



AGENDA

Page County Planning Commission Work Session

Board of Supervisors Room- County Government Center
103 South Court Street, Luray, VA 22835
February 24, 2026 - 7:00 p.m.

Live Meeting Stream: <http://www.pagecounty.virginia.gov/392/Watch-Meetings-Videos>

Call to Order

- A. Pledge of Allegiance
- B. Moment of Silence
- C. Microphone Reminder
- D. Attendance Roll Call

Adoption of Agenda

New Business

- A. Adoption of Minutes: *February 10, 2026*
- B. Selection of Officers
- C. EDA Housing Subcommittee – Appoint Planning
Commission Representative Josh Hahn

Unfinished Business

- A. Checkers LLC / Mark Harris Special Use Permit for
Commercial Outdoor Recreation Area and Facility Tracy Clatterbuck
- B. Whiteside-Pence Special Use Permit for Banquet/Event Facility Tracy Clatterbuck
- C. Discussion of House Bills Josh Hahn
- D. Zoning Subcommittee Report Cathy Grech
- E. Comprehensive Plan Subcommittee Report Cathy Grech

Adjourn

**MINUTES
PAGE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
February 10, 2026**

Members Present

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Catherine Grech, Secretary, District 1 | Chris Adams, District 2 |
| Jared Burner, Chairman, District 3 | Sandy Davis, District 4 |
| Ken Johnson, At-Large | |

Member Absent

William Turner, Vice Chairman, District 5

Staff Present

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Josh Hahn | Tracy Clatterbuck |
|-----------|-------------------|

Call to Order

Chairman Burner called the February 10, 2026 Page County Planning Commission Regular Meeting to order in the Board of Supervisors (BOS) Room located at the Page County Government Center, 103 S Court Street, Luray, Virginia at 7:00 p.m. The call to order was followed by *The Pledge of Allegiance* and a *Moment of Silence*. Chairman Burner reminded all commissioners and speakers to please turn on and/or speak into the microphones. Mr. Hahn conducted an attendance roll call.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Grech made a motion to adopt the agenda, as presented. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed by consensus.

Citizen Comments on Agenda Items

Mr. Hahn noted that Mr. Whitesides had signed up to speak. Ms. Clatterbuck asked if he would like to defer his time to the agenda item for his special use permit (SUP) application, and Mr. Whitesides indicated agreement.

New Business

A. Adoption of Minutes: *January 13, 2026*

Chairman Burner allowed a few minutes to review the minutes. Ms. Grech made a motion to approve the minutes, as presented. Ms. Davis seconded the motion. Chairman Burner asked Mr. Hahn to conduct a roll call vote. The motion passed, unanimously (5-0).

B. Checkers LLC / Mark Harris Special Use Permit for Commercial Outdoor Recreation Area and Facility

Ms. Clatterbuck read from the staff memo included in the packet. Checkers LLC/Mark Harris (Downriver Adventure Company) have filed an application for an SUP to operate a commercial outdoor recreation area and facility consisting of guided rappelling trips at Golden Rock Campground located at 9751 US Hwy 340 N, Rileyville, VA, and further identified by tax map number 8-(A)-103. The parcel contains 44.66 acres and is zoned Woodland-Conservation (W-C). Golden Rock is a non-conforming campground (they were in business prior to the establishment of the Page County Zoning and/or Campground Ordinance) which consists of 20 primitive campsites. Ms. Clatterbuck noted that one of the reasons they are able to apply for an SUP is because this is an existing campground.

As described by the applicant, the proposed activity will complement their existing water-based recreation services and provide visitors with a diversified outdoor adventure experience that showcases the natural beauty and geological features of the area. The applicant is proposing to offer scheduled guided rock rappel tours to individuals and small groups, April through October. There would be a maximum of 15 participants per guided session. Each session is 2 to 4 hours, which includes the safety briefing, instruction, and rappelling activities. The applicant estimates 3 to 4 sessions per week. Participants will utilize existing parking facilities at their headquarters at Bentonville Low Water Bridge. Shuttle transportation to Golden Rock will be provided using their already-established fleet.

Ms. Clatterbuck referenced the definitions for commercial outdoor recreation and commercial outdoor recreation areas and facilities.

Pursuant to § 125-9.D(2) of the Page County Zoning Ordinance, commercial outdoor recreation areas and facilities are only permitted by special use permit pursuant to § 125-22. Section 125-22 further notes that outdoor commercial recreation area and facilities are permitted by special use permit only if constructed and operated in conjunction with a campground, and subject to conditions defined in that section. A copy of applicable code sections are included in the packet along with a narrative provided by the applicant detailing the project further.

Ms. Clatterbuck referenced agenda comments. VDOT has no issues, as no additional traffic should be created from this, due to shuttle services being used. Ms. Clatterbuck noted there are two different sheets from the Health Department. The first one said they would have to have an approved sewage disposal system. Ms. Clatterbuck had subsequently sought clarification with the Health Department, because campgrounds can be served by porta johns up to 30, per the Health Department. There are revised comments from the Health Department indicate porta johns may be used. The Building Official stated “An inspection on harnesses, ropes, carabiners, helmets, & anchors prior to operation and annually thereafter. All inspections will be required to be 3rd party.”

Ms. Clatterbuck noted that draft conditions are included in the packet. She asked that they consider scheduling this for public hearing at the March 10 meeting. They would need to discuss the conditions tonight or at the next meeting. Ms. Clatterbuck noted that the Board of Supervisors directed staff to perform proactive enforcement on all campgrounds, whether they were grandfathered like this one or had SUPs. She shared that Mr. Harris’ campground was one of the most well-run campground operations that she dealt with when performing these inspections. He has his stuff together.

Mr. Hahn read portions of the Comprehensive Plan review section of the staff memo. The property is located in the Agricultural Protection Tier. Tax Map 8-(A)-103 is located on a mixture of soils identified as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Moderate Farmland by NRCS. Portions of the property are located within the FEMA 100-year floodplain. The rappel site is located on the cliff immediately adjacent to the Shenandoah River, so most, if not all, of the site would technically be located in the floodplain. However, no new structures would be needed as part of the rappel site. No dwellings are currently located within 500 feet of the proposed rappel site. The proposed use would be part of an existing,

nonconforming campground use. Planning staff recommends the Planning Commission consider potential adverse impacts presented during the public hearing, should such be scheduled.

Mark Harris spoke on his application for a few minutes. He operates Downriver Canoe Company. This is probably not a normal activity that [the Planning Commission] comes across. He is here to answer any questions. He took over Downriver Canoe Company last February from John Gibson, who had been running it for about 50 years. Mr. Gibson had approached him about two years before to see if he wanted to take it over. Mr. Harris' background is in outdoor endurance sports, including adventure races, mountain bike races, all kinds of activities. He has worked with Mr. Gibson in that capacity for 12 or 13 years. He grew up in South Wales in the U.K. He grew up in an outdoor education center where there was a whole host of activities, including canoeing, kayaking, climbing, caving...and it was all based around a kind of education background. He moved to the United States and was a civil engineer, and did planning for a little bit. He eventually worked his way back to outdoor recreation. What they are looking to do with rappelling is broadening the activities they can provide associated with the river activities. He was in front of the Warren County Planning Board this time last year, where they expanded their use for their site in Warren County to do mountain biking into the State Park. They have a great relationship collaborating with the State Park. They are working this year to expand this into George Washington National Forest, to include rappelling at a couple sites. Those permits are in review, and he expects those to be approved in the next two weeks by the Forestry Service. He appreciated Ms. Clatterbuck's compliments – it was great working with her. He has not actually run a campground before, but he has made successful changes at the campground. The opportunity to use the rock feature at Golden Rock came to mind at that time. It is an iconic location along the river. They worked with the Keysers, who own the property. Initially [the Keysers] were dubious about letting them do the activity. They met with the Keysers, who told them all kinds of history about the area. The Keysers gave permission to have rappelling activity in October of last year. The goal is to get it through the process and be able to start advertising trips during the 2026 season, allowing a combination of paddling and rappelling. They'll also do ropes – they host a lot of Boys Scouts troops. He stated his son and daughter both have recreation degrees at Radford University, and his son is a guide at New River Gorge, and is currently guiding in Utah. He will be heading up this operation as they kick it off.

There was lengthy discussion between Planning Commissioners and the applicant. Major points of this discussion included:

- Mr. Adams asked if there was any state or federal guidelines or certifications. Mr. Harris said there weren't. There are some requirements within George Washington National Forest. There is some things to work through with corporate insurance related to getting certified, trained, and having the right equipment.
- Chairman Burner asked if there are any other activities they want to include, or are they just sticking with rappelling, at this time. Mr. Harris stated they would probably just stick with rappelling. Any other activities would first need to be approved by the property owners, and he doesn't think there is an appetite for further activities. He added that they are just sticking with rappelling, not climbing. In George Washington National Forest, they would be doing both.
- Ms. Grech was a little confused by all the legal entities. She asked for clarification on whether he is representing the campground, Golden Rock Campground. But the

property is owned by Checkers, LLC. Mr. Harris confirmed. He has a lease with Checkers, LLC. Mr. Harris stated Downriver Adventure Company, LLC is his LLC. Downriver Canoe Company was a separate corporation that he assumed last year via asset purchase under a different company name. He represents Downriver Adventure Company. Ms. Grech asked that staff make sure this is correctly listed on the SUP conditions. Ms. Grech asked if the liability will be under the LLC, and Mr. Harris confirmed. She asked about the liability. Mr. Harris stated it was \$2 million and can go up to \$5 million. Ms. Grech asked if he thought this was sufficient, and Mr. Harris stated yes. He added that water activity is actually way more high risk than rappelling because the rappelling is guided and supervised, whereas river activity is not. Ms. Grech referenced the Building Officials comments. She would prefer that the condition related to equipment be worded as “all equipment, including...” with all the other equipment. She is okay with a list, but the list should not be exhaustive. Mr. Harris expressed agreement, as the techniques expand and change. Ms. Grech agreed, insisting the language be something like “all equipment, including but not limited to...”

- Ms. Grech mentioned there had been discussion for recent SUPs to limit them to 30 years rather than 50 years. There was discussion on this. Chairman Burner stated that there hasn't been a formal policy for this, yet. We have started considering the length for each SUP. Mr. Hahn added that the non-conforming campground use has no current time limit. Ms. Grech stated that the rappelling activity is not likely to change given the rock face is not likely to change. Mr. Harris stated the only thing that could change is if the lease ends. There was further discussion on this, and Ms. Clatterbuck added that the SUP would go with the land. Mr. Harris stated that his lease is yearly. Depending on this SUP, the lease would need to be rewritten to allow this use. There was discussion, and staff was asked to add a condition that current and future lease agreements be maintained with county staff. Ms. Grech asked staff to obtain a copy of the current lease.
- Ms. Grech asked if they are anticipating most of the rappelling customers to be folks staying at the campground, and Mr. Harris indicated no. Ms. Grech asked if the parking will be enough. Mr. Harris stated the groups will be small. Each group will be fewer than 15 people. Most of the parking will be done at the HQ in Bentonville. Most of the time, the safety brief will be done at the HQ and then they will be transported down. Ms. Clatterbuck asked if the rappelling would also be booked online, rather than allowing walk-ins. Mr. Harris stated this would be booked online. Ms. Clatterbuck noted that to access the current site, you have to go through a gate with a keypad. There aren't walk-ins; it is pre-booked online. Ms. Grech asked about random people on the river accessing the cliff. Mr. Harris agreed. He stated they currently have issues with people climbing it without permission, and they are working to address that. Ms. Grech stated the conditions should address having the rappelling area clearly posted. Mr. Harris stated they are planning to do that. Mr. Harris noted that they plan to use natural anchors, so that when they leave, there is no indication that there has been any climbing or rappelling. Ms. Grech asked if the customers will be constantly accompanied and monitored, so there would be no need for signage. Mr. Harris agreed, but noted that they are placing some additional signage to stop people from trespassing on top of the cliff from other locations outside of the campground. Ms. Grech stated that in order to ensure public health, safety and welfare, we don't want to be encouraging a lot of activities on the rock face, and people knowing those activities are happening, without those activities being controlled by him. There was discussion about monitoring. Mr.

Harris stated they can't do much about people coming down the river and [trespassing]. Ms. Clatterbuck stated this really just comes down to property management. Mr. Harris stated they are doing a better job controlling access to the property. Ms. Clatterbuck expressed agreement, adding that the gate seems to have helped with this.

- Mr. Adams asked staff to add a condition requiring proof of liability insurance. Mr. Harris mentioned that this would be included in the campground liability insurance.
- Mr. Johnson stated he thinks Mr. Harris is doing a good thing, and he doesn't want to belabor this. In the application, Mr. Harris stated there will be certified instructors and different certification agencies, but we don't require that in the draft SUP language. He isn't suggesting that they should. The role of government is to permit the activity, and then it's on the business owner to conduct the use in a professional manner. He is just asking if this is something in the interest of safety they would do to require certified instructors. Ms. Grech noted that the County recently approved an SUP for riding stables without requiring any qualifications for the instructors. Horse-riding is a dangerous activity. Chairman Burner stated he thinks this is the operator's risk of liability, and that liability risk carries more weight than a condition. There was discussion about how anyone can go into the National Forest and do these activities without a permit.

Ms. Grech stated that she would prefer a 30-year limit rather than 50 years, and there are a few other modifications to the conditions that staff needs to make. Ms. Clatterbuck stated they could address the conditions at the next meeting and still be able to advertise for a public hearing on March 10, 2026. Ms. Grech made a motion to schedule a public hearing on March 10, 2026. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. Chairman Burner asked Mr. Hahn to conduct a roll call. The motion passed, unanimously (5-0).

C. Whitesides-Pence Special Use Permit for Banquet/Event Facility

Ms. Clatterbuck referenced the staff memo included in the packet. She noted some additional photos that she had taken earlier in the day which had not been included in the packet. This SUP application was initially received on July 1, 2025. The applicants have been working on application requirements, including the site plan, agency comments, etc. since the initial date of submittal. Effective July 21, 2025 the zoning ordinance was amended relating to banquet/event facilities, beginning with striking those terms and adding the new terms "event venue" and "venue" along with other relating terms and supplemental regulations associated with this use. This application is "grandfathered" under the old rules relating to terms, use district, and supplemental regulations because the application was received prior to the adoption of the amendments.

Randy Whitesides and Dawn Pence have filed an application for a SUP to operate a banquet/event facility located at 625 Riverbend Road, Stanley, VA, and further identified by tax map number 69-(A)-126. The parcel contains 2.50 acres and is zoned as Agriculture (A-1). The property is improved with an existing dwelling, an existing barn, and numerous accessory sheds. The applicants are proposing to convert the existing barn to the event facility, convert the existing milk barn to a dressing room, convert the existing pig pen to an outdoor bar area, and establish a designated parking area.

Pursuant to § 125-10 D. (16) of the Page County Zoning Ordinance, prior to the aforementioned amendments, banquet facilities and event facilities require an SUP.

Ms. Clatterbuck referenced agency comments. VDOT had no issues. Ms. Clatterbuck noted that the applicants will need to change the entrance location, and the applicants are working with VDOT on a land use permit for that. Ms. Clatterbuck recommended this be a condition of the permit. The Health Department had no objections, noting applicable permits will be required for proper sewage disposal. The applicants are working with the Health Department, and this should also be added as a condition. The Building Official had no objects. Applicable permits will be required, along with structural engineering, and the applicant is aware of this. Ms. Clatterbuck stated this would happen after the decision on this SUP, because it can be costly. Based on the square footage of the barn and proposed seating/fixtures layout, the barn would support an occupant load of 186 people. Staff would note that the applicants are requesting an occupant load of 150 people. Staff recommends that we make the requirements from the Building Official a condition of the SUP.

Ms. Clatterbuck referenced the draft conditions in the SUP, included in the packet as a starting point. She requested the Planning Commission consider scheduling this for public hearing at the March 10, 2026 meeting. If they do so, they should take time to review the draft conditions.

Mr. Hahn read portions of the Comprehensive Plan review section of the staff memo. It is located in the Agricultural Protection Tier. Tax Map 69-(A)-126 is located entirely on soils identified as Prime Farmland by NRCS. The current dimensions of the 2.5 acre parcel were established in 2016 by boundary line adjustment. Seven dwellings are currently located within 500 feet of the parcel's boundary, not including the dwelling located on the parcel. Planning staff recommends the Planning Commission consider potential adverse impacts presented during the public hearing, should such be scheduled.

Ms. Clatterbuck noted that the applicants have a PowerPoint presentation. [Editor's note: there were numerous periods of questions/discussion throughout this presentation.] Major points of the discussion/presentation are summarized, below.]

- Mr. Adams asked if there was a parking plan. Ms. Clatterbuck referenced the site plan, and Mr. Hahn brought this up on the monitor. Ms. Clatterbuck recommended Planning Commissioners visit the site, as she doesn't think the site plan does it justice in showing how much space they have for parking.
- Chairman Burner asked where the septic field would be located. Mr. Whitesides indicated the new one would be in the lower right. Chairman Burner asked if the proposed parking and access would be on top of the proposed drainfield, and Mr. Whitesides said no. Ms. Clatterbuck stated the Health Department would not allow that.
- Mr. Whitesides stated he is a "come-along," but his wife is born and raised, here, and her sister lives across the street. The house had been abandoned for a number of years, when it was aggregated with River Bend Ranch. It was originally the Miller Farm. Mr. Miller was a teacher at the high school. Susan Corbett's parents aggregated the property a number of years ago and fell into disrepair. They were worried about the liability, and it was potentially facing demolition. They bought the property and restored the farm house and stabilized the rest of the outbuildings. There are eight outbuildings. The purpose of the SUP is the barn at the bottom of the property. It was build circa early 1900s, and completely constructed of solid oak, so it's one of the few solid oak barns in the area. The good news is they got the parcel carved out, about 2.5 acres. The

bad news is the outbuildings cost significantly more to maintain than the house, itself. The proposed SUP is to provide possible sources of revenue to maintain and improve the property for the heritage of the community.

- Mr. Whitesides referenced a map of the area displayed on the screen. Riverbend Ranch has horse farms, cattle raising. [Ms. Corbett] has been very active in the community, and maintains it as an active ranch. Their property is a slice out of that property. They use this as a summer home, and they AirBnB it. They allow visitors to use the property. He described all of the outbuildings and some of the equipment and history.
- He used a picture of the barn from the back of the parcel to describe the barn and how they plan to use it. Ms. Clatterbuck noted that the plan is included in the packet.
- He described the five-star AirBnB that they have. They use the dwelling in the summer.
- In order to use the barn [for events], they need a special use permit. He envisions there will be wine-tastings. He noted that this property is in the heart of a larger ranch, it is just way bigger than it looks. He noted that he plans for the old milk house to be renovated and possibly used for changing rooms. Several of his nieces and nephews get their high school pictures here.
- He referred to a sketch that showed the walk out porch and the existing grain bins that can be used for restrooms, to include handicapped restrooms. The drainfield would be to the right of the barn.
- He showed a parking map. There is plenty of room for parking. The proposed location is so they don't ruin the view and the feel of the property. Ms. Clatterbuck noted the entrance that will need to be closed off and where it would be located.
- There was further discussion about the proposed drainfield. Chairman Burner stated the Health Department may have a problem if the pond is located in close proximity. Mr. Whitesides indicated that he's had some people come out and he doesn't think it will be a problem.
- Ms. Davis asked if it would be possible to get acreage for an easement from the adjacent property if it is necessary for the drainfield, as there is a lot going on for only 2.5 acres. Mr. Whitesides wasn't sure, but he stated they only need three restrooms for the facility. In concept it has been approved, but it is subject to the SUP.
- Ms. Davis asked if they have done a market study to look at the feasibility. Mr. Whitesides stated that their daughter is a wedding planner, in town. His wife is quite involved with the wedding venues. They aren't doing this to get rich, but to maintain the property. It's really about the legacy. It's too magnificent to let die.
- Ms. Grech asked if the 150 guests is linked to the profitability of the facility. Mr. Whitesides answered no. Ms. Grech continued – if [the Planning Commission] limited it to 75 or 100, at what point would Mr. Whitesides say it would no longer be profitable? Mr. Whitesides asked why would they need to restrict the number when they are already 20% under the number of people the code allows. They don't want to overwhelming be invasive. The County has suggested they would need 75 spaces [for 150 people], and they could argue they only need 52 or 60. But it could easily take 75. But they feel more than 75 could negatively affect the property. Some of the venues that have been approved have been way too small, but they also don't want this to be an overarching commercial entity. It's a small community. Mrs. Pence stated that from her research, 150 people is a good amount of people to have for a wedding venue. If you get less than that, you won't be as desirable. Ms. Grech stated that most of the wedding event venues aren't 2.5 acres; they're quite larger than that. They are asking to squeeze a lot onto this property. It isn't because the barn could allow up to 186

people that the County must allow 150 or 186 [guests]. Based on criteria that they will review, they could decide that the capacity could be less. She just wants them to be aware that the capacity of the barn is not the only criteria. Mr. Whitesides expressed understanding, but noted that the site plan shows more than enough space for parking. He reference another slide that had the square footage. He described some of the history of the barn. It is believed to be constructed by Pennsylvania and Dutch farmers, because it has such open beams – up to 14 inch solid oak beams, not bolts or screws except in flooring. The oak construction is spectacular. They aren't going to add drywall – they are going to maintain it in its natural state, but perhaps add some ventilation. They will not destroy the look and feel of the barn.

- Mr. Whitesides used other slides to provide further explanation of the layout, including the restrooms and seating. It is a huge barn by historical standards. He referenced the 700 [square feet] covered-under area. They don't want and won't need tents. The septic system will be sufficient so they won't need porta potties. They want to keep it natural. The deck is 240 square feet, and the proposed deck is 480 square feet. They are looking at over 5,000 square feet. So, they think that 150 people is very conservative.
- They are not adding any other buildings. They are proposing a deck and a covered portico over the entrance of the barn just to keep the weather off the entrance. It will be the same rough-hewn timbers and a matching reclaimed or synthetic metal roof. The porch outside would use materials that match the original barn. The restrooms and septic will have to meet Health Department requirements.
- The plan is for adaptive use. The landscape plan is to do minimal landscaping, using native plant species and a few replacement trees. They would do a little more up-lighting and down-lighting for landscape lighting to really show off the architectural features of the barn.
- The real purpose of the SUP is to save the historic buildings by subsidizing some of the cost. They want to partner with some of the local growers. Riverbend Ranch just recently slaughtered their first and second Wagyu beef. They want to get the community involved and share their history with visitors. There is minimal staff support/jobs.
- Ms. Grech asked if they feel they have the support of Ms. Corbett. Mr. Whitesides affirmed. Ms. Grech asked if most of the neighbors were family, and whether he believes there will be any opposition from neighbors. The reason she is asking is there have been previous SUP requests where there was opposition because the cars were to be parked close the fence, and the [vehicle] lights were going to be shining into the homes. She noticed there were no landscape plans at the road. She is concerned about the lights from the cars, because it's not a big property, and the cars will be parked close to the road. Mr. Whitesides stated that these questions are valid and reasonable, but this parcel was a part of a larger ranch and it is all open field. Ms. Grech stated she is more speaking about the neighbors across the road. Mr. Whitesides stated that the barn is on the back of the property, almost 300' back. Ms. Grech stated she was speaking more about parking, and lights shining during maneuvering/parking at the property and when the event ends. Are they prepared to put some bushes at the side of the road, should there be any opposition? Mr. Whitesides indicated yes. They had talked about adding some grapevines at the front, but all three neighbors didn't want that because they wanted to be able to view the pasture.
- Ms. Grech asked when it would be appropriate for Planning Commissioners to view the site, because right now it is covered with ice. There was some discussion on this.

Ms. Grech noted she would hold off scheduling the public hearing so she can visit the site once the snow melts.

- Ms. Clatterbuck expressed caution about requiring landscaping along the road at the Planning Commission level without first consulting VDOT. Ms. Grech agreed. If the acreage were larger, she wouldn't be as concerned. There was some discussion about which new requirements would preclude this application. Ms. Grech stated there was a reason they changed the rules. Chairman Burner stated one thing he's say about the setback changes, they had it more in mind of buildings that would be constructed than this situation, where the historic buildings already exist. Ms. Grech reiterated her concern was not about the building but about the parking. She asked Ms. Clatterbuck to compare this to the SUP for the wedding venue on Big Oak Rd., in terms of capacity and parking lot size, because this is significantly smaller acreage.
- Mr. Hahn recommended allowing Mr. Whitesides to complete his presentation. Mr. Whitesides stated he was effectively done. He noted that the SUP off of Big Oak Rd. has big acreage but it has a stream running almost against the wall. This facility would have more space available than they do, and their barn is smaller. The issue with setbacks are to protect neighbors, and the neighbors on all sides of the parking and barn are cows. It's a ranch. It's all open space - barbed wire around the property. The parking they have proposed are almost 100 feet back from the road. There was further discussion about the history of this road.
- There was some discussion about where the 186 number came from. Ms. Clatterbuck stated this comes from the Building Official based on the square footage of the barn, but the applicants are only requesting 150 person capacity.
- Mr. Whitesides noted that Riverbend Ranch has their own wedding/event venue ranch.
- Ms. Grech asked how they are going to make sure outbuildings will be made inaccessible to event guests. Mr. Whitesides said these building will be locked. There was discussion about the capacity of the short-term rental. Ms. Grech asked if they would require that both [the venue and the short-term rental] be rented at the same time. Mr. Whitesides stated no. He noted that the house has its own parking area, though it will need to be accessed from a new entrance, as they have been told by VDOT. Mr. Clatterbuck stated that VDOT doesn't allow multiple entrances from the same road. There was further discussion about the short-term rental. Mr. Whitesides noted they sometimes use this as a home. Ms. Grech asked how they would prevent people from the short-term rental crashing the event venue. Ms. Whitesides noted the combined parking capacity would be sufficient. Mrs. Pence added that either they or a wedding planner would be onsite during events.
- Mr. Johnson stated that Condition 5 limits maximum guests of the barn but not maximum use of the SUP, which is more than just the barn. One of the things he's learning is that they need to look beyond the current applicants to who the operators may be in the future. We need to look at it from that perspective. Should we establish a limit to the SUP itself, rather than just the barn? Mr. Whitesides indicated this would not be an issue.
- Mr. Johnson asked if we have the usual and adequate conditions should newer owners have a slightly different operation in mind. Ms. Clatterbuck asked if this question was specifically in regards to outdoor music. Mr. Johnson said it would be anything related to noise. Ms. Clatterbuck stated that the older regulations that this falls specifically stated they would need to apply for a festival permit under Chapter 55. We'd have to be careful, though, because this is Ag-zoned property. Wineries and breweries are

allowed by-right. There was further discussion. Mr. Whitesides stated they don't want outdoor music. Ag-tourism was discussed early in the process, when they discussed planting vineyards and having wine-tastings. The spirit of the law and how it is being pushed in Virginia, they didn't want to do that.

Ms. Grech stated she doesn't feel comfortable sending this to public hearing until she can visit the site. Chairman Burner agreed. They also need a little more time to review the conditions in depth, especially given they are reviewing the application under rules that have since been amended. Ms. Clatterbuck if there was anything the Planning Commission needs from staff for the next meeting besides a general comparison with the [Big Oak] SUP. Chairman Burner stated staff might work on the language to tie the 150 person limit to the SUP than just the barn. Mr. Whitesides added that site visits could be set up with their daughter.

D. Discussion of House Bills

Mr. Hahn referenced an updated summary document from what was included in the packet. These bills are flowing through House/Senate pretty quickly. There was some discussion about how to review these. Ultimately, Chairman Burner asked everyone to review the documents and be ready to discuss at the next meeting.

Unfinished Business

A. 2025 Annual Report

Mr. Hahn referenced changes made in in the draft annual report. No further changes were recommended.

Open Citizen Comment Period

None

Chairman's Report

None

Clerk's Report

Mr. Hahn noted he had been informed by the Nina Fox that the Economic Development Authority (EDA) will resume their Housing Subcommittee in March, and they'd like to have a Planning Commissioner represented or attending that subcommittee. He asked the Planning Commission to consider who they would like that person to be.

Adjourn

Ms. Grech made motion to adjourn. Ms. Davis seconded the motion. Chairman Burner adjourned the meeting at 8:38 p.m.

Jared Burner, Chairman



County of Page, Virginia
 Planning & Community Development
 103 South Court St., Suite B
 Luray, VA 22835

SPECIAL USE PERMIT

Owner: Checkers LLC
Applicant: Mark Harris (Downriver Adventure Company)
Tax Map #: 8-(A)-103

Purpose: Commercial Outdoor Recreation Area and Facility (Guided Rappelling Trips) operated in conjunction with the existing non-conforming campground.

APPROVED _____ DENIED _____
 By the Page County Board of Supervisors on _____

1. This special use permit is transferable; it will meet the requirements in and have privileges provided for in the Page County Zoning Ordinance, and any ordinance amendments for the period set forth within the parameters in this special use permit. The special use permit shall remain with the property for a period of fifty (50) years, or at such time as the existing non-conforming campground ceases operation for a period of two years.
2. Mark Harris, or his/her successor(s) and/or assigns (Lessors), shall be in compliance with all county ordinances, the Uniform Statewide Building Code, and all state agency regulations.
3. An inspection on all rappelling equipment, including but not limited to, harnesses, ropes, carabiners, helmets, and anchors shall be required prior to operation and annually thereafter. All inspections will be required to be through an approved third party inspector. This condition is subject to modification in writing from the Page County Building Official.
4. The business operator and/or owner shall apply for and maintain a valid Page County business license, if applicable.
- 4.5. Proof of liability insurance shall be submitted to the Zoning Administrator prior to operation of the business and upon any subsequent renewal, as applicable.
6. A comprehensive emergency action plan must be developed and filed with the Director of Emergency Services prior to the operation of the commercial outdoor recreation area and facility.
- 5.7. A copy of the current lease agreement, as well as any future amendments or updated lease agreements, shall be provided to the Zoning Administrator prior to operation of the business and upon any subsequent changes.
- 6.8. Any lighting that is provided on the property will be directed downwards so as not to produce a glare onto adjoining properties or roads or rights-of-way.
- 7.9. Any change of use or expansion of services not included in this special use permit will require an additional, new, or modified special use permit, as required by the Page County Zoning Ordinance, at that time.
- 8.10. The Zoning Administrator or their designated representative may visit the site at any time to ensure compliance with the special use permit.

Commented [TLC1]: May want to discuss based on comments at the last meeting.



County of Page, Virginia
Planning & Community Development
103 South Court St., Suite B
Luray, VA 22835

SPECIAL USE PERMIT

Applicants: Randy Whitesides and Dawn Pence

Tax Map #: 69-A-126

Purpose: Banquet/Event Facility

APPROVED _____ DENIED _____
By the Page County Board of Supervisors on _____

1. This special use permit is transferable; it will meet the requirements in and have privileges provided for in the Page County Zoning Ordinance, and any ordinance amendments for the period set forth within the parameters in this special use permit. The special use permit shall remain with the property for a period of fifty (50) years.
2. Randy Whitesides and Dawn Pence, or his/her successor(s) and/or assigns (Lessors), shall be in compliance with all county ordinances, the Uniform Statewide Building Code, and all state agency regulations.
3. The business operator and/or owner shall apply for and maintain a valid Page County business license.
4. Randy Whitesides and Dawn Pence, or his/her successor(s) and/or assigns (Lessors), shall advise each lessee that the farming operation(s) on the adjoining parcel where the banquet/event facility will be operated may emit extraneous and noxious odors, sounds, and include operation of farm equipment and farm vehicles around the banquet/event facility, and further each lessee shall be required to execute a waiver, disclaimer, and release of liability agreement pertaining to any adverse effects any farming operation may have on the lessees use or lessors property.
5. The maximum occupant load of the existing barn shall be 150 persons.
6. No parking for the banquet/event facility is permitted along Riverbend Road. All parking shall be in the designated area as shown on the concept plan dated September 23, 2025.
7. Any outdoor fires on the property shall be enclosed by a fire ring. All fire rings shall be enclosed by a non-flammable material at least 8" in height.
8. Any lighting that is provided on the property will be directed downwards so as not to produce a glare onto adjoining properties or roads or rights-of-way.
9. All entrance requirements required by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) shall be completed prior to the operation of the banquet/event facility. This condition is subject to modification in writing from VDOT.
10. All building code requirements required by the Uniform Statewide Building Code and/or the Page County Building Official shall be completed prior to the operation of the banquet/event facility. This condition is subject to modification in writing from the Page County Building Official.
11. All health requirements related to water and sewage required by the Virginia Department of Health shall be completed prior to the operation of the banquet/event facility. This condition is subject to modification in writing from the Virginia Department of Health.

12. The proposed project must be in substantial compliance with the concept plan dated September 23, 2025. Any change of use or expansion of services not included in this special use permit will require an additional, new, or modified special use permit, as required by the Page County Zoning Ordinance, at that time.
13. The Zoning Administrator or their designated representative may visit the site at any time to ensure compliance with the special use permit.
14. Violations: This special use permit may be revoked upon material noncompliance with the terms of the permit, or upon violation of any other relevant terms of the Zoning Ordinance or any other ordinances of the County of Page, Virginia. However, prior to the commencement of any action to revoke this permit, the county shall notify the permit holder in writing of the material in noncompliance or violation, and the permit holder shall have thirty (30) days thereafter to cure the material non-compliance or violation. The notice shall be deemed given when hand delivered to the permit holder or when mailed by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the permit holder. The schedule of penalties is as follows:
 - First Offense: A written warning detailing the offense shall be issued.
 - Second Offense: This permit shall be revoked for a period of thirty (30) days, commencing on the date of notice by Page County.
 - Third Offense: This permit shall be revoked for a period of ninety (90) calendar days, commencing on the date of notice by Page County.
 - Fourth Offense: This permit shall be revoked permanently, effective immediately without further notice.

I (we) the undersigned owner(s)/occupant(s) understand and agree to the foregoing conditions of this special use permit. I further understand that this special use permit may be reviewed on a yearly basis or at any time, the county determines necessary to ensure the compliance with and enforcement of all applicable conditions, codes, and regulations.

Owner(s)/Occupant(s)

Date

Board of Supervisors Chairman

Date

County Administrator

Date

Planning Commission Discussion
2026 Regular Session House/Senate Bills
Updated 2/20/26

HB418: Zoning; manufactured housing. (Introduced by Nicole Cole - Chief Patron; referred to Committee on H-Counties, Cities and Towns, Assigned to Subcommittee #1; incorporated into HB655 on 1/23/26)

- **Zoning; manufactured housing.** Amends existing provisions that require localities to permit manufactured housing in areas zoned for agriculture by expanding such requirement to all zoning districts where site-built housing is allowed. The bill provides that manufactured housing shall be subject to development standards that are equivalent to those applicable to site-built single-family dwellings but that such standards shall not have the effect of excluding manufactured housing. The bill also removes the authority of localities without a zoning ordinance to designate the areas within the locality in which manufactured housing may be located.

HB419: Approval of land use applications; residential development. (Introduced by Nicole Cole - Chief Patron; referred to Committee on H-Counties, Cities and Towns, Assigned to Subcommittee #3; continued to 2027 on 1/30/26 at subcommittee's recommendation)

- **Approval of land use applications; residential development.** Requires every locality to take final action to approve, approve with conditions, or deny any land use application for the rezoning or development of property that includes residential development within 12 months from the date of submission of such application to the locality.

HB655: Zoning; manufactured housing. (Introduced by Michelle Lopes Maldonado – Chief Patron; referred to Committee on H-Counties, Cities and Towns, Assigned to Subcommittee #1 which recommended incorporating HB418 and HB801 on 1/23/26; read third time and passed House Block Vote on 1/29/26; referred to Committee on Local Government in Senate on 1/30/26)

- **Zoning; manufactured housing.** Amends existing provisions that require localities to permit manufactured housing in areas zoned for agriculture by expanding such requirement to all zoning districts where site-built housing is allowed. The bill provides that manufactured housing shall be subject to development standards that are equivalent to those applicable to site-built single-family dwellings but that such standards shall not have the effect of excluding manufactured housing. The bill also removes the authority of localities without a zoning ordinance to designate the areas within the locality in which manufactured housing may be located.

HB711: Solar facilities; local regulation, special exceptions. (Introduced by Charniele L. Herring - Chief Patron; referred to Committee on H-Counties, Cities and Towns; Assigned to Subcommittee #3; Read third time and passed House on 2/5/26, Referred to Committee on Local Government in Senate on 2/6/26.)

- **Local regulation of solar facilities; special exceptions.** Provides that a ground-mounted solar energy generation facility to be located on property zoned agricultural, commercial, industrial, or institutional shall be permitted pursuant to various criteria to be included in a local ordinance, such as specifications for setbacks, fencing, solar panel height, visual impacts, and grading, and a decommissioning plan for solar energy equipment and facilities, unless otherwise permitted by right. The bill requires localities to furnish the State Corporation Commission a record of special exception decisions reached pursuant to these provisions that includes (i) the reason for any adverse decision, (ii) any finding of nonconformity with the local comprehensive plan, and (iii) the date of the last revision to the comprehensive plan. Finally, the bill requires the State Corporation Commission to compile and maintain on the Commission's public website a searchable database of all solar special exception decisions and the reasons for any adverse decisions made over a period of not less than five years. This bill is a recommendation of the Commission on Electric Utility Regulation.

HB801: Zoning; manufactured housing. (Introduced by Dan I. Helmer - Chief Patron; referred to Committee on H-Counties, Cities and Towns, assigned to Subcommittee #1, incorporated into HB655 on 1/23/26)

- **Zoning; manufactured housing.** Amends existing provisions that require localities to permit manufactured housing in areas zoned for agriculture by expanding such requirement to all zoning districts where site-built housing is allowed. The bill provides that manufactured housing shall be subject to development standards that are equivalent to those applicable to site-built single-family dwellings but that such standards shall not have the effect of excluding manufactured housing. The bill also removes the authority of localities without a zoning ordinance to designate the areas within the locality in which manufactured housing may be located.

HB804: Localities; statewide housing targets. (Introduced by Dan I. Helmer - Chief Patron; referred to Committee on H-Counties, Cities and Towns, assigned to Subcommittee 2, which recommended reporting; read third time and passed House on 1/29/26; referred to Committee on Local Government in Senate on 1/30/26)

- **Statewide housing targets for localities.** Requires localities to increase their total housing stock by at least 7.5 percent over the five-year period beginning January 1, 2028. The bill provides that in order to meet such 7.5 percent growth target, a locality shall develop a housing growth plan that best meets the needs of the locality while meeting the growth target rates. The bill provides that such plan may include any strategy deemed appropriate by the locality; however, for purposes of demonstrating a good faith effort to meet growth targets, a locality shall include modeling that demonstrates that the plan will result in the permitting of the required number of units and either (i) a zoning ordinance that includes provisions allowing for the by-right development and construction of multifamily residential uses on at least 75 percent of all land contained in commercial or business zoning district classifications, including any land contained in commercial or business zoning district classifications that allow for the by-right development and construction of single-family residential uses or (ii) at least three of the housing growth strategies enumerated in the bill. The bill further provides that after January 1, 2033, an applicant that seeks local government approval for a residential development site plan or rezoning that will have the effect of increasing the supply of housing in a locality and has that

application rejected may, in addition to other remedies, appeal such decision to the board of zoning appeals.

HB816: Zoning; by-right multifamily development. (Dan I. Helmer - Chief Patron; referred to Committee on H-Counties, Cities and Towns, assigned to Subcommittee 2, which recommended reporting; read third time and passed House on 1/29/26; referred to Committee on Local Government in Senate on 1/30/26)

- **Zoning; by-right multifamily development.** Requires a locality to include provisions in its zoning ordinance allowing for the by-right development and construction of multifamily residential uses on at least 75 percent of all land contained in commercial or business zoning district classifications, including any land contained in commercial or business zoning district classifications that allow for the by-right development and construction of single-family residential uses. The bill provides that such provisions shall not apply in underdeveloped areas that are covered by a tree canopy of at least 60 percent, impose more stringent land use requirements for such development than would otherwise be required, or require that a special exception, special use, or conditional use permit be obtained for such development. The bill also (i) stipulates that the review and approval of such development shall be done administratively by the locality's staff; (ii) requires that the zoning ordinance provisions must exempt any proposed development that converts an existing building to a multifamily residential use from any setback, height, or frontage requirements; (iii) permits the zoning ordinance provisions to require any proposed development to dedicate some or all of its ground floor space to commercial uses; and (iv) provides that any proposed residential development that dedicates a minimum of 10 percent of the total number of housing units to affordable housing may be offered application incentives by the locality. The bill also prohibits localities from approving any commercial or business use on a property adjacent to the approved multifamily residential development that is different from the use that had been established at the time the multifamily residential development was approved.

HB891: Siting of battery energy storage projects; commercial solar photovoltaic generation facilities, etc. (Introduced by Irene Shin – Chief Patron; referred to Committee on H-Counties, Cities and Towns; Assigned to Subcommittee #1 on 1/28/26; read third time and passed House on 2/5/26; referred to Committee on Local Government in Senate on 2/6/26)

- **Siting of battery energy storage projects; commercial solar photovoltaic generation facilities; permitted accessory use.** Deems battery energy storage projects as a permitted accessory use in all zoning districts on any parcel of land that is subject to an approved special exception, as defined in the bill, for a commercial solar photovoltaic generation facility, if such battery energy storage project is located within the boundaries of the parcel covered by the existing special exception and complies with any applicable federal, state, and local safety or fire codes and environmental regulations. The bill prohibits a host locality from requiring a special exception or any other local land use approval on such battery energy storage project. The bill clarifies that nothing in the provisions of the bill shall be construed to (i) limit the authority of a host locality to enforce compliance with applicable codes or ensure the safe operation of the battery energy storage project or (ii) preclude the developer of a battery energy storage project from negotiating a siting agreement with the host locality. The bill also clarifies that any battery

energy storage project for which an initial interconnection request has been filed with an electric utility or a regional transmission organization prior to July 1, 2030, and is constructed in accordance with the provisions of the bill shall be subject to the applicable local ordinance and regulation in effect on July 1, 2026.

HB895: Electric utilities; energy storage requirements, Department of Energy to develop model ordinance. (Introduced by Richard C. "Rip" Sullivan, Jr. - Chief Patron; referred to Committee on H-Counties, Cities and Towns, Assigned to Subcommittee #3 on 1/22/26; Subcommittee recommended reporting on 2/11/26; read third time and passed House on 2/17/26)

- **Electric utilities; energy storage requirements; Department of Energy to develop model ordinance; work groups; reports.** Increases the targets for energy storage capacity that Appalachian Power and Dominion Energy Virginia are required to petition the State Corporation Commission (the Commission) for approval to construct, acquire, or procure and extends the time frame by which such capacity must be met. Under the bill, (i) Appalachian Power shall petition the Commission for approval to construct, acquire, or procure at least 780 megawatts of short-duration energy storage capacity by 2040 and 520 megawatts of long-duration energy storage capacity by 2045 and (ii) Dominion Energy Virginia shall petition the Commission for approval to construct, acquire, or procure at least 16,000 megawatts of short-duration energy storage capacity by 2045 and 3,480 megawatts of long-duration energy storage capacity by 2045. "Long-duration energy storage" and "short-duration energy storage" are defined in the bill. The bill requires the Commission to conduct a technology demonstration program for long-duration energy storage resources and initiate a proceeding to determine if such technology is viable and that the targets in the bill are reasonably achievable, for which a final order shall be entered no later than March 1, 2030. Certain provisions of the bill are only effective upon such determination by the Commission. The bill requires the Department of Energy, in consultation with the Department of Environmental Quality and the Department of Fire Programs, to create a model ordinance for use by localities in their regulation of energy storage projects and to submit a report to the General Assembly by December 1, 2026. The bill directs the Department of Energy and the Department of Environmental Quality to convene a work group to develop recommendations and financial incentives related to the development of long-duration energy storage projects and submit a report to the General Assembly by December 1, 2026. The bill also directs the Department of Energy to engage with PJM Interconnection, LLC, in reviewing regional market conditions related to energy storage resources and permits Dominion Energy Virginia to propose a partnership with institutions of higher education to deploy energy storage resources.

HB1091: Right to farm; solar panels. (Introduced by Amy J. Laufer – Chief Patron; referred to Committee on Agriculture, Chesapeake and Natural Resources, subcommittee Agriculture; Subcommittee recommends continuing to 2027 on 2/5/26; Continued to 2027 in Subcommittee on 2/11/26; Left in Committee on 2/18/26)

- **Right to farm; solar panels.** Adds any operation for the production of electricity from solar panels concurrent with the bona fide production of crops, animals, or fowl to the definition of "agricultural operation" in the Right to Farm law, which limits the circumstances under which agricultural operations may be deemed a nuisance by preventing certain actions by localities.

HB1279: Affordable housing; religious organizations and other nonprofit tax-exempt properties.

(Introduced by Joshua G. Cole – Chief Patron; referred to Committee on H-Counties, Cities and Towns; Assigned to Subcommittee #2 on 1/28/26; read third time and passed House on 2/6/26; referred to Committee on Local Government in Senate on 2/6/26)

- **Affordable housing; religious organizations and other nonprofit tax-exempt properties.** Allows for the administrative approval of development and construction of housing on land owned by property tax-exempt religious organizations or certain property tax-exempt nonprofit organizations and provides that zoning ordinances for all purposes shall allow the by-right development and construction of housing on real property owned by such organizations. The bill requires that the implementation and approval of such developments be completed administratively and states that localities shall not require a special exception, special use permit, conditional use permit, rezoning, or any discretionary review or approval process. The bill requires that at least 60 percent of the housing development's total units be for affordable housing and that the housing development remain affordable for at least 50 years. The bill also provides that all such housing is subject to local real property taxation following completion, unless explicitly exempted by the locality. The bill has a delayed effective date of September 1, 2026. **The provisions of the bill do not become effective unless reenacted by the 2027 Session of the General Assembly.**

SB443: Siting of battery energy storage projects; commercial solar photovoltaic generation facilities.

(Introduced by Jeremy S. McPike – Chief Patron; referred to Committee on Local Government on 1/13/26; read third time and passed Senate on 1/29/26; referred to Committee on Counties, Cities and Town in House on 2/4/26; **Reported from Subcommittee on 2/13/26; Passed House on 2/16/26; Signed by House/Senate on 2/18/26**)

- **Siting of battery energy storage projects; commercial solar photovoltaic generation facilities; permitted accessory use.** Deems battery energy storage projects as a permitted accessory use in all zoning districts on any parcel of land that is subject to an approved special exception, as defined in the bill, for a commercial solar photovoltaic generation facility, if such battery energy storage project is located within the boundaries of the parcel covered by the existing special exception and complies with any applicable federal, state, and local safety or fire codes and environmental regulations. The bill prohibits a host locality from requiring a special exception or any other local land use approval on such battery energy storage project. The bill clarifies that nothing in the provisions of the bill shall be construed to (i) limit the authority of a host locality to enforce compliance with applicable codes or ensure the safe operation of the battery energy storage project or (ii) preclude the developer of a battery energy storage project from negotiating a siting agreement with the host locality. The bill also clarifies that any battery energy storage project for which an initial interconnection request has been filed with an electric utility or a regional transmission organization prior to July 1, 2030, and is constructed in accordance with the provisions of the bill shall be subject to the applicable local ordinance and regulation in effect on July 1, 2026.