Drone Farms and Sky Rights: The Next Frontier in Real Estate Development

Yariv C. Ben-Ari
Partner; Co-Chair, Israel Practice;
Co-Chair, Real Estate Hospitality

Gita Gandhi
Partner

HERRICK

When Airspace Becomes Infrastructure

For most of modern commercial history, the airspace above a building was legally defined yet economically dormant, as zoning height restrictions or transferable development rights rarely translated into operational or income-generating relevance for owners. What occurred above the roofline seldom influenced underwriting models, operating budgets, or asset valuations in any sustained way. That long-standing assumption is now dissolving as drone technology reshapes the functional meaning of airspace.

The integration of small unmanned aircrafts ("UAS"), commonly referred to as drones, into real estate operations represents one of the most underappreciated structural shifts in contemporary property markets, because what began as a marketing enhancement (high-resolution aerial photography for listings) has matured into operational infrastructure that reshapes how assets are inspected, monitored, insured, financed, secured, and valued. Drones are no longer peripheral tools; they are increasingly embedded components of asset management strategy.

This transformation did not occur in isolation but emerged from deliberate rulemaking by the Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA"), first through Part 107 in 2016 and now through the anticipated adoption of Part 108, together marking a progression from limited permission for commercial use to scalable enterprise integration. Under Part 107, drones became legally usable within defined constraints; under Part 108, they may become economically transformative at portfolio scale.

The Regulatory Foundation: Part 107

In 2016, the FAA implemented Part 107, formally titled the Small Unmanned Aircraft Rule, thereby creating the first comprehensive federal framework governing commercial drone operations in the United States. The rule required remote pilot certification, imposed operational limitations, and standardized safety obligations so that commercial drone activity could occur within a predictable regulatory structure. Flights were generally required to remain within visual line of sight, under specified altitude limits, and clear of certain controlled airspace unless additional authorization or waivers from local air traffic control ("ATC") or the FAA, as required, was obtained. Operations over people or moving vehicles required separate approvals with compliance responsibility resting on the remote pilot in command.

Although intentionally cautious in order to protect the integrity of the national airspace, Part 107 delivered regulatory clarity that proved enormously valuable to institutional real estate markets. Developers began using drones to document construction progress with greater frequency and accuracy, asset managers deployed them for roof and façade inspections that reduced reliance on scaffolding and lifts, brokers enhanced marketing materials with aerial imagery, and insurance carriers adapted underwriting practices to accommodate structured drone usage within enterprise risk frameworks.

Yet Part 107 embedded a structural limitation that constrained scale because the visual line-of-sight requirement meant drones generally had to remain within the remote pilot's direct sight, while Beyond Visual Line of Sight ("BVLOS") operations were permitted only through individualized waivers that were limited in number, complex to obtain, and operationally restrictive. As a result, drones functioned as valuable but episodic tools that improved discrete processes without fundamentally reconfiguring enterprise-level property operations.

The Shift to Enterprise Scalability: Proposed Part 108

The proposed Part 108 signals a fundamental shift in regulatory philosophy by moving away from a pilot-centered compliance model toward an enterprise

authorization framework under which organizations operating structured drone programs would assume responsibility for safety management systems, maintenance protocols, operational oversight procedures, and technological safeguards such as detect-and-avoid capabilities. Most significantly, routine BVLOS operations are anticipated to become permissible without individualized waivers provided performance-based safety standards are satisfied, thereby removing the central constraint that limited Part 107 to the individual remote pilot in command.

This transition transforms drones from dispatched service devices into embedded infrastructure systems capable of operating across multi-building campuses, distributed logistics portfolios, and large-scale mixed-use developments without continuous human visual supervision. The practical distinction between these models is profound, because what was once an efficiency tool deployed on demand could become a continuously operating layer of aerial intelligence integrated into daily asset management.

Operational Transformation in Real Estate

Under an enterprise BVLOS regime, the operational model of real estate ownership evolves from periodic inspection to continuous monitoring, because property owners would be able to automate inspections across entire portfolios rather than dispatching teams asset by asset. Storm damage could be documented in real time, aerial data could feed directly into centralized asset management platforms, and artificial intelligence tools could analyze roof conditions, façade integrity, drainage patterns, or solar panel performance before minor deterioration escalates into significant capital expenditure.

Inspection cycles would therefore shift from scheduled intervals to ongoing assessment, while maintenance strategies would transition from reactive repair to predictive intervention based on data trends. Workplace injury exposure associated with ladders, scaffolding, and elevated inspections would decline, insurance claims could be substantiated within hours rather than weeks, and lenders as well as equity partners would gain improved transparency into asset condition through structured reporting.

As these efficiencies compound across portfolios, underwriting assumptions and valuation metrics may adjust to reflect reduced operating volatility and improved capital planning accuracy, making drone integration not merely a technological enhancement but a structural contributor to asset stability.

Sports, Stadiums & Event Venues: Lessons from the Olympics

Large sports venues and stadium properties present a particularly visible example of how drone integration is reshaping real estate operations and airspace utilization. During global events such as the 2026 Winter Olympic Games, drones have been deployed for broadcast cinematography, perimeter security, crowd monitoring, and coordinated aerial light displays that function as dynamic entertainment infrastructure. These uses illustrate how airspace above a venue can be programmed, managed, and monetized as part of the event experience.

Modern stadiums, including facilities such as SoFi Stadium, the sports and entertainment venue located in Inglewood, California serving as the home for the NFL's Los Angeles Rams and Los Angeles Chargers, are increasingly designed as technology-forward assets that integrate advanced surveillance systems, high-capacity connectivity, and digital fan engagement platforms. Drone operations complement these systems by enabling real-time perimeter sweeps, structural inspections of roof trusses and lighting rigs, and rapid post-event damage assessments without disrupting event schedules. In high-security environments, coordinated drone monitoring may augment traditional surveillance by providing aerial perspectives of ingress and egress points, parking facilities, and surrounding infrastructure.

"Drones are no longer peripheral tools; they are increasingly embedded components of asset management strategy."

"Well-capitalized operators capable of implementing comprehensive safety management systems and advanced technological safeguards are likely to dominate the sector."

From a real estate perspective, this evolution suggests that stadium rooftops and adjacent parcels may serve as permanent drone staging areas, docking and charging hubs, or broadcast platforms, particularly as BVLOS authorization expands under Part 108. Venue operators may incorporate drone corridors, secure launch zones, and integrated command centers into facility design, treating airspace as a programmable extension of the property. As sports franchises and venue owners compete for marquee events, the ability to safely integrate drone-based broadcast, security, and entertainment systems may become a differentiating attribute in site selection and capital planning.

Logistics Integration & Building Design

The implications of Part 108 extend beyond inspection into the physical and economic design of buildings, because enabling routine BVLOS operations without individualized waivers may allow logistics providers to integrate commercial properties directly into autonomous delivery networks. In this environment, warehouses, multifamily towers, hotels, and office campuses may require designated drone landing zones, rooftop access corridors, charging stations, and digital airspace management protocols that position buildings as active nodes within distribution ecosystems rather than passive endpoints. Companies such as Amazon and Walmart are currently testing such drone use in places such as Texas and Arizona for delivery and logistics.

Proximity to drone corridors and compatibility with autonomous delivery systems could influence tenant demand, site selection decisions, and asset valuation, much as access to highway interchanges or broadband connectivity once differentiated properties. Buildings that fail to accommodate drone-enabled logistics may encounter competitive disadvantages similar to those experienced by properties that resisted earlier infrastructure transitions.

From Cost Efficiency to Revenue Generation: Rooftop Drone Farms

Beyond operational savings, Part 108 introduces the possibility of monetizing rooftop airspace through what may be described as drone farms, particularly on industrial and logistics properties where large, flat roofs represent underutilized horizontal infrastructure. Under a routine BVLOS framework, these rooftops could host docking stations, charging hubs, maintenance enclosures, and autonomous fleet deployment systems that collectively function as micro-distribution and service nodes. Control over such fleets could be transferred among different operators similar to the leasing of commercial aircraft.

In such a configuration, drones could launch and return autonomously for inspection services, security patrols, environmental monitoring, or delivery partnerships, while property owners lease rooftop space to drone logistics operators or technology providers in arrangements analogous to telecommunications equipment leases. Once regulatory clarity stabilized the telecommunications sector, rooftops transitioned from passive structural components to recurring revenue sources, and a comparable evolution may occur with drone infrastructure as enterprise operations become institutionalized and standardized. Real estate owners could contemplate entering into easements and other restrictive covenants that may be needed to account for necessary, aeronautical access.

Valuation, Transactions & Portfolio Strategy

As drone integration matures, its influence extends into valuation methodology and transactional practice because automated inspections reduce recurring operating expenses, enhance capital planning

accuracy, and introduce supplemental revenue streams through rooftop leasing arrangements that may be capitalized alongside traditional rental income. Enhanced data transparency also improves lender confidence and may influence financing terms, particularly for portfolios demonstrating consistent predictive maintenance performance.

Accordingly, due diligence processes are likely to expand to include rooftop structural assessments, aviation compliance reviews, proximity analysis to restricted airspace, and evaluation of data governance policies associated with drone operations. Transaction documents may address regulatory adherence and allocate responsibility for maintaining drone-related systems, while investors increasingly assess whether properties are designed or retrofitted for efficient integration into autonomous aerial networks.

US National Security, CFIUS Considerations & Executive Orders

The expansion of drone infrastructure introduces national security considerations into real estate analysis, particularly as the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States ("CFIUS") has broadened scrutiny of foreign acquisitions involving properties located near sensitive government facilities or critical infrastructure. While historically focused on corporate transactions, CFIUS now evaluates certain real estate transactions when geographic proximity could enable intelligence collection, and drones intensify this concern by transforming buildings into potential data platforms.

A drone operating from a rooftop can capture high-resolution imagery of neighboring facilities, observe access patterns, and map infrastructure components, while modern systems transmit and store digital files through cloud-based architectures that may implicate foreign supply chains or overseas data access. Regulators may therefore examine not only property ownership but also who controls the technology operating above it and how the resulting data is stored, accessed, and secured.

Recent executive orders (Executive Order "Unleashing American Drone Dominance" (signed June 6, 2025) and Executive Order "Restoring American Airspace Sovereignty" (signed June 6, 2025)) issued by President Donald Trump seek to simultaneously expand US drone innovation and strengthen airspace security, directing the FAA to accelerate integration of unmanned aircraft systems into the national airspace while enhancing safeguards against unauthorized or malicious drone activity. The orders promote routine BVLOS operations, faster regulatory approvals, support for American-made drone manufacturing and exports, and expanded commercial and public safety applications. At the same time, they establish stronger counter-unmanned aerial system coordination, improved detection capabilities around critical infrastructure and major events, and heightened enforcement against unlawful drone use—reflecting a dual focus on economic competitiveness and national security.

Such orders signal that foreign ownership or operation of large-scale drone farms could attract heightened review, particularly for properties located near military installations, ports, energy facilities, or telecommunications nodes. As a result, sophisticated investors may evaluate drone operator ownership structures, data storage policies, and proximity to restricted airspace as part of routine transaction analysis.

Legal Structuring & Risk Allocation

Monetizing rooftop airspace requires disciplined legal and operational structuring, because structural engineers must confirm load capacity and roof integrity, insurance policies must address aviation-related exposures, municipal zoning ordinances may affect launch activity, and contractual arrangements

"Rooftops may evolve into drone farms, airspace may become monetized infrastructure, and continuous autonomous oversight may emerge as a standard feature of professional asset management."

must clearly allocate responsibility for compliance, maintenance, and data governance. Additionally, owners need to analyze privacy rights and trespass issues as well as proximity to certain restricted airspace. Although markets tend to adapt quickly once regulatory frameworks stabilize, early adopters must navigate evolving standards and allocate risk with precision in order to avoid mispricing operational exposure.

Well-capitalized operators capable of implementing comprehensive safety management systems and advanced technological safeguards are likely to dominate the sector, and real estate investors positioned to partner with such platforms, or to develop internal capabilities, may secure durable competitive advantages as enterprise drone operations scale.

Real Estate Structuring, Investment Strategy & Regulatory Overlay

As drone infrastructure becomes embedded within property operations, investors must approach airspace not merely as a technological add-on but as a regulated asset layer requiring structured governance, contractual clarity, and capital planning discipline. The introduction of rooftop drone farms, autonomous inspection fleets, and delivery corridors creates a hybrid regulatory environment in which aviation law, land use controls, insurance frameworks, privacy laws, and private lease agreements intersect.

From a structuring perspective, property owners contemplating rooftop drone operations must determine whether to retain operational control, enter into ground or rooftop lease agreements with third-party operators, or create joint ventures that allocate revenue and compliance responsibilities. Lease documentation will need to address airspace access rights, indemnification provisions, insurance minimums, maintenance obligations, reciprocal easement agreements, real estate covenants, hours of operation and termination triggers tied to regulatory changes, as well as potential costs of abandoned or malfunctioning equipment. In mixed-use projects or condominium regimes, governance documents may require amendment to clarify who controls rooftop airspace and whether drone-related revenue is treated as common income or allocated to a specific ownership interest.

Regulatory compliance will extend beyond FAA authorization. Municipal zoning ordinances may restrict launch activity, noise levels, or equipment placement, particularly in dense urban environments. Environmental review may be triggered if drone infrastructure alters rooftop structures or introduces lighting systems. In certain jurisdictions, state privacy statutes and biometric data laws may apply to aerial imagery capture, particularly where facial recognition or advanced analytics are involved; in fact, many local jurisdictions outright forbid any drone operations. As a result, investors must coordinate aviation counsel with land use attorneys and data governance professionals to avoid fragmented compliance. Zoning counsel may be needed in order to analyze future jurisdictional limits.

Capital expenditure planning also becomes more nuanced. Rooftop reinforcement, power upgrades, secure enclosures, and network integration may require upfront investment that must be evaluated against projected operational savings or lease income. Investors may model drone-related improvements similarly to solar installations or telecommunications infrastructure, analyzing internal rates of return based on long-term service agreements or energy-equivalent operational savings. Where drone farms generate recurring revenue, appraisers and lenders will need to determine whether such income is contractual and durable enough to support capitalization within net operating income calculations.

Insurance markets will play a critical role in shaping investment behavior. Policies must address aviation liability, cyber risk associated with data transmission, and potential property damage from equipment malfunction. Insurers may require documented safety management systems consistent with Part 108 enterprise authorization, effectively making regulatory compliance a condition of coverage. Over time, properties that demonstrate disciplined drone governance and documented operational performance may benefit from favorable underwriting treatment relative to assets lacking structured oversight.

Finally, institutional investors must evaluate portfolio-level strategy. Early adoption may create competitive differentiation and operational efficiency, yet regulatory evolution remains ongoing. Investors with geographically diverse holdings may face varying local restrictions and airspace classifications, requiring asset-by-asset feasibility assessments. Capital allocation decisions will therefore hinge on a combination of regulatory certainty, tenant demand, technological maturity, and projected revenue durability.

In this environment, airspace transitions from a passive legal abstraction into a managed, regulated, and potentially income-producing component of the capital stack. Those who treat drone integration as a strategic real estate initiative—rather than a peripheral operational experiment—will be better positioned to capture long-term value as aviation governance and property economics continue to converge.

Conclusion: Sky Rights as an Emerging Asset Variable

The evolution from Part 107 to Part 108 marks the institutionalization of drone infrastructure within property economics, as the former validated commercial viability within a cautious regulatory envelope while the latter has the potential to unlock scalable enterprise systems capable of reshaping cost structures, operational models, and revenue strategies. The technical issues currently under FAA review will materially influence the speed, scalability, and cost profile of advanced drone integration. Additionally, evolving federal procurement and security policies may indirectly shape market demand by incentivizing US-manufactured or security-vetted platforms in defined operational contexts. Together, these regulatory and policy variables will determine not only how quickly BVLOS becomes routine, but also which operators and business models can scale sustainably under the emerging compliance framework.

Rooftops may evolve into drone farms, airspace may become monetized infrastructure, and continuous autonomous oversight may emerge as a standard feature of professional asset management. Historically, certain rooftops were considered economically dormant absent additional development rights, yet drone technology reimagines air rights by allowing the airspace above a building to generate independent return that may rival traditional development premiums.

For disciplined investors in the United States and abroad, the opportunity lies not merely in regulatory compliance but in strategic capitalization, because aviation law is increasingly intersecting with real estate economics in ways that reward early recognition and thoughtful integration. The horizon is no longer theoretical; it is regulatory, operational, and investable.

HERRICK

Herrick's Israel Practice Group

Delivering comprehensive legal services to Israeli clients who pursue investment and business opportunities in the U.S.

For more information, please contact

Yariv C. Ben-Ari

Partner; Co-Chair, Israel Practice;
Co-Chair, Real Estate Hospitality

ybenari@herrick.com

(212) 592-1440

www.herrick.com