

**REGULAR MEETING OF  
LURAY PLANNING COMMISSION  
March 11, 2026**

The Luray Planning Commission met on Wednesday, March 11, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. in regular session. The meeting was held in the Luray Town Council Chambers at 45 East Main Street, Luray, Virginia at which time there were present the following:

**Commissioner's Present:**

Ronald Good, Chairman  
John Shaffer, Vice Chairman  
Bill Huffman  
Barbie Stombock  
Brian Sours  
Tracie Dickson

**Commissioners Absent:**

Frankie Seaward

**Others Present:**

Bryan Chrisman, Town Manager  
Brooke Fox, Planning & Zoning Technician

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Good at 7:00 p.m. and everyone joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ROLL CALL**

The roll was called with six (6) members present and one (1) member absent.

**ADDITIONS OR DELETION OF AGENDA**

**Motion:** Commissioner Huffman approved the March 11, 2026, agenda as presented.

**Motion seconded** by Commissioner Shaffer with the vote as follows: **YEA:** Chairman Good, Commissioners Shaffer, Huffman, Stombock, Sours, Dickson **Approved 6-0**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chairman Good led a review of the February 11, 2026, regular meeting minutes.

**Motion:** Commissioner Dickson made the motion to approve the February 11, 2026, regular meeting minutes as presented. **Motion seconded** by Commissioner Sours with the vote as follows: **YEA:** Chairman Good, Commissioners Shaffer, Huffman, Stombock, Sours, Dickson **Approved 6-0**

**GENERAL CITIZENS COMMENTS:**

There were no citizen comments.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

### 7A) Code Amendments M-1 Accessory Structures & Alternative Energy Elements

The Planning Commission is requested to conduct a public hearing to receive comments from the public regarding proposed code amendments to the Zoning District regulations.

#### The principal changes focus on:

Chapter 407 of Article IV would be amended to allow accessory buildings by right as an accessory to any use permitted by Special Use Permit and to any lawfully non-conforming use in the M-1 zoning district.

Chapter 517 of Article V would be amended to limit sustainable energy systems in Town to small scale systems.

#### **M-1 Accessory Structures**

Public hearing was opened. With no one signed up to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Chrisman informed the commission that the town has received a couple of inquiries from property owners that have single-family homes in the M-1 district. Under the current ordinance they are not allowed to have an accessory structure at all. This means no storage building, no swimming pool, and no other accessory structure. All of these houses predate the ordinance. This would provide a mechanism for a suitable accessory use in this district for those types of situations.

Chairman Good pointed out that it would have to meet the setbacks of section 407.4. Mr. Chrisman also stated it has to be a lawfully nonconforming use. Meaning it predated the M-1 district ordinance.

**Motion:** Commissioner Shaffer made the motion to recommend the proposed M-1 accessory structure code amendment be recommended to council for approval. **Motion seconded** by Commissioner Stombock **YEA:** Chairman Good, Commissioners Shaffer, Huffman, Stombock, Sours, Dickson **Approved 6-0**

#### **Alternative Energy Elements**

Public hearing was opened. With no one signed up to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Huffman asked if Virginia Legislation had recently passed something that allows for very small solar units to be plugged into your house or even mounted in a window such as in the city and would this type of small scale solar be included in this amendment. Mr. Chrisman stated, yes, small scale solar is an extension of the house such

as a roof mounted system. Or they can have a yard mounted system. This can even be in the commercial district. If a system cannot be mounted on a roof due to its age and ability to hold such a system, it can be ground mounted as long as it meets the setback. And if it is attached to the side of a house, as long as it meets the setback it is allowed under the small scale.

Chairman Good pointed out that it also states it would need to meet the national standards and the building code.

Commissioner Stombock asked to confirm that the small-scale accessory definition is 50% or less in size of the existing dwelling or primary structure on the property?

Mr. Chrisman stated it is 75% of the existing roof system of a dwelling and that is a by-right use in all zoning districts for residential construction. Mr. Chrisman stated that ground mount systems would require a special use permit because you are considering adjacent uses and that is the 50% of the size of the existing structure. The special use is there to consider the adjacent uses on other properties, and you do not want these to be so tall that it disrupts the view shed or interferes with the property use.

**Motion:** Commissioner Huffman made the motion the proposed zoning amendment be recommended to council for approval. **Motion seconded** by Commissioner Stombock  
**YEA:** Chairman Good, Commissioners Shaffer, Huffman, Stombock, Sours, Dickson  
**Approved 6-0**

#### **7B) SUP26-001 Two (2) Lodging Houses R3 102 S. Hawksbill Street**

The Planning Commission is requested to conduct a Public Hearing to receive citizen input and to consider a request for a Special Use Permit to locate two (2) Lodging Houses at 102 S Hawksbill Street in the High Density Residential (R3) Zoning District.

#### **Staff recommended the following conditions be considered:**

- 1) Compliance with Town Code Section 519 – Lodging House Regulations
- 2) Chapter 519, Item (g) is to be specifically noted for Special Approval, in this case, provided that the Town Attorney confirms that such a use is allowable.
- 3) Change of Use to allow two (2) Lodging House units in one structure from the Page County Building Official, with a revised Certificate of Occupancy required.
- 4) Creation and maintenance of a minimum of two (2) off-street parking spaces, one per bedroom per lodging house unit is required.
- 5) The two (2) lodging house units must be physically separated and have their own private entrance with no internal access connections available between the units.
- 6) Special Use Permit shall not transfer upon sale of the property or membership interest composition of the holding company.

Public hearing was opened. With no one signed up to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Chairman Good asked commissioners to reference 519.1(g)(3) which states each rental must encompass the entire structure. The question being is the downstairs unit considered the entire structure and the same for the upstairs unit, is it the entire structure? Mr. Chrisman states that this is a legal question. Under number one, it states it must be a single-family dwelling. This is a building that previously already had two apartments in it and is not a single-family dwelling. We have not had this request before with an over and under situation. On a side-by-side duplex it is easier because they have a dividing wall and their own driveway. Everything is physically separate. This is a stacked unit. Number two states may be subject to only one rental transaction for the same time period. As Chairman Good stated it must encompass the entire structure. The question would be legally does a divided over and under that is physically separate constitute a single dwelling? Just because they are upper and lower instead of side by side, does that matter? There is no way to draw a lot line like we have with duplexes that are side by side. These units are on the same parcel. If the attorney says this is a viable use, then it is ok. But if he comes back and says this is not a viable use, at that point your recommendation for approval is mute.

Commissioner Stombock stated that she thought this had been discussed before. Specifically, in B1 on main street. She thought it had been discussed that it could not be short-term rentals because they were in the same structure. Mr. Chrisman stated that what the council did this last time was amend section 519. Their concern was that buildings that were in the business district and downtown area could be multiple uses. Other wise you would not be able to have a mixed-use building. The bottom could be a business, and the upstairs could be a residence. In the business district they do not have to follow chapter 519. They are exempt from 519 because they are a by-right use in the business district. It is considered a mixed-use. But if they had a building in the business district that had four dwelling units in it and they wanted to use the top two as short-term rentals or the bottom two as long-term rentals the council did not want to take away the ability for that property owner to have that option. So, in the business district they did allow that. The business district is about one hundred feet away from this structure so even though it is in R3 right now, the neighbors across the street can have it as a by-right use and they cannot. So, once we find a legal determination, does this actually meet the intent of 519 or does it not? The only other option this property owner would have then is to rezone from R3 to B1. If they did not do that then they could do two long-term rentals. Chairman Good stated it is a great place located right on the greenway and close to downtown. Commissioner Stombock stated it would make great workforce housing for people who work downtown. Mr. Chrisman stated that this used to be a single-family dwelling and at some point, in time, it was converted to upper and lower apartments. Commissioner Shaffer stated that they are separated and it would be the same as if they were side by side.

Mr. Chrisman stated that if the commission chooses to table this special use permit application and wait on legal to respond it would show up on the next agenda as a discussion item. If legal comes back and says that this particular situation is not going to meet the requirements in chapter 519, we can refund the applicant. At that point, the applicant can apply to rezone the property or split it and have a long-term unit on one

level and a short-term rental on the second level and they can apply for a special use permit for that one short-term rental unit at that location. Again, this is a legal determination about what options the applicant may have per this section of the ordinance.

Commissioner Stombock asked if an elderly woman wanted to live in the downstairs of her home and rent upstairs could she do that? Mr. Chrisman stated this one is different because it has two water meters and two separate accounts. In Commissioner Stombock's case that would not be allowed in R3 in a special use permit situation. She stated if allowed this could help an elderly person in need of supplemental income or someone looking for a long-term rental. Mr. Chrisman stated the only district with a provision preventing room renting in the residential area is the R1 district.

With no further discussion, Chairman Good stated this topic will appear on the April 15, 2026, agenda.

## **UPDATES & DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **8A) Accessory Dwelling Units**

The Planning Commission is requested to review and discuss proposed amendments to the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) section of the ordinance, including the definition. Included are several sheets indicating the current definition, the current Ordinance section, and a list of topics for discussion related to these uses and the possible expansion.

Topics for consideration included, but are not limited to:

- Location in zoning districts
- New construction or renovated existing structures (change of use)
- Operational requirements
- Utilities and setbacks
- Subdivision
- Minimum lot sizes
- Special Use Permits

Mr. Chrisman stated that the only change that came up was the economic impact and potential changes in property values. This came up in the council meeting and one of the things they discussed was if we widen the zones where accessory dwelling units are available, how could that type of housing and the more economical affordable housing construction methods have a potential negative impact on property or home values in those zoning districts. Commissioner Stombock asked how many parcels are in the zoning district accessory dwelling units are being considered? Mr. Chrisman stated we may be able to ask Page County GIS to determine this. Commissioner Stombock stated these units are not cheap to build. Only a small percentage of a particular zoning district would build these units, and the growth would be slow. She discussed making accessory dwelling units available in R1 which offers the most land space available. The

size of the lot should be considered instead of what zoning district it is. Commissioner Stombock asked if the general assembly considered a couple of bills regarding accessory dwelling units? Mr. Chrisman stated yes and they are still active. The attorney has suggested waiting to see if that gets signed because it will change the discussion. Commissioner Stombock mentioned that if passed it would state that it requires local zoning to allow at least one accessory dwelling unit on lots with single family homes. Mr. Chrisman stated that this would be for ordinances that take effect after July 2027. And ours is already in effect. If it passes the biggest thing is how it will impact our existing ordinance.

**ACTION ITEMS**

**COMMISSION COMMENTS**


**CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS**

Chairman Good informed members that several businesses are moving into vacant buildings.

The next meeting would be held on April 15, 2026.

**ADJOURNED**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

  
Bryan Chrisman  
Town Manager