for Airport maintenance equipment and temporary storage of non-aeronautical City equipment at market rate. The first step in this process is understanding the physical limitations of the proposed development area at the intersection of Sky Ranch Drive and Executive Drive. This includes City required setbacks, FAA taxilane object free area minimums, and other layout considerations. Another area of focus for this project is researching regional hangar demand. The Airport maintains an active list of current and future tenants on a wait list with hangar size preferences, however this list is generally limited to the local demand and is not

necessarily an accurate representation of regional demand. Lastly, this study will look at estimated costs of a hangar development and determine if a future project can be self-funded by the Airport Enterprise Fund.

## LAYOUTS

The attached draft conceptual hangar layouts #1, #2, #3, #4 and #4A were created using the following criteria:

- Determine the required FAA taxilane object free areas for Group I (< 49') and Group II aircraft (49' - < 79'), based on maximum sized aircraft in each hangar row.
- Maximize the number of hangar units for aircraft with larger, 38'+ wingspans in 3 sizes.
- Minimize the amount of pavement needed to service these hangars.
- Add a non-aeronautical building for current Airport needs and future expansion.

The Airport Manager has added conceptual layout 5 to begin addressing some additional considerations including:

- Moving larger hangars into current commercially zoned areas.
- Providing direct street access for larger hangars that may be commercially occupied and may require streetside access for customer access and package deliveries.
- 50' gaps between rows for customer/employee parking and a fire lane.
- Minimizing heavier Group II aircraft traffic on pavement surfaces to decrease wear and damage. This is accomplished through shorter distances to the larger hangars.

## SETBACK REQUIREMENTS

The Building Department has provided the following setback information and a copy of the current Airport PCD is attached to this report:

- Aircraft Storage Subzone: No setbacks from the leasehold lot lines are required because the leaseholds have been arranged to provide adequate setbacks for safety and aesthetic purposes. Setbacks are required within the Executive/Corporate Aircraft Storage Subzone area as deemed necessary through the Site Plan and Architectural Review process to achieve the level of aesthetic quality warranted by the location within the airport complex. (This section was amended by City Council Resolution 88-02 N. C.S.)
- Aircraft Commercial Subzone:
  1. No off-street parking or structure shall be placed closer than 25 feet from the leasehold line adjacent to any public street. A minimum of 10 feet shall be preserved between the back of sidewalk and any landscaping setback.
  2. No structure shall be placed closer than 20 feet from the side lot lines of the leasehold.

3. No structure shall be placed closer than 80 feet from the rear leasehold line or from a taxiway.
4. No auto, truck, or aircraft parking, driveways, or ramp shall be placed closer than five feet from any interior leasehold line except as permitted in the Petaluma Zoning Code as a modification or exception.

### T-HANGARS

A T-hangar development is only shown in the attached conceptual layout #2. T-hangars typically minimize available individual hangar space and maximize paving required to serve both sides of a hangar row. While this allows for the maximum number of aircraft to be stored, it increases development costs for custom T-hangar row buildings, and does not serve tenants who are looking for more space. Currently, the most desired hangars, besides box hangars, are end units with additional space. One potential justification for not developing more T-Hangars is that several of the 45' x 41' and 55' x 45' hangars will be likely taken by current tenants, freeing up at least 6-12 T-hangars. A plan to increase T-hangar availability through tenants upgrades could have cost benefits and reduced risks of developing new T-hangars that may not have immediate demand, which has been observed in other airports. T-hangars remain in demand, however standard turnover from tenants who sell an aircraft, or move out of the area, continues to meet hangar demand.

After the Airport Commission and City staff review, the Hangar Feasibility Study contractor will be provided with hangar layout feedback, which will be combined with industry data on regional hangar demand, estimated development costs, and published into a draft report.

### CASE STUDIES

### ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

### CITYWIDE GOALS & PRIORITIES

### FURTHER RECOMMENDATION

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Hangar Study Alternative 1
2. Hangar Study Alternative 2
3. Hangar Study Alternative 3
4. Hangar Study Alternative 4
5. Hangar Study Alternative 4A
6. Hangar Study Alternative 5 (Airport Manager)
7. Airport Planned Community District (PCD)