UKIAH REGIONAL AIRPORT COMMISSION
August 3, 2010
Minutes

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT
Eric Crane, Vice Chair
Don Albright
Jeff Sloan
Carl Steinmann

STAFF PRESENT
Greg Owen, Airport Manager
Kim Jordan, Senior Planner
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT
Darryl Hudson
John Eisenzopf

1. CALL TO ORDER
The Airport Commission meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Crane at 6:30 p.m. at the Ukiah Regional Airport, Old Flight Service Station, 1403 South State Street, Ukiah, California. Roll Call was taken with the results listed above.

Vice Chair Crane became aware there was an error on the agenda concerning the date for this meeting and questioned whether the revised agenda was in compliance with the Brown Act regulations. Staff consulted with the City Attorney and stated, in his professional opinion, the procedure was properly handled, but that the Commission could vote on whether to continue the meeting or elect to have the meeting tonight.

M/S Sloan/Albright to proceed with having a meeting tonight. Motion carried. (4-0).

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Everyone recited the pledge of allegiance.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – July 20, 2010
M/S Albright/Sloan to approve July 20, 2010 minutes, as submitted. Motion carried (4-0).

4. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
None.

5. DISCUSSION/ACTION
5A. Nomination for Airport Commission Chair
Commissioner Albright nominated Vice Chair Crane for Chair of the Ukiah Airport Commission. The nomination was seconded by Commissioner Sloan. Motion carried by an all AYE voice vote of the Commissioners present to elect Vice Chair Crane as Chair.

Chair Crane nominated Commissioner Albright for Vice-Chair of the Ukiah Airport Commission. The nomination was seconded by Commissioner Sloan. Motion carried by an all AYE voice vote of the Commissioners present to elect Commissioner Albright as Vice Chair.

5B. Airport Land Use Plan Review
The Commission continued discussion of the Ukiah Municipal Airport Building Area and Land Use Development Plan Guidelines.

WESTSIDE NORTH PLANNING AREA

Description

Staff commented Fixed Based Operators (FBO) is too broad of a term for a use. When looking at the definition, there is almost nothing it does not include.
Commission:
- Referred to Glossary for FBO taken from Ukiah Municipal Airport Master Plan.
- The definition of FBO appears to be very broad where the concentration is on aviation-related uses predominately in large hangars.
- Consider striking last sentence of ‘Description’ that reads, ‘For the most effective utilization of the northern tip, a shared or communal parking lot is the best solution.’
- Parking for aircraft or vehicles as an allowed use is a potential use for the northern tip of Westside North.

Commission consensus:
- Strike last sentence of ‘Description.’

Purpose

Commission consensus:
- Defer review of this section until after allowed use discussion.

Allowed Uses

Commission consensus:
- Strike – Large and medium size hangars with minimum 3000 square foot building footprint.
- Maintain uses: aircraft avionics, aircraft painting/bodywork, aircraft sales/leasing, aircraft service/repair

Fixed-Base Operations (FBO)/permanent helicopter operations as an interim use until eastside of Airport is developed.

Staff comment:
- FBO is too broad a term.

Commission comment:
- Consider making ‘permanent helicopter operations as an interim use until eastside of Airport is developed a permitted use.

Commission comment:
- Discussion about helicopter parking in the area.

Staff comment:
- Drew attention to the two existing ‘cargo feeder’ operation pad areas having no actual tie-down facilities that were established to discourage random parking of helicopters.

Recommended adding ‘Transient fixed-wing and rotocraft parking’ in place of Fixed-Base Operations (FBO)/permanent helicopter operations as an interim use until eastside of the Airport is developed. Need good working definition for ‘transient.’

Staff comment:
- Recommends modifying the ‘Description’ section to acknowledge the existing transient helicopter parking, stating that this parking exists, but the intention is to move this type of operation to the east side of the Airport when it is developed to accommodate this activity.

- Add – Transient fixed-wing aircraft as an allowed use.

Commission comment:
- Discussion about long-term goal of rotocraft operations to occur on the eastside of the Airport.
Discussion about the definitions of ‘interim’ and ‘transient.’
Recommends adding the definitions of ‘interim’ and ‘transient’ to the Glossary section.

Staff comment:
Interim suggests that the operation is permanent in a location that is not in the preferred location, but is acknowledging the use can be there until the preferred location is available. Transient means the location is not permanent.

- Add to ‘Description’ section that there is existing transient helicopter parking and that the intent is to move this type of activity to the eastside of the Airport when developed to accommodate the use.

- Modify ‘Fixed-Base Operations (FBO)/permanent helicopter operations as an interim use until eastside of Airport is developed’ to ‘permanent helicopter operations as an interim use until eastside of Airport is developed’ and move to permitted use.

Commission comment:
Discussion about hangars for commercial versus private use as it relates to how the hangar is being used where the intent is to effectively utilize a hangar to its best and highest use. Feasibility in this regard should be a consideration because improvements, commercial or private, enhance the economic well-being of the Airport.

What about a person that stores an aircraft in a hangar that may not be used for aviation-related purposes, but the plane is leased/used for commercial purposes? This might be considered private use of hangar. What about if the aircraft is owned privately or commercially?

Commercial essentially has two definitions: 1) Building where actual commerce is being conducted. 2) Building not being used for aviation-related purposes, but operates in support of a business out of a commercial use.

Staff comment:
The concern is how the hangar is being used. Is there commerce being conducted in the hangar? Ownership has no relevance on the use.

A plane used for commercial purposes that is stored in a hangar is not really in support of a business.

Commercial uses are typically associated with large hangars and conversely private uses are often associated with small hangars. From the discussion, it appears the Commission's preference is large hangars in Westside North. It is possible that large hangars for private use could be converted to a commercial use.

Staff comment:
Labeling a hangar either for commercial or private use may be problematic and cited the Willits Airport as an example where ‘commercial activities’ were being conducted in a ‘private’ hangar with the storage of a plane that is used for commercial purposes and the hangar was not operating as a business.

Commission comment:
Recommends the ALUP document include language that private development should be recognized as a vehicle for improvements made to the Airport. Encouraging developments that provide improvements that will revert to the City over time benefits the City so if someone wants to build something and it makes sense for a particular location, it should be a consideration.
Also the purchase of fuel for aircraft is important to the economic viability of the Airport no matter how the aircraft is being used.

What should occur if a person constructs a new hangar for a business and the business fails, but wants to keep the hangar to store an airplane or lease to another person to store his/her aircraft?

**Staff comment:**
Would the Commission be alright with this scenario?

**Commission comment:**
Agreed, it would be acceptable to allow the hangar to be sub-leased for the purposes of storing another aircraft as a private use.

**Staff comment:**
Is the Commission okay with people renting space to store aircraft?

**Commission comment:**
Discussion about hangar size and use for commercial or private purposes.

- Modify allowed use – ‘Larger hangar development for commercial use as opposed to private use’ to ‘Hangars for commercial use or private use.’
- Strike – Machine Shop and replace with Aviation shop
- No change - Aircraft and aircraft parts manufacturing and machining.

**Commission comment:**
Discussion that manufacturing use is not likely to occur at Airport.

Seasonal fire fighting/temporary helicopter operations (At which time eastside of Airport is developed and lease expires, seasonal fire fighting/temporary helicopter operations would be relocated.

**Staff comment:**
Recommends acknowledging that CAMP operates in Westside North and noting when the Airport has the ability to more appropriately accommodate the use, the operation will be moved to the eastside of the Airport.

- Add language to ‘Description’ section’ to acknowledge seasonal fire/fighting/temporary helicopter operations exist, but at which time eastside of Airport is develop and lease expires, seasonal fire fighting/temporary helicopter operations would be relocated to the eastside.

**Permitted Uses**

**Commission consensus:**

- Strike – Hangars for private use (must be a minimum of 3000 square feet) because hangars for private use this was made an allowed use.

**Commission comments:**
Questioned the minimum of 3000 sq.ft. component for private use and whether this was feasible/realistic.

- Strike - Manufacturing

**Commission comments:**
Not likely to occur at Airport. Would have to be zoned M-1 and there must be a sufficient number of acreage available for this use.

- No change - Warehouse and distribution

**Commission comments:**
There was discussion about the benefit of receiving ground rent associated with this type of use if someone wanted to construct a building and operate a warehouse and distribution business.

- No change – Electronic assembly/repair
- Strike – Technical services
- Modify – Freight to Air freight
- Add – Interim helicopter parking

**Minimum Building Footprint**

**Staff comment:**
- Based on the discussion concerning building size, the building footprint is very important to the Commission.
- The uses within the buildings pertains to what is going on in the buildings whereas the building footprint pertains to new construction.
- Commission has expressed an interest in having a minimum building footprint whereby a Site Development Permit (SDP) would be required for the construction.
- The intent of establishing a minimum building footprint is to encourage uses that are compatible with other Airport uses as well as provide for maximum effective use of land, particularly vacant land.

**Commission comment:**
- Supports making the minimum building footprint larger to avoid ‘chopping’ up the land in order to encourage larger developments.

**Commission consensus:**
- Strike lines 20-25, page 11
- Minimum Building footprint shall be 3000 sq. ft.; 5000 sq. ft is the preferred.
- Maximum square footage = none.
- Include in ‘Purpose’ section that developments should be considered for highest and best use of land.

**REQUIRED PARKING**

**Staff comment:** At this time, the parking requirements for the Airport default to the City of Ukiah Zoning Ordinance and/or UMC, Article. The parking requirements for every use proposed are reviewed.

**Commission comment:**
- Referred to pages 15 & 16 relevant to UMC (Article 9) parking requirements for the various uses that occur or could potentially occur at the Airport.
- Discussion about the number of ADA compliant parking spaces required for the Airport and how this would work in conjunction with the location and configuration of the buildings. The Airport has some spaces marked for handicapped persons.
- Discussion about vehicle and aircraft parking, noting while the application of the UMC (Article 9) for determining the number of parking spaces may work for projects in the City, it may not be the best approach for the Airport. Even though the Airport is essentially a facility with
different rules and applications, it must conform to building codes and other standards for developments. The Airport does not have a formal parking plan with marked and/or designated parking areas for the uses/visitors. Currently, the Airport has some parking spaces that are marked for the administration building/offices and some marked spaces for commercial businesses/FBOs, such as FedEx and Feather Lite. Airport users take advantage of the marked communal parking accommodations that are existing, but also randomly park in driveways, in unmarked/unimproved areas and private hangar tenants/owners typically park their vehicles adjacent to the hangar or in the hangars.

- Discussion specifically about page 15, lines 12-19, regarding Ukiah Zoning Ordinance parking requirements for ‘Office’ uses. The language, ‘One parking space for each two hundred fifty square feet of gross leasable space’ can be a consideration. Strike the rest of the sentence that reads, ‘except within the City of Ukiah Parking District No. 1 boundaries where the requirement is one parking space for each three-hundred fifty square feet of not leaseable space. (Differential is result of available public parking provided within the District). Similar uses having drive-up windows or drive-through facilities shall have stacking area for five vehicles’ because the Airport is not located in Ukiah Parking District No. 1 so these regulations do not apply.
- It may be that some of the parking issues can be addressed in the leases. It is likely that many of the tenants do not pay for parking because the lease does not specify where the parking spaces are located.

Staff comments:
- Recommended grouping the uses from the revised allowed and permitted uses for each sub-area and determine how to proceed with establishing parking standards for the Airport.
- Further recommended creating a parking analysis for the Airport by counting the number of existing communal parking space for sub-areas Westside North, Westside Central and Westside South.
- Parking spaces for uses that overlap can be shared.
- Recommended providing for a parking section in the lease that designates where tenants should park.
- Referred to page 16, UMC parking requirements for ‘Other uses,’ and stated this may be the appropriate section to address parking for private hangars as it relates to the use as a private use versus a commercial use.

Commission consensus:
- Defer further discussion concerning parking at the Airport until the Commission reviews the revised group of allowed and permitted uses and counts the number of the communal parking spaces.

**ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

**Site Development Permit:** For new construction in the in the Airport PF (Public Facilities) Zoning District.

Commission consensus: Modifications to Findings to approve a SDP:


Finding No. 2: Modify – The location, size and intensity of the proposed project will not create hazardous or inconvenient vehicular, aircraft or pedestrian traffic pattern.

Finding No 4: Delete.

Provide a statement in the document acknowledging there are existing landscaped areas and that green spaces also exist on the Airport whereby landscaping would not be required on a project by project basis.
Finding No. 5: Modify – The proposed development will not hinder the development or use of existing buildings on the Airport, or impair the value or operations thereof.

Finding No. 6: Modify – The improvement of any commercial or industrial structure will not have a substantial detrimental impact on the character or value of an adjacent Airport operation/business.

Finding No. 7: Delete

Finding No. 8: Buildings at the Airport are utilitarian having a box-like uninteresting external appearance. Staff will work on language for this finding.

Staff: In this instance, ‘form is following function.’

The Commission was of the opinion that new construction/development does not necessarily have to be compatible with existing structures.

Modify Finding No. 8 such that the design of the structure(s) and grounds can be monotonous and/or box-like.

Page 17. *Is there a square footage or type of project that should be exempt from a Site Development Permit?*

Staff: The way the zoning code works is if the project involves less than 150 sq. ft. of change to an existing structure, no SDP is required only a building permit.

Commission:
- Would have no issue with someone doing 1000 sq. ft. addition to a hangar.

Page 17. *The Zoning Ordinance exempts the following from the requirements to secure a SDP. All other applicable permits (business license, building permit, etc.) are required.*

Staff: Does the Commission want to default to the Zoning Code regulations provided the project complies with the Airport Land Use Plan Guidelines that any change to a building 150 sq.ft. or less would only require a Building Permit. If, however, the change was more than 150 sq.ft, a Minor SDP is required. Additionally, if the change to a building is 1000 sq.ft or more, a Major SDP is required.

Does the Commission want to follow these same thresholds?

**Major and Minor Site Development Permit**

Staff:
- The value of discretionary review refers to the Findings.
- Even if there is no discretionary review necessary for a project, it must comply with all building code standards including those rules for compliance with building setbacks and building restriction lines.

Commission consensus:

Threshold for Building Permit = 300 sq. feet or less for change to a building. 1200 sq. ft or less for change/addition to hangar. No public notice and no discretionary review.

Threshold for Minor SDP = 1200 square feet ≤ 3600 square feet for hangars; 300≤900 square feet for buildings. Public notice and discretionary review by Zoning Administrator.
Add threshold for Major SDP = 3600 square feet or greater for hangars; 900 square feet or greater for buildings. Public notice and discretionary review by Planning Commission.

**Use Permit**

Strike - subsections c & d.
No change – subsection e.
No change – subsection f. Lighting standards pertain to buildings.

5C. **Appoint Sub-Committee Airport Noise**
The intent of the sub-committee is to address noise concerns at the Airport, consider solutions, and report back to Council.

M/S Albright/Sloan to formulate a sub-committee to address the issue of Airport noise that consists of Airport Commissioners Jeff Sloan and Don Albright and public member Darryl Hudson. Motion carried by all AYE voice vote of the Commissioners present.

6. **REPORTS**

6A. **CALSTAR**
Airport Manager Owen: Calstar is progressing with plans to relocate, noting other structures will be added to the site for offices and living quarters. It was noted Calstar will remove the pre-manufactured buildings at the existing location from the Airport.

The new lease has not been signed.

6B. **Roof Specifications**
Airport Manager Owen: The City Purchasing Supervisor will be working this month on the roof specifications.

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT REGULAR MEETING IN AUGUST**
1. Calstar update
2. Roof specifications
3. Report from sub-committee concerning Airport noise
4. Airport Land Use Plan

8. **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**
None.

9. **STAFF COMMENTS**
Hangar inspections will begin August 17th. Airport Manager Owen explained the procedure and what staff will be looking for and require for compliance with Airport Hangar Policies and Procedures.

Staff will paint stripes for hangars at tenant’s request in order to be able to align aircraft straight.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**
There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:11 p.m.

__________________________________________
Eric Crane, Chair

__________________________________________
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary