



## POWHATAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

### Agenda: Regular Meeting

Tuesday, December 5, 2023

6:00 PM

Powhatan Village Building Auditorium

3910 Old Buckingham Road

### MEETING PROCEDURE AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

All Planning Commission meetings are open to the public and interested persons may participate on the day and time specified above.

In addition to participating in person, members of the public may participate remotely by electronic means by joining a webinar at <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89655087654> or by dialing in by phone at 1-929-205-6099 OR 1-312-626-6799, then typing in the webinar ID 896 5508 7654. During the public comment period, participants may raise their hand using the zoom controls on the computer screen, or (if dialing in) by pressing \*9 on a phone (instructions will also be posted at [powhatanva.gov/432/Live-Stream-of-Powhatan-County-Meetings](http://powhatanva.gov/432/Live-Stream-of-Powhatan-County-Meetings)).

The meeting may be watched live at [powhatanva.gov/432/Live-Stream-of-Powhatan-County-Meetings](http://powhatanva.gov/432/Live-Stream-of-Powhatan-County-Meetings).

Copies of the proposed plans, ordinances, and amendments may be reviewed in the Department of Community Development in the Powhatan County Administration Building (3834 Old Buckingham Road) between 8:30 AM and 5:00 PM of each business day by appointment only. Copies of staff reports are available prior to the Public Hearing upon request and will be available online at least five (5) days prior to the meeting at <http://powhatanva.gov/agendacenter>. Please call (804) 598-5621 with any questions.

### AGENDA ITEMS

**1. Call to Order**

Dr. Barbara Brown (Chair)

**2. Invocation**

Ms. Vicki Hurt (Vice Chair)

**3. Adoption of Agenda**

a. Request to Postpone Action/Amend the Agenda

**4. Administrative Items**

a. Approval of Minutes: October 17, 2023 (Workshop)

**5. Public Comment Period**

At this time, the Planning Commission will hear citizen comments on matters not scheduled for a public hearing that involve the services, policies, and affairs of Powhatan County government related to planning or land use issues.

**6. Old Business** None

**7. Public Hearings**

7.1 23-03-ZA Minor Meat Processing

7.2 23-07-ZA Amendment of the Conditional Use Solar Energy Farm

**8. New Business** None

**9. Adjourn**

Next Regular Meeting: Tuesday, January 9, 2024 (6:00 p.m.)

**VIRGINIA: AT A WORKSHOP MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION HELD IN THE POWHATAN VILLAGE BUILDING AUDITORIUM, 3910 OLD BUCKINGHAM ROAD IN POWHATAN COUNTY, VIRGINIA, TUESDAY, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023, AT 6:00 PM.**

---

**Planning Commissioners Present**

Vicki Hurt, District 1 (Vice Chair)  
Darlene Bowlin, District 2,  
Bobby Hall, District 3  
Jane Pendergast, District 4,  
Barbara Brown, District 5 (Chair)

**Planning Commissioners Absent**

None

**Staff Members Present**

Tom Lacheney, County Attorney  
Michael Ciriello, Planning Director  
Sean Clendening, Planner I Technician

---

**1. Call to Order**

Dr. Barbara Brown called the meeting to order.

**2. Invocation**

Ms. Hurt led the invocation.

**3. Public Comment** (time limit 3 minutes per individual/5 minutes per group, 30 minutes total time limit that can be extended by the Planning Commission)

Chairman Brown opened the public comment period.

[David Anderson, 2366 Belle Crest Circle](#), said that different tax parcels should be treated differently, even if having only one access point per parcel may be easier.

[Debbie Weir, 1501 Page Road](#), agreed with Mr. Anderson. She said unique locations require careful consideration. She listed loop driveways as an example.

Chairman Brown closed the public comment period.

#### **4. Adoption of Agenda**

Ms. Hurt motioned **to amend** the agenda to discuss boutique meat-packing businesses first.

Ms. Pendergast seconded the motion.

Chairman Brown, Ms. Hurt, Ms. Pendergast, Ms. Bowlin, and Mr. Hall voted AYE.

**VOTE 5-0**

**MOTION PASSED**

#### **5. Workshop**

##### **a. ZA 23-04 Boutique Meat Packing Businesses**

Mr. Ciriello gave a presentation that included the comprehensive plan and existing zoning districts. He told the Planning Commission to question whether “the proposed use was consistent with the County’s stated intentions and vision for agricultural areas.” He also asked about the best regulatory mechanism to accommodate the use: CUPs with specific standards or use-by-right subject to a general standard.

Ms. Hurt said the use fit with Powhatan County in this political season. Ms. Hurt said allowing a meatpacking business aligned with the County's rural focus. Ms. Hurt said she did not want the rendering done in Powhatan County. Mr. Ciriello said it was okay if the Planning Commission did not think the rendering process was consistent with the County's goals and objectives. Ms. Hurt said she did not want to allow anything that could disrupt surrounding property owners. Chairman Brown mentioned a conditional use permit rather than use-by-right. Ms. Hurt and Ms. Pendergast agreed. Ms. Pendergast noted that they may want to consider differentiating between the type of animals being processed because it affects conditions and space restrictions. Mr. Ciriello said he did not recommend splitting the uses because the County could control the animals being stored on-site. He asked about the scale. Mr. Hall said the businesses aligned with the County's goals and objectives. He recommended that the County look at linear footage from the property line for these plants. The rest of the Planning

Commission agreed, and Ms. Bowlin said that the scale should depend on the parcel size. The Planning Commission decided that a conditional use permit was the best option.

Chairman Brown was concerned about allowing a meatpacking plant on a ten-acre parcel. Mr. Ciriello said the County could define a maximum square footage for storage and operations and include setbacks to decrease visibility. Mr. Ciriello said that more minor details were things like smell and noise, but he believed they were regulated by the State. The Planning Commission agreed that there should be a conditional use permit with specific standards, limitations on the number of animals, design guidelines regarding light and noise, and setbacks. They also agreed that building size limits should depend on the size of the lot. Ms. Pendergast asked if the Planning Commission should consider the number of animals that can be stored for a period of time. Ms. Bowlin said the limit should depend on the parcel size, and Ms. Bowlin agreed. Mr. Ciriello said that was a good idea. Ms. Pendergast asked if the health department controlled commercial septic and water systems, and Mr. Ciriello said they did.

**b. ZA 23-04 Land-locked/ Flag lots**

Mr. Ciriello presented research, the number of landlocked lots, flag-lot definitions, and potential solutions. He suggested that the Planning Commission clarify its definition and add dimensional standards. He noted that this process may require more work but believed it was the best route. He recommended that the standard be based on the road the property abuts and its geographical context. Ms. Hurt said she usually liked to defer to VDOT. Mr. Lacheney advised the Planning Commission to refrain from using VDOT's standards. He explained that VDOT does not have driveway spacing rules for residential development on State roads like Rte. 60.

Chairman Brown explained that flag-lots affected zoning, and the County currently had two definitions. She asked if the Planning Commission wanted a definition related to the size of the lot or the size of the road access area. Mr. Ciriello asked if the Planning Commission wanted to add an exemption for landlocked parcels. Mr. Lacheney said that Mr. Ciriello was trying to distinguish between people trying to develop and people trying to give access to a neighbor. He added that the County would clearly state

that easements may not be used to access for subdividing a parcel. Ms. Hurt agreed with this method. Mr. Ciriello noted that family divisions were exempt. Chairman Brown asked if the County should allow a landlocked parcel to obtain an access in some way. She also said that the Planning Commission should consider that there will be different requirements based on where the access point is. Ms. Hurt agreed. Mr. Lachenev pointed out that private roads are a possible solution because once a private road is built, the parcel is no longer considered a flag lot. Mr. Ciriello said there is an area along Three Bridge Road with the potential for eight driveways in the span of 200 ft. The Planning Commission agreed that one definition will not fit all landlocked parcels. Ms. Pendergast said she wanted to avoid discussing the topic because it was the property owner's problem to solve.

Ms. Hurt asked how other localities have handled landlocked parcels. Mr. Lachenev said landlocked lots are usually inexpensive because they will remain landlocked. Mr. Ciriello said that some localities have rules about flag lots, which are different. Ms. Hurt said landlocked lots may not be that big of an issue. Mr. Lachenev said that a prescriptive easement was an alternative solution. Mr. Ciriello asked if the Planning Commission was going to add "landlocked parcels" to the definition and allow flag lots.

Ms. Bowlin asked if the residual lot had to be of a certain acreage, and Mr. Ciriello said it was impossible to anticipate every circumstance. Mr. Lachenev suggested that the width could be a ratio, and Ms. Hurt said she liked that idea. He also suggested that the County treat flag lots like private roads and have a minimum standard required to present before the Planning Commission for approval. The Planning Commission agreed that there needed to be a consistent definition of "flag lot." Mr. Ciriello noted that the driveway access could come out if the County revisited the access easement management ordinances. Mr. Lachenev said the Planning Commission needed to get the zoning and subdivision definitions to match up, decide whether they wanted to allow flag lots on landlocked parcels, and determine if they wanted to revisit the idea of flag lots. He said that as for the definitions, the County says that the stricter definition always applies if there is a disagreement. Chairman Brown noted that a landlocked parcel is the owner's issue, not the Planning Commission's. Ms. Pendergast asked if the

County should even be solving the problems of flag lots right now. Mr. Hall said he would like the County to allow flag lots so that he could build on his father's property. Ms. Bowlin asked if there was a way that citizens could just go before the Planning Department. Ms. Hurt said the possibility of a flag lot didn't bother her, but she did not want driveways bunched up together. She added that she was mainly concerned with how the easements affected people driving on the roads.

**c. ZA 23-06 Subdivision Access Management**

Mr. Lacheney gave a presentation that included maps along Rte. 60 – Anderson Highway and Ballsville Road. He explained that the Board wanted a comprehensive solution for the land rushes that were occurring and causing a ton of driveways. He said that the Board wanted to approve all two-parcel private roads. He then went on to present on private roads and access and circulation. He noted that this was not a long-term solution but only designed to stop things now. He said the County could require subdivision developers to present before the Board before allowing their subdivisions. He also reiterated that this was not a permanent solution. Ms. Bowlin asked how long the application for Ballsville Road had been in, and Mr. Lacheney said it had been in since June. Mr. Ciriello said the spacing between driveways was pretty generous in this case. He noted that the County had no standard for what an interior parallel road would be, like gravel or dirt. Mr. Lacheney said it would be a gravel road. Ms. Bowlin said restricting a large property owner too much devalued their property.

Chairman Brown noted that it was not the role of the Planning Commission to indemnify people's land purchases. Ms. Pendergast said it wasn't the County's responsibility to maximize each landowner's property across the Board. She said Mr. Lacheney's proposal was a good temporary fix, and they would look at a comprehensive solution. Ms. Hurt agreed. The Planning Commission decided to let Mr. Lacheney proceed with scheduling a public hearing. Ms. Bowlin pointed out a subdivision in her area where had the County allowed private roads, they could have avoided at least two driveways onto the main road. Mr. Lacheney said that once this proposal passes, the owner could come to the Board and

request approval to add private roads. Ms. Hurt noted that long, skinny lots were not of rural character.

Mr. Lacheney agreed that Ms. Bowlin had a good example.

**d. ZA 23-01 I-1 uses in CC**

Mr. Ciriello gave a presentation that included the intention of commerce center (CC) and commerce center planner development (CC-PD). He said he would like to review the ordinance and all permitted uses. Mr. Lacheney explained that citizens look at the permitted uses as by-right uses when they should be thought of more as suggestions. That way some can be proffered out later by the Planning Commission and Board. He suggested that the County restructure the system. Ms. Hurt said that made sense to her. Mr. Ciriello pointed out that many of the uses aren't even possible. Mr. Lacheney noted that the ordinance was initially drafted for Currituck, North Carolina, but the County bought it from a company in Ohio before he was hired. Ms. Pendergast said that proffering a conceptual plan did not prevent citizens from reapplying to redo them in the future. Mr. Lacheney said that uses should not be an issue if the County has good design standards to regulate development. Mr. Ciriello said he did not mind going to the Board to stop this process. He added that the County did not have clarity on accessory uses either. Mr. Ciriello asked to take some time with Mr. Lacheney to make the uses under commerce center clear and concise for the citizens. The Planning Commission agreed.

**6. Adjourn**

Ms. Hurt motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Pendergast seconded the motion.

Chairman Brown, Ms. Hurt, Ms. Pendergast, Ms. Bowlin, and Mr. Hall voted AYE.

**VOTE 5-0 MOTION PASSED**



# Case #23-03-ZA

## County of Powhatan

Amend Several Sections of Chapter 83 (Zoning Ordinance) to  
Include the By-Right and Conditional Use of Minor and Regular Meat  
Processing Facility

Staff Report Prepared for the Planning Commission  
July 5, 2023  
Updated: November 29, 2023

---

---

### I. PUBLIC MEETINGS

Board of Supervisors	June 26, 2023	Initiation
Planning Commission	July 5, 2023	Public Hearing
Public Workshop	October 17, 2023	
Planning Commission	December 5, 2023	Public Hearing

### II. SUMMARY OF AMENDMENT

The proposed amendment to the zoning ordinance would allow minor meat processing as a conditional use in the Light Industrial (I-1) and Heavy Industrial (I-2) and as a conditional use in the Agricultural 10 (A-10) zoning districts. This amendment would also allow standard meat processing as a conditional use in the Light Industrial (I-1) and conditional use in the Heavy Industrial (I-2) zoning districts. This amendment would also include definitions and use standards for minor and standard meat processing facilities. This amendment would also eliminate the existing definition of Abattoir.

### III. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

#### Current Situation

Since the COVID-19 pandemic, an increased demand for local meats has revealed a shortage of small-scale meat processing plants in Virginia. Although the demand for meat is high, farmers are having increasingly more difficulties accessing local meat processors. Wait times for processing can take months, which puts a burden on farmers and contributes to supply chain delays. In agricultural communities like Powhatan there is a need for local access to processing facilities, especially those who operate on a small-volume model.

In February of this year a bipartisan, bicameral bill was introduced, the Strengthening Local Processing Act, which would increase federal cost share for state facility inspections, create a competitive grant program for small processing facilities to increase processing capacity, and create two educational grant programs for meat processing workforce training.



The proposed amendment to the zoning ordinance would allow minor meat processing as a by-right principal use in the Light Industrial (I-1) and Heavy Industrial (I-2) and as a conditional use in the Agricultural 10 (A-10) zoning districts. This amendment would also allow standard meat processing as a conditional use in the Light Industrial (I-1) and a by-right use in the Heavy Industrial (I-2) zoning districts. This amendment would also include definitions and use standards for minor and standard meat processing facilities. This amendment would also eliminate the existing definition of Abattoir.

<b>Applicable Zoning Districts</b>	
<b>Conditional Use</b> <i>Standard meat processing</i>	Heavy Industrial (I-2)
<b>Conditional Use</b> <i>Standard meat processing</i>	Light Industrial (I-1)
<b>Conditional Use</b> <i>Minor meat processing</i>	Heavy Industrial (I-2) Light Industrial (I-1)
<b>Conditional Use</b> <i>Minor meat processing</i>	Agricultural-10 (A-10)
<b>Standards for Specific Principal Uses   Meat processing and Minor meat processing</b> [Sec. 83-432(b)(3)(e)] and [Sec. 83-432(b)(3)(f)]	

(e) Standard meat processing

1. The facility must comply with all applicable state and federal regulations regarding the licensing, inspection, and operation of a meat processing facility including but not limited to permits from the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and the United States Department of Agriculture Food Safety Inspection Service.
2. All buildings and structures must be set back from all property lines a minimum of 250 feet.
3. All processing must occur in the primary building which must be an enclosed structure.
4. Materials may be stored within enclosed accessory buildings. No outdoor storage of products, materials, or machinery is permitted.
5. Animals must be confined in a fully enclosed area in the rear of the primary building.
6. A perimeter buffer Type C as outlined in Sec. 83-461(e) will be required along adjacent parcels.
7. Animals may only be kept overnight on the property if the following standards are met:
  - a. Animals must be kept in a fully enclosed area.
  - b. Overnight supervision is required. Overnight supervision can be accomplished through an employee onsite or through appropriate electronic monitoring.
  - c. No more than twenty (20) animals may be kept overnight.

(f) Minor meat processing

1. The facility must comply with all applicable state and federal regulations regarding the licensing, inspection, and operation of a meat processing facility including but not limited to permits from the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and the United States Department of Agriculture Food Safety Inspection Service.
2. All buildings and structures must be set back from all property lines a minimum of 500 feet.
3. All processing must occur in the primary building which must be an enclosed structure.
4. Materials may be stored within enclosed accessory buildings. No outdoor storage of products, materials, or machinery is permitted.
5. Animals must be confined in a fully enclosed area in the rear of the primary building.
6. In the Agricultural 10 (A-10) District, a minimum of 20 acres is required for a minor meat processing facility.
7. A perimeter buffer Type C as outlined in Sec. 83-461(e) will be required along adjacent parcels.
8. Animals may only be kept overnight on the property if the following standards are met:
  - a. Animals must be kept in a fully enclosed area.
  - b. Overnight supervision is required. Overnight supervision can be accomplished through an employee onsite or through appropriate electronic monitoring.
  - c. No more than ten (10) animals may be kept overnight.

## Proposed Amendments

The proposed amendment would establish *meat processing* and *minor meat processing* as new uses in the zoning ordinance. These new uses are intended to better serve the agricultural community of Powhatan by providing an avenue for smaller scale meat processing facilities to operate in the county. The amendment also proposes use standards that will be applicable to all standards and minor meat processing facilities. These standards are intended to preserve the area's existing rural character and to ensure compatibility with surrounding properties. They include:

- Minimum lot acreage and setbacks
- Limitations to overnight animal confinement
- Perimeter buffer requirements
- Outdoor storage standards

The use standards outlined in the amendment will apply to all meat processing facilities.

Additional impacts may need to be addressed on a case-by-case basis through the CUP.

- *Permit Minor Meat Processing in Village Growth Area Districts*

Add minor meat processing to the list of conditional uses within the following districts:

- Light Industrial (I-1) [Sec. 83-251]
- Heavy Industrial (I-2) [Sec. 83-261]

- *Conditional Use of Minor Meat Processing in Rural Districts*

Add minor meat processing to the list of conditional uses within the following district:

- Agricultural 10 (A-10) [Sec. 83-162]

- *Conditional Use of Standard Meat Processing in Village Growth Area Districts*

Add standard meat processing to the list of conditional uses within the following districts:

- Heavy Industrial (I-2) [Sec. 83-261]

- *Adopt Use Standards*

Create specific standards for that use, which are intended to ensure that the use will remain a small-scale operation with minimal negative impacts to adjacent properties.

- *Define Uses*

Article XI – Definitions

Sec. 83-521. Definitions

*Meat processing facility, minor:* A facility for the commercial processing of meat for human consumption, including, but not limited to, slaughtering, butchering, cutting, dressing, and packaging of meat products, but does not include rendering. The primary building where processing occurs cannot exceed 5,000 square feet in size. Associated office and other accessory buildings do not count towards this square footage limit. A meat processing facility is designed to accommodate the confinement and slaughtering of live animals and may include packing, treating, storage, or sale of the product on the premises. A minor meat processing facility does not include butcher shops, rendering plants, or restaurants.

*Meat processing facility, standard:* A facility for the commercial processing of meat for human consumption, including, but not limited to, slaughtering, butchering, cutting, dressing, and packaging of meat products, but does not include rendering. A meat processing facility is designed to accommodate the confinement and slaughtering of live animals and may include packing, treating, storage, or sale of the product on the premises. The maximum square footage of a standard meat processing building and accessory areas including parking is 50,000 square feet. A meat processing facility may not include rendering plants; but may include retail butcher shops and/or restaurants.

#### IV. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ANALYSIS

*Chapter 4: Economic Development* of the 2021 Long-Range Comprehensive Plan identifies goals and objectives aimed at supporting small businesses and creating a diversified local economy:

- *Goal: Economic Development:* Powhatan County will have a diverse and balanced economy that supports sustained business and employment opportunities for its citizens and attracts revenues from outside the county to generate further income to fund high-quality county government services.
  - Objective ED.5: Increase the number and variety of jobs in the county through the retention and attraction of quality commercial enterprises.

#### V. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Zoning Department **recommends approval** of the proposed amendment, as it would support the creation and expansion of small businesses, aligning with the goals of the *2020 Strategic Plan* (Goal #4: Economic Development, Objective #4.1: Business-Friendly Economic Development) and the *2021 Long-Range Comprehensive Plan*.

#### VI. PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION

In accordance with public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good planning practices, the Planning Commission recommends (*approval / denial / deferral*) of the request submitted by the County of Powhatan to amend provisions set forth in several sections of Chapter 83 (Zoning Ordinance) to amend by conditional use minor meat processing.

#### VII. Planning Commission Vote

AYE NAY	Ms. Hurt, District 1
AYE NAY	Ms. Bowlin, District 2
AYE NAY	Mr. Hall, District 3
AYE NAY	Ms. Pendergast, District 4
AYE NAY	Dr. Brown, District 5



# Case #23-07-ZA

## County of Powhatan

Amend Chapter 83 Section(s) 152, 162, 262, 455,  
Zoning Ordinance

Staff Report Prepared for the Planning Commission  
November 29, 2023

---

### I. PUBLIC MEETINGS

Planning Commission

December 5, 2023

Public Hearing

### II. SUMMARY OF AMENDMENT

The proposed amendment would remove Solar Energy Farms as a conditional use from A-10, A-20, and I-2. Specifically proposed changes would be to section(s) 83-521 definitions of the Powhatan zoning ordinance, 83-152 Conditional Uses Agricultural-20 (A-20), 82-162 Conditional Uses Agricultural-10 (A-10), 83-262 Conditional Uses Heavy Industrial (I-2), 83-455 Off Street Parking and Loading Utility Uses Solar Farms.

### III. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

#### Current Ordinance

#### Sec. 83-521. Definitions.

*Solar energy farm means a system consisting of solar panels, modules, and related equipment (e.g., heat exchanger, pipes, inverter, wiring, storage) that collects solar radiation and transfer it as heat to a carrier fluid for use in hot water heating or space heating and cooling, and/or that collects solar energy and converts it into electricity. It is designed to meet demands for a larger area and is typically mounted on the ground.*

#### Proposed Amendment.

*Sec. 83-152 (9) CUP A-20 District (STRIKE)*

*Sec. 83-162 (26) CUP A-10 District (STRIKE)*

*Sec. 83-262 (2) CUP I-2 district (STRIKE)*

***Sec. 83-455 (d) (2) Off Street Parking Loading Utility Uses Solar (STRIKE)***

**IV. Staff Analysis**

As outlined in the proposed definitions solar farms, referenced CUP, and associated regulated activities, which are used for large-scale energy collection, will be removed from the zoning ordinance. The proposed change does not affect solar energy collections systems that are commonly used for individual single-family residential homes and roof top solar collection for commercial properties.

**V. Staff Recommendation**

The Planning Department recommends *denial of the proposed amendment changes in that it is unclear what the unintended consequences would be regarding agricultural development, more pressure for high/medium density subdivision development in lieu of other development options in agricultural zoning and the possible need for expanded energy production in industrial zoned areas. Additionally, according to energy professionals there may be no more capacity to support additional solar farms in Powhatan and so the need for to ban this use may be redundant.*

**VI. Planning Commission Resolution**

In accordance with public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good planning practices, the Planning Commission recommends (approval / denial / deferral) of the request submitted by the County of Powhatan to amend provisions set forth in several section of chapter 83 (Zoning Ordinance) to amend the conditional use(s) of Solar Energy Farms.

**VII. Planning Commission Vote**

AYE NAY	Ms. Hurt, District 1
AYE NAY	Ms. Bowlin, District 2
AYE NAY	Mr. Hall, District 3
AYE NAY	Ms. Pendergast, District 4
AYE NAY	Dr. Brown, District 5

Attachments: Sec. 83-152

Sec. 83-162

Sec. 83-262

## Sec. 83-152. Conditional uses.

The following uses are allowable as principal uses in the A-20 District only on approval of a conditional use permit and subject to any referenced use-specific standards and all other applicable regulations of this chapter:

- (1) Farm winery, special impact;
- (2) Horse racetrack or show grounds;
- (3) Livestock market;
- (4) Telecommunications tower;
- (5) Cemetery;
- (6) Airport;
- (7) Airstrip;
- (8) Helicopter landing facility;
- ~~(9) Solar energy farm;~~
- (10) Utility use, major;
- (11) Animal shelter;
- (12) Pound;
- (13) Kennel, commercial;
- (14) Veterinary clinic;
- (15) Conference or training center;
- (16) Country club;
- (17) Fairground;
- (18) Golf course;
- (19) Marina, commercial;
- (20) Recreation facility, nonprofit;
- (21) Recreation facility, public;
- (22) Shooting range, commercial;
- (23) Rural event venue;
- (24) Auction facility;
- (25) Campground/recreational vehicle park;
- (26) Place of worship.

(Ord. No. O-2013-06, 9-16-13; Ord. No. O-2019-20, 4-24-19)

## Sec. 83-162. Conditional uses.

The following uses are allowable as principal uses in the A-10 District only on approval of a conditional use permit and subject to any referenced use-specific standards and all other applicable regulations of this chapter:

- (1) Farm winery, special impact;
- (2) Horse racetrack or show grounds;
- (3) Livestock market;
- (4) Sawmill, commercial;
- (5) Farm worker housing;
- (6) Manufactured home park;
- (7) Assisted living facility;
- (8) Continuing care retirement community;
- (9) Hospice facility;
- (10) Rooming or boarding house;
- (11) Telecommunications tower;
- (12) Community center;
- (13) Museum;
- (14) College or university;
- (15) Private school;
- (16) Vocational or trade school;
- (17) Correctional facility;
- (18) Fire training facility;
- (19) Nursing home;
- (20) Cemetery;
- (21) Club or lodge;
- (22) Halfway house;
- (23) Shelter for victims of domestic violence;
- (24) Airport;
- (25) Helicopter landing facility;
- ~~(26) Solar energy farm;~~
- (27) Utility use, major;
- (28) Animal grooming;
- (29) Animal shelter;
- (30) Pound;
- (31) Kennel, commercial;
- (32) Kennel, private, less than two acres;
- (33) Veterinary clinic;



- (34) Conference or training center;
- (35) Country club;
- (36) Fairground;
- (37) Golf course;
- (38) Marina, commercial;
- (39) Recreation facility, commercial indoor;
- (40) Recreation facility, commercial outdoor;
- (41) Recreation facility, nonprofit;
- (42) Shooting range, commercial;
- (43) Rural event venue;
- (44) Antique store;
- (45) Art gallery;
- (46) Auction facility;
- (47) Farmers' market;
- (48) Flea market;
- (49) Campground/recreational vehicle park;
- (50) Country inn;
- (51) Commercial landscaping operation;
- (52) Asphalt or concrete plant;
- (53) Brewery or distillery;
- (54) Microbrewery or micro-distillery;
- (55) Winery;
- (56) Convenience center, county;
- (57) Heavy vehicle/equipment repair and servicing;
- (58) Wood and stump recycling business;
- (59) Contractor's storage yard.

(Ord. No. O-2013-09, 2-3-14; O-2016-29, 8-22-16; Ord. No. O-2019-20, 4-24-19; Ord. No. O-2022-26 , 6-27-22; Ord. No. O-2022-27 , 6-27-22)

## **Sec. 83-262. Conditional uses.**

The following uses are allowable as principal uses in the I-2 District only on approval of a conditional use permit and subject to any referenced use-specific standards and all other applicable regulations of this chapter:

- (1) Livestock market;
- ~~(2) Solar energy farm;~~
- (3) Animal shelter/pound;
- (4) Kennel, commercial;
- (5) Business service establishment;
- (6) Amusement park;
- (7) Motorsports park;
- (8) Shooting range, commercial;
- (9) Truck stop;
- (10) Truck hauler business;
- (11) Fuel oil or bottled gas distribution or storage;
- (12) Abattoir;
- (13) Hazardous material collection site;
- (14) Land clearing debris disposal facility.

(Ord. No. O-2013-14, 2-3-14)