

<https://www.planning.org/pas/memo/2019/sep/>

Planning for Utility-Scale Solar Energy Facilities

PAS Memo — September/October 2019

By Darren Coffey, AICP

Solar photovoltaics (PV) are the fastest-growing energy source in the world due to the decreasing cost per kilowatt-hour — 60 percent to date since 2010, according to the U.S. Department of Energy (U.S. DOE n.d.) — and the comparative speed in constructing a facility. Solar currently generates 0.4 percent of global electricity, but some University of Oxford researchers estimate its share could increase to 20 percent by 2027 (Hawken 2017). Utility-scale solar installations are the most cost-effective solar PV option (Hawken 2017).

Transitioning from coal plants to solar significantly decreases carbon dioxide emissions and eliminates sulfur, nitrous oxides, and mercury emissions. As the U.S. Department of Energy states, "As the cleanest domestic energy source available, solar supports broader national priorities, including national security, economic growth, climate change mitigation, and job creation" (U.S. DOE n.d.). As a result, there is growing demand for solar energy from companies (e.g., the "[RE100](#)," 100 global corporations committed to sourcing 100 percent renewable electricity by 2050) and governments (e.g., the [Virginia Energy Plan](#) commits the state to 16 percent renewable energy by 2022).

Federal and state tax incentives have accelerated the energy industry's efforts to bring facilities online as quickly as possible. This has created a new challenge for local governments, as many are ill-prepared to consider this new and unique land-use option. Localities are struggling with how to evaluate utility-scale solar facility applications, how to update their land-use regulations, and how to achieve positive benefits for hosting these clean energy facilities.

As a land-use application, utility-scale solar facilities are processed as any other land-use permit. Localities use the tools available: the existing comprehensive (general) plan and zoning ordinance. In many cases, however, plans and ordinances do not address this type of use. Planners will

need to amend these documents to bring some structure, consistency, and transparency to the evaluation process for utility-scale solar facilities.

Unlike many land uses, these solar installations will occupy vast tracts of land for one or more generations; they require tremendous local resources to monitor during construction (and presumably decommissioning); they can have significant impacts on the community depending on their location, buffers, installation techniques, and other factors (Figure 1); and they are not readily adaptable for another industrial or commercial use, hence the need for decommissioning.



Figure 1. Utility-scale solar facilities are large-scale uses that can have significant land-use impacts on communities. Photo by Flickr user U.S. Department of Energy/Michael Faria.

While solar energy aligns with sustainability goals held by an increasing number of communities, solar industries must bring an overall value to the locality beyond the clean energy label. Localities must consider the other elements of sustainability and make deliberate decisions regarding impacts and benefits to the social fabric, natural environment, and local economy. How should a locality properly evaluate the overall impacts of a large-scale clean energy land use on the community?

This *PAS Memo* examines utility-scale solar facility uses and related land-use issues. It defines and classifies these facilities, analyzes their land-use impacts, and makes recommendations for how to evaluate and mitigate those impacts. While public officials tend to focus on the economics of these facilities and their overall fiscal impact to the community, the emphasis for planners is on the direct land-use considerations that should be carefully evaluated (e.g., zoning, neighbors, viewsheds, and environmental impacts). Specific recommendations and sample language for addressing utility-scale solar in comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances are provided at the end of the article.

The Utility-Scale Solar Backdrop

In contrast to solar energy systems generating power for on-site consumption, utility-scale solar, or a solar farm, is an energy generation facility that supplies power to the grid. These facilities are generally more than two acres in size and have capacities in excess of one megawatt; today's utility-scale solar facilities may encompass hundreds or even thousands of acres. A solar site may also include a substation and a switchyard, and it may require generator lead lines (*gen-tie* lines) to *interconnect* to the grid (Figure 2).



Figure 2. Components of a solar farm: solar panels (left), substation (center), and high-voltage transmission lines (right). Photos courtesy Berkley Group (left, right) and Pixabay (center).

From 2008 to 2019, U.S. solar photovoltaic (PV) installations have grown from generating 1.2 gigawatts (GW) to 30 GW (SEIA 2019). The top 10 states generating energy from solar PV are shown in Figure 3. For many of these initial projects, local planning staff independently compiled information through research, used model ordinances, and relied on professional networks to cobble together local processes and permit conditions to better address the adverse impacts associated with utility-scale solar.

However, each individual project brings unique challenges related to size, siting, compatibility with surrounding uses, mitigating impacts through setbacks and buffers, land disturbance processes and permits, financial securities, and other factors. This has proven to be a significant and ongoing challenge to local planning staff, planning commissions, and governing bodies.

Top 10 States

California	25,016 MW
North Carolina	5,467 MW
Arizona	3,788 MW
Nevada	3,452 MW
Florida	3,156 MW
Texas	2,957 MW
New Jersey	2,829 MW
Massachusetts	2,535 MW
New York	1,718 MW
Utah	1,661 MW
Georgia	1,572 MW




Figure 3. Utility solar capacity in the United States in 2019. Courtesy Solar Energy Industry Association.

Some localities have adopted zoning regulations to address utility-scale solar facilities based on model solar ordinance templates created by state or other agencies for solar energy facilities. However, these ordinances may not be sufficient to properly mitigate the adverse impacts of these facilities on communities. Many of these initial models released in the early 2010s aimed to promote clean energy and have failed to incorporate lessons learned from actual facility development. In addition, the solar industry has been changing at a rapid pace, particularly regarding the increasing scale of facilities. Planners should therefore revisit any existing zoning regulations for utility-scale solar facilities to ensure their relevance and effectiveness.

Rapid growth of utility-scale solar facilities has emerged for rural communities, particularly those that have significant electrical grid infrastructure. Many rural counties have thousands of acres of agricultural and forested properties in various levels of production. Land prices tend to be much more cost-effective in rural localities, and areas located close to high-voltage electric transmission lines offer significant cost savings to the industry. Figure 4 shows the extent of existing electric transmission lines in one rural Virginia county.




Figure 4. Electric transmission lines in Mecklenburg County, Virginia. Courtesy Berkley Group.

Federal and state tax incentives have further accelerated the pace of utility-scale solar developments, along with decreasing solar panel production costs. These factors all combine to create land-use development pressure that, absent effective and relevant land-use regulatory and planning tools, creates an environment where it is difficult to properly evaluate and make informed decisions for the community's benefit.

Solar Facility Land-Use Impacts

As with any land-use application, there are numerous potential impacts that need to be evaluated with solar facility uses. All solar facilities are not created equal, and land-use regulations should reflect those differences in scale and impact accordingly.

Utility-scale solar energy facilities involve large tracts of land involving hundreds, if not thousands, of acres. On these large tracts, the solar panels often cover more than half of the land area. The solar facility use is often pitched as "temporary" by developers, but it has a significant duration — typically projected by applicants as up to 40 years.

Establishing such a solar facility use may take an existing agricultural or forestry operation out of production, and resuming such operations in the future will be a challenge. Utility-scale solar can take up valuable future residential, commercial, or industrial growth land when located near cities, towns, or other identified growth areas. If a solar facility is close to a major road or cultural asset, it could affect the viewshed and attractiveness of the area. Because of its size, a utility-scale solar facility can change the character of these areas and their suitability for future development. There may be other locally specific potential impacts. In short, utility-scale solar facility proposals must be carefully evaluated regarding the size and scale of the use; the conversion of agricultural, forestry, or residential land to an industrial-scale use; and the potential environmental, social, and economic impacts on nearby properties and the area in general.

To emphasize the potential impact of utility-scale solar facilities, consider the example of one 1,408-acre (2.2-square-mile) Virginia town with a 946-acre solar facility surrounding its north and east sides. The solar project area is equal to approximately 67 percent of the town's area. A proposed 332.5-acre solar facility west of town increases the solar acres to 1,278.5, nearly the size of the town. Due to its proximity to multiple high-voltage electrical transmission lines, other utility-scale solar facilities are also proposed for this area, which would effectively lock in the town's surrounding land-use pattern for the next generation or more.

The following considerations are some of the important land-use impacts that utility-scale solar may have on nearby communities.

CHANGE IN USE/FUTURE LAND USE

A primary impact of utility-scale solar facilities is the removal of forest or agricultural land from active use. An argument often made by the solar industry is that this preserves the land for future agricultural use, and applicants typically state that the land will be restored to its previous condition. This is easiest when the land was initially used for grazing, but it is still not without its challenges, particularly over large acreages. Land with significant topography, active agricultural land, or forests is more challenging to restore.

It is important that planners consider whether the industrial nature of a utility-scale solar use is compatible with the locality's vision. Equally as important are imposing conditions that will enforce the assertions made by applicants regarding the future restoration of the site and denying applications where those conditions are not feasible.

Agricultural/Forestry Use. Agricultural and forested areas are typical sites for utility-scale solar facility uses. However, the use of prime agricultural land (as identified by the USDA or by state agencies) and ecologically sensitive lands (e.g., riparian buffers, critical habitats, hardwood forests) for these facilities should be scrutinized.

For a solar facility, the site will need to be graded in places and revegetated to stabilize the soil. That vegetation typically needs to be managed (e.g., by mowing, herbicide use, or sheep grazing) over a long period of time. This prolonged vegetation management can change the natural characteristics of the soil, making restoration of the site for future agricultural use more difficult. While native plants, pollinator plants, and grazing options exist and are continually being explored, there are logistical issues with all of them, from soil quality impacts to compatibility of animals with the solar equipment.

A deforested site can be reforested in the future, but over an additional extended length of time, and this may be delayed or the land left unforested at the request of the landowner at the time of decommissioning. Clearcutting forest in anticipation of a utility-scale solar application should be avoided but is not uncommon. This practice potentially undermines the credibility of the application, eliminates what could have been natural buffers and screening, and eliminates other landowner options to monetize the forest asset (such as for carbon or nutrient credits).

For decommissioning, the industry usually stipulates removal of anything within 36 inches below the ground surface. Unless all equipment is specified for complete removal and this is properly enforced during decommissioning, future agricultural operations would be planting crops over anything left in the ground below that depth, such as metal poles, concrete footers, or wires.

Residential Use. While replacing agricultural uses with residential uses is a more typical land-use planning concern, in some areas this is anticipated and desired over time. "People have to live somewhere," and this should be near existing infrastructure typical of cities, towns, and villages rather than sprawled out over the countryside. This makes land lying within designated growth areas or otherwise located near existing population centers a logical location for future residential use. Designated growth areas can be important land-use strategies to accommodate future growth in a region. Permitting a utility-scale use on such land ties it up for 20–40 years (a generation or two), which may be appropriate in some areas, but not others.

Industrially Zoned Land. Solar facilities can be a good use of brownfields or other previously disturbed land. A challenge in many rural areas, however, is that industrially zoned land is limited, and both public officials and comprehensive plan policies place a premium on industries that create and retain well-paying jobs. While utility-scale solar facilities are not necessarily incompatible with other commercial and industrial uses, the amount of space they require make them an inefficient use of industrially zoned land, for which the "highest and best use" often entails high-quality jobs and an array of taxes paid to the locality (personal property, real estate, machinery and tool, and other taxes).

LOCATION

The location of utility-scale solar facilities is the single most important factor in evaluating an application because of the large amount of land required and the extended period that land is dedicated to this singular use, as discussed above.

Solar facilities can be appropriately located in areas where they are difficult to detect, the prior use of the land has been marginal, and there is no designated future use specified (i.e., not in growth areas, not on prime farmland, and not near recreational or historic areas). Proposed facilities adjacent to corporate boundaries, public rights-of-way, or recreational or cultural resources are likely to be more controversial than facilities that are well placed away from existing homes, have natural buffers, and don't

change the character of the area from the view of local residents and other stakeholders.

CONCENTRATION OF USES

A concentration of solar facilities is another primary concern. The large scale of this land use, particularly when solar facilities are concentrated, also significantly exacerbates adverse impacts to the community in terms of land consumption, use pattern disruptions, and environmental impacts (e.g., stormwater, erosion, habitat). Any large-scale homogenous land use should be carefully examined — whether it is rooftops, impervious surface, or solar panels. Such concentrated land uses change the character of the area and alter the natural and historic development pattern of a community.

The attraction of solar facilities to areas near population centers is a response to the same forces that attract other uses — the infrastructure is already there (electrical grid, water and sewer, and roads). One solar facility in a given geographic area may be an acceptable use of the land, but when multiple facilities are attracted to the same geography for the same reasons, this tips the land-use balance toward too much of a single use. The willingness of landowners to cooperate with energy companies is understandable, but that does not automatically translate into good planning for the community. The short- and medium-term gains for individual landowners can have a lasting negative impact on the larger community.

VISUAL IMPACTS

The visual impact of utility-scale solar facilities can be significantly minimized with effective screening and buffering, but this is more challenging in historic or scenic landscapes. Solar facilities adjacent to scenic byways or historic corridors may negatively impact the rural aesthetic along these transportation routes. Buffering or screening may also be appropriate along main arterials or any public right-of-way, regardless of special scenic or historic designation.

The location of large solar facilities also needs to account for views from public rights-of-way (Figure 5). Scenic or historic areas should be avoided, while other sites should be effectively screened from view with substantial vegetative or other types of buffers. Berms, for example, can provide a very effective screen, particularly if combined with appropriate vegetation.



Figure 5. This scenic vista would be impacted by a solar facility proposed for the far knoll. Photo courtesy Berkley Group.

DECOMMISSIONING

The proper decommissioning and removal of equipment and other improvements when the facility is no longer operational presents significant challenges to localities.

Decommissioning can cost millions in today's dollars. The industry strongly asserts that there is a significant salvage value to the solar arrays, but there may or may not be a market to salvage the equipment when removed. Further, the feasibility of realizing salvage value may depend on who removes the equipment — the operator, the tenant, or the landowner (who may not be the same parties as during construction) — as well as when it is removed.

Providing for adequate security to ensure that financial resources are available to remove the equipment is a significant challenge. Cash escrow is the most reliable security for a locality but is the most expensive for the industry and potentially a financial deal breaker. Insurance bonds or letters of credit seem to be the most acceptable forms of security but can be difficult to enforce as a practical matter. The impact of inflation over decades is difficult to calculate; therefore, the posted financial security to ensure a proper decommissioning should be reevaluated periodically — usually every five years or so. The worst possible outcome for a community (and a farmer or landowner) would be an abandoned utility-scale solar facility with no resources available to pay for its removal.

Additional Solar Facility Impacts

In addition to the land-use impacts previously discussed, there are a number of significant environmental and economic impacts associated with utility-scale solar facilities that should be addressed as part of the land-use application process.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

While solar energy is a renewable, green resource, its generation is not without environmental impacts. Though utility-scale solar facilities do not generate the air or water pollution typical of other large-scale fossil-fuel power production facilities, impacts on wildlife habitat and stormwater management can be significant due to the large scale of these uses and the resulting extent of land disturbance. The location of sites, the arrangement of panels within the site, and the ongoing management of the site are important in the mitigation of such impacts.

Wildlife Corridors. In addition to mitigating the visual impact of utility-scale solar facilities, substantial buffers can act as wildlife corridors along project perimeters. The arrangement of panels within a project site is also important to maintain areas conducive to wildlife travel through the site. Existing trees, wetlands, or other vegetation that link open areas should be preserved as wildlife cover. Such sensitivity to the land's environmental features also breaks up the panel bay groups and will make the eventual restoration of the land to its previous state that much easier and more effective. A perimeter fence is a barrier to wildlife movement, while fencing around but not in between solar panel bays creates open areas through which animals can continue to travel (Figure 6).

Conceptual Site Plan

Wildlife Corridors




Figure 6. A conceptual site plan for a 1,491-acre utility-scale solar facility showing wildlife corridors throughout the site. Courtesy Dominion Energy.

Stormwater, Erosion, and Sediment Control. The site disturbance required for utility-scale solar facilities is significant due to the size of the facilities and the infrastructure needed to operate them. These projects require the submission of both stormwater (SWP) and erosion/sediment control (ESC) plans to comply with federal and state environmental regulations.

Depending on the site orientation and the panels to be used, significant grading may be required for panel placement, roads, and other support infrastructure. The plan review and submission processes are no different with these facilities than for any other land-disturbing activity. However, such large-scale grading project plans are more complex than those for other uses due primarily to the scale of utility solar. Additionally, the impervious nature of the panels themselves creates stormwater runoff that must be properly controlled, managed, and maintained.

Due to this complexity, it is recommended that an independent third party review all SWP and ESC plans in addition to the normal review procedures. Many review agencies (local, regional, or state) are under-resourced or not familiar with large-scale grading projects or appropriate and effective mitigation measures. It is in a locality's best interest to have the applicant's engineering and site plans reviewed by a licensed third party prior to and in addition to the formal plan review process. Most localities have engineering firms on call that can perform such reviews on behalf of the jurisdiction prior to formal plan review submittal and approval. This extra step, typically paid for by the applicant, helps to ensure the proper design of these environmental protections (Figure 7).



Figure 7. Example of compliance (left) and noncompliance (right) with erosion and sediment control requirements. Photos courtesy Berkley Group.

The successful implementation of these plans and ongoing maintenance of the mitigation measures is also critical and should be addressed in each proposal through sufficient performance security requirements and long-term maintenance provisions.

Cultural, Environmental, and Recreational Resources. Every proposed site should undergo an evaluation to identify any architectural, archaeological, or other cultural resources on or near proposed facilities. Additionally, sites located near recreational, historic, or environmental resources should be avoided. Tourism is recognized as a key sector for economic growth in many regions, and any utility-scale solar facilities that might be visible from a scenic byway, historic site, recreational amenity, or similar resources could have negative consequences for those tourist attractions.

ECONOMIC IMPACTS

This *PAS Memo* focuses on the land-use impacts of utility-scale solar facilities, but planners should also be aware of economic considerations surrounding these uses for local governments and communities.

Financial Incentives. Federal and state tax incentives benefit the energy industry at the expense of localities. The initial intent of industry-targeted tax credits was to act as an economic catalyst to encourage the development of green energy. An unintended consequence has been to benefit the solar industry by saving it tax costs at the expense of localities, which don't receive the benefit of the full taxable rate they would normally receive.

Employment. Jobs during construction (and decommissioning) can be numerous, but utility-scale solar facilities have minimal operational requirements otherwise. Very large facilities may employ one or two full-time-equivalent employees. During the construction phase there are typically hundreds of employees who need local housing, food, and entertainment.

Fiscal Impact. The positive fiscal impact to landowners who lease or sell property for utility-scale solar facilities is clear. However, the fiscal impact of utility-scale solar facilities to the community as a whole is less clear and, in the case of many localities, may be negligible compared with their overall budget due to tax credits, low long-term job creation, and other factors.

Property values. The impact of utility-scale solar facilities is typically negligible on neighboring property values. This can be a significant concern of adjacent residents, but negative impacts to property values are rarely

demonstrated and are usually directly addressed by applicants as part of their project submittal.

Solar Facilities in Local Policy and Regulatory Documents

The two foundational land-use tools for most communities are their comprehensive (general) plans and zoning ordinances. These two land-use documents are equally critical in the evaluation of utility-scale solar facilities. A community's plan should discuss green energy, and its zoning ordinance should properly enable and regulate green energy uses.

THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The comprehensive plan establishes the vision for a community and should discuss public facilities and utilities. However, solar facilities are not directly addressed in many comprehensive plans.

If solar energy facilities are desired in a community, they should be discussed in the comprehensive plan in terms of green infrastructure, environment, and economic development goals. Specific direction should be given in terms of policy objectives such as appropriate locations and conditions. If a community does not desire such large-scale land uses because of their impacts on agriculture or forestry or other concerns, then that should be directly addressed in the plan.

Some states, such as Virginia, require a plan review of public facilities — including utility-scale solar facilities — for substantial conformance with the local comprehensive plan (see *Code of Virginia* §15.2-2232). This typically requires a review by the planning commission of public utility facility proposals, whether publicly or privately owned, to determine if their general or approximate locations, characters, and extents are substantially in accord with the comprehensive plan.

Most comprehensive plans discuss the types of industry desired by the community, the importance of agricultural operations, and any cultural, recreational, historic, or scenic rural landscape features. An emphasis on tourism, job growth, and natural and scenic resource protection may not be consistent with the use pattern associated with utility-scale solar facilities. If a plan is silent on the solar issue, this may act as a barrier to approving this use. Plans should make clear whether utility-scale solar is desired and, if so, under what circumstances.

This plan review process should precede any other land-use application submittal, though it may be performed concurrently with other zoning approvals. Planners and other public officials should keep in mind that even if a facility is found to be substantially in accord with a comprehensive plan, that does not mean the land-use application must be approved. Use permits are discretionary. If a particular application does not sufficiently mitigate the adverse impacts of the proposed land use, then it can and should be denied regardless of its conformance with the comprehensive plan.

Similarly, in Virginia, a utility-scale solar facility receiving use permit approval without a comprehensive plan review may not be in compliance with state code. The permit approval process is a two-step process, with the comprehensive plan review preferably preceding the consideration of a use permit application.

THE ZONING ORDINANCE

While a community's comprehensive plan is its policy guide, the zoning ordinance is the regulatory document that implements that policy. Plans are advisory in nature, although often upheld in court decisions, whereas ordinance regulations are mandatory. In addition to comprehensive plan amendments, the zoning ordinance should specifically set forth the process and requirements necessary for the evaluation of a utility-scale solar application.

In zoning regulations, uses may be permitted either by right (with or without designated performance measures such as use and design standards) or as conditional or special uses, which require discretionary review and approval. Solar facilities generating power for on-site use are typically regulated as by-right uses depending on their size and location.

Utility-scale solar facilities, however, should in most cases be conditionally permitted regardless of the zoning district and are most appropriate on brownfield sites, in remote areas, or in agriculturally zoned areas. This is particularly true for more populated areas due to the more compact nature of land uses. There are, however, areas throughout the country where utility-scale solar might be permitted by right under strict design standards that are compatible with community objectives.

To better mitigate the potential adverse impacts of utility-scale solar facilities, required application documents should include the following:

- Concept plan

- Site plan
- Construction plan
- Maintenance plan
- Erosion and sediment control and stormwater plans

Performance measures should address these issues:

- Setbacks and screening
- Plan review process
- Construction/deconstruction mitigation and associated financial securities
- Signage
- Nuisance issues (glare, noise)

The [model specific planning and zoning recommendations below](#) outline comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance amendments, the application process, and conditions for consideration during the permitting process.

The Virginia Experience

The recommendations presented in this *PAS Memo* are derived from research and the author's direct experience with the described planning, ordinance amendment, and application and regulatory processes in the following three Virginia localities, all rural counties in the southern or eastern parts of the state.

MECKLENBURG COUNTY

When Mecklenburg County began seeing interest in utility-scale solar facilities, the county's long-range plan did not address solar facilities, and the zoning ordinance was based on an inadequate and outdated state model that did not adequately regulate this land use.

The town of Chase City is located near the confluence of several high-voltage utility lines, and all proposed facilities were located near or within the town's corporate limits. The county approved the first utility-scale solar facility application in the jurisdiction without any conditions or much consideration. When the second application for a much larger facility (more

than 900 acres) came in soon after, with significant interest from other potential applicants as well, the county commissioned the author's consulting firm, The Berkley Group, to undertake a land-use and industry study regarding utility-scale solar facilities.

As Mecklenburg officials continued with the approval process on the second utility-scale solar facility under existing regulations, they received the results of the industry study and began considering a series of amendments to the comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance. Though county officials were particularly worried about the potential concentration of facilities around Chase City, town officials expressed formal support for the proposed land use. Other Mecklenburg communities expressed more concern and wanted the facilities to be located a significant distance away from their corporate boundaries. These discussions led to standards limiting the concentration of facilities, encouraging proximity to the electrical grid, and establishing distances from corporate boundaries where future solar facilities could not be located.

Since the adoption of the new regulations, numerous other utility-scale solar applications have been submitted and while some have been denied, most have been approved. Solar industry representatives' concerns that the new regulations were an attempt to prevent this land use have therefore not been realized; these are simply the land-use tools that public officials wanted and needed to appropriately evaluate solar facility applications. Many of the examples and best practices recommended in this article, including the model language provided at the end of the article, are a result of the utility-scale solar study commissioned by the county (Berkley Group 2017) and the subsequent policies and regulations it adopted.

SUSSEX COUNTY

Sussex County is located east and north of Mecklenburg, and the interest in utility-scale solar projects there has been no less immediate or profound. The announcement of the new Amazon headquarters in Arlington, Virginia, along with the company's interest in offsetting its operational energy use with green energy sources furthered interest in this rural county more than 100 miles south of Arlington.

As in Mecklenburg County, local regulations did not address utility-scale solar uses, so public officials asked for assistance from The Berkley Group to develop policies and regulations appropriate for their community. Sussex County officials outlined an aggressive timeline for considering new

regulations regarding solar facilities and, within one month of initiation, swiftly adopted amended regulations for solar energy facilities.

The same metrics and policy issues examined and adopted for Mecklenburg County were used for the initial discussion in Sussex at a joint work session between the board of supervisors (the governing body) and the planning commission. Public officials tailored the proposed standards and regulations to the county context based on geography, cultural priorities, and other concerns. They then set a joint public hearing for their next scheduled meeting to solicit public comment.

Under Virginia law, land-use matters may be considered at a joint public hearing with a recommendation from the planning commission going to the governing body and that body taking action thereafter. This is not a typical or recommended practice for local governments since it tends to limit debate, transparency, and good governance, but due to the intense interest from the solar industry, coupled with the lack of land-use regulations addressing the proposed utility-scale solar uses, county officials utilized that expedited process.

No citizens and only two industry officials spoke at the public hearing, and after two hours of questions, discussion, and some negotiation of proposed standards, the new regulations were adopted the same evening.

Since the new regulations have been put into place, no new solar applications have been received, but informal discussions with public officials and staff suggest that interest from the industry remains strong.

GREENSVILLE COUNTY

Greensville County, like Mecklenburg, lies on the Virginia-North Carolina boundary. The county has processed four solar energy applications to date (three were approved and one was denied) and continues to process additional applications. Concurrently, the county is in the process of evaluating its land-use policies and regulations, which were amended in late 2016 at the behest of solar energy interests.

The reality of the land-use approval process has proved more challenging than the theory of the facilities when considered a few years ago. As with other localities experiencing interest from the solar energy industry, the issues of scale, concentration, buffers/setbacks, and other land-use considerations have been debated at each public hearing for each application. Neighbors and families have been divided, and lifelong

relationships have been severed or strained. The board of supervisors has found it difficult in the face of their friends, neighbors, and existing corporate citizens to deny applications that otherwise might not have been approved.

County officials have agreed that they do want to amend their existing policies and regulations to be more specific and less open to interpretation by applicants and citizens. One of their primary challenges has been dedicating the time to discuss proposed changes to their comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance. A joint work session between the board of supervisors and planning commission is being scheduled and should lead to subsequent public hearings and actions by those respective bodies to enact new regulations for future utility-scale solar applicants.

Action Steps for Planners

There are four primary actions that planners can pursue with their planning commissions and governing bodies to ensure that their communities are ready for utility-scale solar.

REVIEW AND AMEND THE PLAN

The first, and most important, step from a planning viewpoint is to review and amend the comprehensive plan to align with how a community wants to regulate utility-scale solar uses. Some communities don't want them at all, and many cities and towns don't have the land for them. Larger municipalities and counties around the country may have to deal with this land use at some point, if they haven't already. Local governments should get their planning houses in order by amending plans before the land-use applications arrive.

REVIEW AND AMEND LAND-USE ORDINANCES

Once the plan is updated, the next step is to review and amend land-use ordinances (namely the zoning ordinance) accordingly. These ordinances are vital land-use tools that need to be up to date and on point to effectively regulate large and complex solar facilities. If local governments do not create regulations for utility-scale solar facilities, applications for these projects will occupy excessive staff time, energy, and talents, resulting in much less efficient and more open-ended results.

EVALUATE EACH APPLICATION BASED ON ITS OWN MERITS

This should go without saying, but it is important, particularly from a legal perspective, that each project application is evaluated based on its own merits. All planners have probably seen a project denied due to the politics at play with regard to other projects: "That one shouldn't have been approved so we're going to deny this one." "The next one is better so this one needs to be denied."

The focus of each application should be on the potential adverse impacts of the project on the community and what can be done successfully to mitigate those impacts. Whether the applicant is a public utility or a private company, the issues and complexities of the project are the same. The bottom line should never be who the applicant is; rather, it should be whether the project's adverse impacts can be properly mitigated so that the impact to the community is positive.

LEARN FROM OTHERS

Mecklenburg County's revised solar energy policies and regulations began with emails and phone calls to planning colleagues to see how they had handled utility-scale solar projects in their jurisdictions. The primary resources used were internet research, other planners, and old-fashioned planner ingenuity and creativity.

While it is the author's hope and intent that this article offers valuable information on this topic, nothing beats the tried and true formula of "learn from and lean on your colleagues."

Conclusion

The solar energy market is having major impacts on land use across the country, and federal and state tax incentives have contributed to a flood of applications in recent years. While the benefits of clean energy are often touted, the impacts of utility-scale solar facilities on a community can be significant. Applicants often say that a particular project will "only" take up some small percentage of agricultural, forestry, or other land-use category — but the impact of these uses extends beyond simply replacing an existing (or future) land use. Fiscal benefit to a community is also often cited as an incentive, but this alone is not a compelling reason to approve (or disapprove) a land-use application.

The scale and duration of utility-scale solar facilities complicate everything from the land disturbance permitting process through surety requirements. If not done properly, these uses can change the character of an area, altering the future of communities for generations.

Local officials need to weigh these land-use decisions within the context of their comprehensive plan and carefully consider each individual application in terms of the impact that it will have in that area of the community, not only by itself but also if combined with additional sites. The concentration of solar facilities is a major consideration in addition to their individual locations. A solar facility located by itself in a rural area, close to major transmission lines, not prominently visible from public rights-of-way or adjacent properties, and not located in growth areas, on prime farmland, or near cultural, historic, or recreational sites may be an acceptable land use with a beneficial impact on the community.

Properly evaluating and, to the extent possible, mitigating the impacts of these facilities by carefully controlling their location, scale, size, and other site-specific impacts is key to ensuring that utility-scale solar facilities can help meet broader sustainability goals without compromising a community's vision and land-use future.

Specific Planning and Zoning Recommendations for Utility-Scale Solar

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Darren K. Coffey, AICP, is co-owner and chief executive officer of The Berkley Group, a local government consulting firm in Virginia. Prior to forming The Berkley Group, he worked as a land-use planner for various localities in North Carolina and Virginia. The Berkley Group began working on utility-scale solar planning issues in early 2017 as that industry began to take off in Virginia. Coffey has bachelor of science degrees in economics and geography from James Madison University and a master of arts in geography from Rutgers University, and he attained AICP certification in 2000. He may be reached at darren@bgllc.net.

The author would like to thank Denise Nelson, PE, CFM, ENV SP, Berkley Group Environmental Engineer, for her contributions to this article.

REFERENCES AND RESOURCES

Berkley Group. 2017. "Solar Facility Impacts Analysis: An Examination of Land Use Impacts." Unpublished study. Mecklenburg County, Virginia.

Climate Group and CDP. 2019. "[RE100](#)."

Hawken, Paul. 2017. *Drawdown: The Most Comprehensive Plan Ever Proposed to Reverse Global Warming*. New York: Penguin Books.

Solar Energy Industry Association (SEIA). 2019. "[U.S. Solar Market Insight](#)." June 18.

U.S. Department of Energy (U.S. DOE). n.d. "[Solar Energy in the United States](#)." Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

Virginia, Commonwealth of. 2018. *2018 Virginia Energy Plan*. Office of the Secretary of Commerce and Trade, Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy.