

October 1, 2007

Dear Members of the Town Planning Commission,

While we do not doubt the goodwill of the Planning Commission's allowance of one week to provide written comment on the specifics of the proposed Comp Plan Amendment, we emphasize that it failed to respect our request for a special work session in November. One week is insufficient time for the proper analyses, consultation and economic impact studies that would be required, considering the importance of the document that you are proposing.

In good faith we provide herein a list of detailed questions. Some relate to the fundamental issue of the openness of the process, which your vote to close the public hearing only highlighted.

1. Are you aware that it is the sole prerogative of the Planning Commission to invite public input to the work sessions and not the right of the public to initiate input, contrary to the comments of your chair?
2. Are you satisfied that the format of several minutes allotted to speakers is sufficient time for detailed public input on your plan?
3. Is there a deadline for the implementation of this document? If not, why was the dominant concern of the committee the schedule and the possibility of needing to advertise again?
4. What is the committee's justification for ignoring the 1997 Comprehensive Plans call to "conduct community meetings in the planning areas..." with regard to future updates? *(see page 3 of the 1997 Comp Plan)*
5. The Comprehensive Plan is to be updated every five years. What is the legal and ethical justification behind "amending" the Plan rather than doing a proper update as foreseen and called for in your own documents? *(see page 3 of the 1997 Comp Plan)*
6. On what basis is there a wholesale abandonment of the 1997 Comprehensive Plan's "High Priority" transportation schedule such as the pursuit of an I-66 interchange at Shenandoah Shores Rd and Leach Run Parkway including the much needed flyover of Happy Creek Rd (which is not dependent on the interchange)? *(see page 47 of the 1997 Comp Plan)*
7. Despite the Town and County spending significant resources on the Happy Creek Charette process (in which many of us participated), is there a reason why its findings are not referenced in your document?

8. Is it the Town's position that the purpose of annexation is so that land "should be protected and retained for agriculture"? (see page 38 of the proposed Comp Plan Update)
9. Why have the Town Planning Commission and staff not coordinated with the County on this important planning document? (see attached 9/25/07 letter from Warren County)
10. Why was the EDA and the rest of the local business community left out of the development of this document? (see attached 9/27/07 letter from the EDA)
11. All the above begs one last question; If not the citizens, property owners and other stakeholders; who was consulted during this process and whose point of view does this document represent?

In closing, we hope that these few questions are used for the positive purpose of highlighting the issues of concern with the proposed Plan Amendment and the process that developed it. We hope that you will consider taking all the time necessary to address and correct these issues in a thoughtful and inclusive way. All the citizens of Front Royal/Warren County can benefit from your work here or be harmed by your failure to address these important issues.

Sincerely,

The following Property Owners in the North East Planning Area:

Foster Industries LLC
The Williams Bros. Corporation of America
Kingsley Holdings LLC
Strike First Corporation of America
Power-Comm Inc.
Auriga Ltd.
Human Life International, Inc.
Petrine Companies
Rivendell Club
Hipp Business Park – Ranson5 LLC
Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen
AirPac, Inc.
Front Royal Industrial Park LLC