

Jonathan Blake

From: Karen Johnson <kpj64@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 4:52 PM
To: Jonathan Blake; Ann-Marie Aubrey
Cc: Lois Latraverse
Subject: Yellin Trailer Parking Lot
Attachments: Frito letter 4-22-2010.pdf

Hi Jonathan & Anne Marie,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Yellin Parking Lot application proposed by Frito Lay. As you know, I am a direct abutter to the site and my concerns over the years have been to minimize impacts for Alexander's Lake residents related to noise and light intrusion as well as water quality impacts to the lake.

Overall, the plan looks like a reasonable approach to what is already used as a trailer storage area. A paved lot with proper drainage is a preferred approach for trailer storage rather than a gravel parking area. It appears the water quality measures are an improvement over the existing conditions so appreciate the effort to upgrade the Yellin lot.

I do have a few questions related to internal circulation and other site impacts:

1. It appears that access to the lot will be via an existing paved drive at the rear of the site - is it possible to close off the gravel drive adjacent to the railroad? If it is the intention to stop using the gravel drive can this be formalized by preventing access from the 1886 Upper Maple Street driveway?
2. It is unclear what the purpose of this lot is - is it for storing trailers or are they storing product in these trailers ready for shipping? Many of them appear to be for storage only and not suitable for transport. The question only relates to an operational concern. The access drive at 1886 Upper Maple Street is often the subject of confusion for delivery drivers not familiar with the area. I just encountered one the other day who was blocking my driveway while I was trying to leave my house. He was given an address of 1886 Upper Maple Street - he clearly missed the Lake Road access and at that point, had no place to turn around. Frito has tried to improve signage from 395 but it is not clear enough if drivers are given the wrong address.
3. Is it necessary to have 40 foot high light poles (pole + base + fixture) - multiple shorter poles can provide the same light levels and will minimize light pollution. The elevation of the lot is at least 16 feet higher than the elevation of the lake making the light fixture 56 feet higher, therefore even so call dark sky compliant or cut off fixtures are completely visible from the lake. This additional light pollution is not necessary.
4. I am also requesting an increase in the vegetative buffer - specifically that at least twice the number of evergreen trees be planted at a staggered pattern to screen this area.
5. We discussed a Forest Management Plan that was part of prior approvals - see attached approval from August 22, 2010 that references this plan prepared by Connwood Foresters, Inc. I note that this reference is also carried over to subsequent approvals. I do not have a copy of this plan but recall from prior years that it is clearly shown on KWP plans that are hopefully still part of your files. It would be helpful to revisit this requirement as it is part of the special permit record.

I understand that no action will be taken this evening so I hope we will have an opportunity to discuss these concerns.

Karen Johnson
1819 Upper Maple Street
Mobile # 203 605 9175