

SUNLAND-TUJUNGA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL  
SPECIAL LAND-USE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
February 26, 2018

---

- I. Meeting was called to order at 7:12pm by Chairperson Cindy Cleghorn
- II. Roll Call
  - a. Present
    - i. Cindy Cleghorn
    - ii. Elektra Kruger
    - iii. Nina Royal
    - iv. David Barron
    - v. John Laue
    - vi. Liliana Sanchez
    - vii. Pati Potter
    - viii. Vartan Keshish
  - b. Absent
    - i. Bill Skiles
    - ii. Debby Beck
    - iii. Karen Zimmerman
    - iv. Cathi Comras
  - c. No public representative present
- III. Self-Introduction of LUC Board Members
- IV. Approval of Minutes
  - a. **MOTION:** by Pati Potter to approve the February 5, 2018 STNC-LUC Meeting Minutes as amended 2<sup>nd</sup> by Vartan Keshish Vote: Unanimously approved
- V. 6477 Foothill Bl. (x Tujunga Canyon Pl.), proposed Express Car Wash – Benjamin Fiss
  - a. Applicant requested this meeting with the LUC to present up-dates on the proposal
  - b. Proposal has been revised based on input received from both community members and the LUC
  - c. Review: Property is currently a vacant lot with one block building. Located at the intersection of Foothill Bl. and Tujunga Canyon Pl.
  - d. Change #1 = structural colors to better match buildings adjacent to the site
  - e. The original site plan had 2 driveways, it has now been revised to have only one which results in pushing the vacuum stations further away from adjacent residential properties, the driveway itself has been pushed further away as well
    - i. Has increased the landscape buffer between the car wash and the residential properties resulting in one less vacuum station
    - ii. There now is one entry, clients circulate around the pay station, circulate through the car wash tunnel and then circulate to the vacuum stations
  - f. The revised site plan also makes it possible to gate the driveway providing greater security at night when the car wash is not in operation
  - g. At the last meeting there were questions about a landscape plan which they now have to include trees – and with the larger buffer can accommodate larger trees.
    - i. Landscape plantings will be drought tolerant, mostly California native including the Fortnight Lily, Coyote Bush, California Fescue, Hopseed Bush and Blue Hibiscus for color. Trees to include the Monte Verde Multi and Toyon Multi

- ii. The landscape buffer initially proposed to be 5 ft has now been increased to 6 ½ ft moving the driveway closer to Foothill Bl and further away from the nearest SFR
- h. At the last meeting there were a lot of questions re noise. They have worked with their noise consultant and the City Planning Department to ensure they are in compliance with noise regulations and to address the noise concerns of the community
  - i. Have taken ambient noise readings of the community as well as that of other car washes with equipment similar to that proposed for 6477 Foothill so the site has been specifically designed to address noise concerns.
  - ii. The equipment is state-of-the-art available, blowers (the noise source located where cars enter the tunnel) have been located as close to the roadway as possible and as far away from any SFR as possible
  - iii. There are small canopies above each of the individual vacuum stations to help direct any noise away from the adjacent community
  - iv. The end result of the design effort is that the proposed Project does not exceed noise thresholds on an on-going operational basis
- i. Modern car wash equipment is quieter, more efficient, cleans cars in less time, are more environmentally friendly because they use less water, soaps and waxes used are not as harsh and the water is treated before being disposed of
- j. At the last meeting there were comments re the large number of existing car washes in the area. To address that they referred to the car wash behind the 76 gas station recently approved by the LUC with a number of conditions
  - i. The applicant reviewed those conditions w/the intent to meet those same conditions thereby hopefully garnering LUC/community support, however it was determined that none of the conditions would apply to the 6477 Foothill site as they do not have any of the same problems
    - 1. Reductions in dedications, proximity to adjacent residences, issues with adjacent sidewalks
    - 2. Would appreciate any conditions or guidance to gain support. That is why they have come before the community and LUC, that is why they have made changes to the initial design based on community input
- k. Q&A: Q = question from audience C = Comment from the audience A = Response by applicant representative
  - i. Q: Re the north wall height, what will that wall height be?
    - 1. A: Wall height per code is 6', we have requested 10'. It is up to the City as to whether they will approve the 10'
    - 2. C: A 6' soundwall isn't going to cut it – I have a sight-line above 6' and there is no guarantee of getting a 10' wall.
    - 3. A: A 10' wall is a minor request from the City and is easy to get unless there is opposition
    - 4. Pati P.: The project property is 3 feet lower than the neighbor's property. Will the 10' wall be 10' from the project property or from the neighbor's property level.
    - 5. A: It will be 10' from natural grade which probably would be half way between
  - ii. C: The change in coloring in the new rendering looks like it is going to be purple/orange like the adjacent public storage building which is a little obnoxious. Before it was green/tan

1. A: The orange color is a change from the initial red
- iii. Q: I notice there are no telephone poles in the rendering – are you eliminating telephone poles on that property?
  1. A: I wish we could. The only way to change that would be to go underground and that would be a DWP Project
- iv. Q: Will the property be completely locked up at night so that the homeless can't get in there?
  1. A: There will be no fence or gate, but the site will be locked up with a chain and secured with motion detector lights
- v. Q: What is the item in the NE corner?
  1. A: That is the enclosed trash location
  2. C: The trash storage is right next to a residential neighbor - me. There is a similar trash enclosure on the other side of the E wall that attracts rats all the time. I don't need more rodent problems
- vi. C: There was somebody here last time – I don't know your association with this lady – but her actions were unacceptable
  1. A (from applicant): I am new to Sunland-Tujunga. I do not know who anybody is – I did not bring anybody to the meeting
  2. C: She is not a neighbor to the proposed Project – she has no right to comment about the Project
- vii. Q: What is the decibel noise level?
  1. Noise studies are still in progress
- viii. Q: What are the proposed hours of operation?
  1. A: 7am to 7pm
  2. Q: Weekends?
  3. A: 7am to 7pm, 7 days
  4. C: That seems awfully early for a car wash
  5. Pati P.: What hours of operation would be acceptable to the neighborhood?
  6. C: 8am – 7pm
- ix. C: The ingress/egress will be a big problem for traffic. If you want the Project, you have to do more traffic studies. Move the entrance to the E side.
  1. Cindy C.: Where is there an opening on the E side?
  2. C: That is their problem to determine
  3. C2: Use some of their own land to place the driveway on the E side
- x. Liliana S.: Q (addressed a neighbor) You stated that at the last meeting, you were approached by an audience member belonging to the Chamber of Commerce that gave you the idea that the community had a racial divide related to this particular project
  1. C: (a non-neighbor audience member began disrupting the meeting loudly and rudely) demanded the question be stated "correctly" not implicating the Chamber

VI. Disrupted meeting led to early adjournment at 7:52 pm