



# Venice Neighborhood Council

LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294 | [www.VeniceNC.org](http://www.VeniceNC.org)

Email: [Chair-LUPC@VeniceNC.org](mailto:Chair-LUPC@VeniceNC.org)



## Land Use & Planning Committee (LUPC) STAFF REPORT

March 5, 2026

City Case No: ZA-2025-2673-CDP-CU2-CLQ-CDO=SPPC-WDI

CEQA Case No: ENV-2025-2674-EAF

Related City Case No(s): none

Address of Project: 2499 Lincoln Blvd, block between Van Buren & Garfield Avenues

Applicant/Property Owner: Farzad Nourollah, 2499 Lincoln LLC

Applicant's Representative: Brian Silvera, Brian Silvera & Assoc.

Standard of Review: Coastal Act, with certified Land Use Plan (LUP) as guidance (for CDPs)  
Venice Community Plan  
Other applicable State laws: Assembly Bill 2097  
Other applicable City laws: ADU ordinance  
Mello Act & Housing Crisis Act

City Hearing: N/A

Email for City Planner: [luis.lopez@lacity.org](mailto:luis.lopez@lacity.org)

LUPC Staff assigned: Richard Stanger, when former LUPC member, and continued by Mark Mack

### I. Project Description:

Demo of existing retail, auto repair, & auto sales & repair garage within 3 structures for the construction of a 4,860 SF automated express, full service carwash (120' carwash bay/tunnel).

### II. Motion:

The Venice Neighborhood Council recommends *denial* of the proposed Bellagio Carwash because it 1) harms the City and Venice's ability to implement the developments proposed in the draft update of the Venice Community Plan and the Venice Land use Plan, especially that the Lincoln corridor is designated to

**absorb very much needed housing projects, and 2) introduces substantial negative impacts to its surrounding area, and it will increase traffic and problematic turning movements.**

**Moved: Mark Mack**

**Seconded: Robin Rudisill**

**Vote: 7-0-0 (1 absent, 1 position open)**

### **III. Outreach and Neighbor notifications:**

Brian Silvera [Company: Brian Silvera & Associates] conducted outreach to the immediate and surrounding neighbors and encountered overwhelming opposition to the proposed carwash project, see Appendix B below.

In addition, in July 2025, prior to becoming a VNC Board member and as LUPC Staff assigned by the prior LUPC Chair, Richard Stanger prepared an analysis of the project. See ADDENDUM for that analysis. Note that the analysis was based on information collected prior to the Applicant's representative meeting with the community and making some changes to the project based on their concerns.

# ADDENDUM

Report prepared by Richard Stanger, July 1, 2025

## A. Detailed Project Description:

The basic description from the website is “Demolition of existing retail, auto repair, and auto sales & repair garage w/in structures for the construction of a 4,860 sf. automated express, full service carwash (120' Carwash Bay/Tunnel).” There are several Bellagio Car Wash facilities in southern California, and this project proposes locating another on Lincoln Boulevard (“Lincoln”). The basic plan is shown as Figure 1. The proposed facility will have a front wall of faux windows, doorways, minor articulations, and landscaping. There is no interior building. Behind the façade will be two lanes of cars moving towards a 120' carwash tunnel. After being washed and dried in the tunnel, the cars are driven to one of 21 vacuum stations where drivers can vacuum out the cars.

As part of my review, I visited the Bellagio Carwash in Carson. Any consideration of the project’s benefits and impacts must include the noise from the industrial-grade dryers used just before the cars exit the carwash tunnel. From the sidewalk the noise is very loud, and there is a flow of warm, humid air with a soapy smell (and some water droplets). The noise can be heard, although much attenuated, a block away.

**Figure 1: Plan of the Proposed Facility (from Application)**



## **B. Description of Surrounding Area:**

The subject site, 2499 Lincoln, is the west-side block between Garfield and Van Buren Avenues. It is presently the location of several auto repair businesses behind a long, black plywood wall (see Appendix A. for photograph). Immediately to the west there are three parcels zoned single-family residential that are presently parking lots for cars apparently associated with the businesses (see Figure 1). It appears that one parking lot (1166 Garfield Avenue) has been sold and there is a City Planning notice for a new single-family home.

Behind the property is a single-family zoned neighborhood referred to as Presidents Row. From Harding Avenue on the north to Harrison Avenue on the south, the five blocks on the west side of Lincoln are zone [Q] C2-1-CDO. The CDO refers to the Lincoln Boulevard Community Design Overlay that was adopted by the City in 2008. The Goals and Objectives section of the CDO states:

*"The purpose of the Lincoln CDO is to ensure that the development along Lincoln Boulevard reflects the overall vision of a cohesive **pedestrian-friendly** and vibrant commercial and residential boulevard. Rather than serve simply as an auto-oriented commercial and traffic corridor, Lincoln is envisioned to become a **multimodal** main street for the Venice Community."*<sup>1</sup> [Highlights added]

The five blocks are characterized by one and two story commercial buildings with the exception of a 4-story residential apartment building at 1167 Lincoln north of Garfield Avenue.

## **C. Planning Efforts:**

Over the past several years City Planning has undertaken an update of the Venice Community Plan and the Venice Land Use Plan. The five blocks between Harding and Harrison Avenues are proposed to be classified as "Village" which means lower-density mixed-use (commercial/residential). This classification continues the intent of the CDO's "multimodal" objective. The Venice Neighborhood Council (VNC) last July basically concurred with this classification suggesting that the classification be amended to "Neighborhood Center" in part to allow more residential units.

## **D. Potential Benefits of the Project:**

The Applicant clearly believes there is a substantial demand for another carwash along Lincoln given the size of the proposed facility and its 21 vacuum stations. If so, then that would be the benefit of the project to Venice.

## **E. Potential Drawbacks of the Project:**

### **1. The project will prejudice the update of Venice Community Plan and the Venice Local Coastal Program.**

Since 2008, it has been the stated intent to change the character of Lincoln from "*an auto-oriented commercial and traffic corridor*" to one emphasizing mixed-use developments that

---

<sup>1</sup> Lincoln Boulevard Community Design Overlay District, Ordinance #179,906, 2008, page 1.

include both commercial and residential units and a more pedestrian-friendly environment. City Planning's proposed update to the Venice Community Plan and the Venice Land Use Plan continues this vision by reclassifying this five-block stretch of Lincoln – in fact most of Lincoln – for mixed-use developments, in this case a “village” designation. The VNC concurs.

This project runs completely counter to this long-proposed direction. It is inherently impractical and undesirable to add a residential component over the proposed carwash given its nature and impacts. It may also discourage mixed-use development nearby because of its loud and constant noise.

## **2. The project introduces substantial negative impacts to its surroundings.**

It is curious that within the 35 pages of Findings, the application addresses noise only once (Finding #4.1) and does so favorably. It word “noise” is mentioned twice more, but only in passing. The reason why this is curious is that it is clearly the project's principle negative impact. The 120' carwash tunnel uses industrial grade dryer fans as the last step in the process. The noise is very loud, a roar, that continues non-stop during the project's operating hours and every day of the year. The neighbors have measured the noise from these blowers at 90Db at two other Bellagio Carwashes; and I can personally attest, having visited the Bellagio Carwash in Carson, that the noise is in that range. Moreover, walking by on the sidewalk one is blown by warm, humid air with a soapy smell (and some water droplets). (The tunnel entrance for this project faces Van Buren Avenue, so that pedestrians on Lincoln will not experience the exhaust, and the nose will be somewhat lessened.) The noise will be focused on the commercial block south of Van Buren along Lincoln and the one single-family home across the street (1164 Van Buren). Although much attenuated, the noise can be heard a block away,

The two SFR-zoned parcels (now parking lots) will not be shielded from the project based on the project plans. The east side of those parcels face 16 customer vacuum stations.

## **3. The project will generate traffic on Lincoln, Garfield and Van Buren.**

The project will obviously attract automobile trips and, judging by its size and the 21 vacuum stations, a lot of expected car trips at certain times. Most will use Lincoln which will add to that arterial's existing traffic and add far more turning movement into Van Buren Avenue where the site's entrance will be. Especially in the afternoon, traffic southbound on Lincoln backs up northward beyond Garfield Avenue. That makes turns across the southbound lanes difficult. Turns from Garfield northbound onto Lincoln in the mornings will also be difficult. From the west, Van Buren will be an access route and Garfield a return route. Both are residential streets serving a single-family neighborhood. Both already have multiple speed bumps to lower vehicle speeds indicating they already have traffic issues.

Caltrans is studying the extension of the existing dedicated bus lanes north of Rose Avenue south through Marina del Rey. In time the lanes will most likely be extended. Increasing vehicles turning across a dedicated bus lane is problematic regardless of if the bus lane is all-day or only during rush hours. A southbound bus lane will add to the turning issues discussed in the last paragraph.

## F. Recommendation:

I recommend that LUPC and the VNC oppose the proposed Bellagio Carwash because it 1) harms the City and Venice's ability to implement the developments proposed in the draft update of the Venice Community Plan and the Venice Land use Plan, 2) introduces substantial negative impacts to its surrounding area, and it will increase traffic and problematic turning movements.

## G. My Responses to Findings in the Application:

In reviewing this project's application, I did not contact either neighbors or the Applicant. The neighbors, Ms. Christensen and Mr. Perez, sent me and others a detailed letter summarizing their concerns - and the those of 28 other supporters. I therefore did not need to ferret out how the neighborhood felt about the project. The project website on ZIMAS included seven detailed Findings totaling 35 pages as well as the project's plans. I felt I did not need any more information than what was already available. I did visit the Bellagio Carwash in Carson (Avalon Boulevard & 223<sup>rd</sup> Street) to see for myself what the project actually entailed. I spoke with four adjacent neighbors whose back yards abutted the project with a high masonry wall between them. My analysis and recommendation are my own.

### FINDING #1: COMMUNITY DESIGN OVERLAY LAMC 13.08 SUPPLEMENTAL FINDINGS

The Application states that the project either conforms with the Lincoln Boulevard Community Design Overlay (CDO) standards or do not apply. However, in stepping through the standards, the Findings ignore the overall intent of the CDO. The Goals and Objectives section of the document states that:

*"The purpose of the Lincoln CDO is to ensure that the development along Lincoln Boulevard reflects the overall vision of a cohesive **pedestrian-friendly** and vibrant commercial and residential boulevard. Rather than serve simply as an auto-oriented commercial and traffic corridor, Lincoln is envisioned to become a **multimodal** main street for the Venice Community."*<sup>2</sup> [Highlights added]

New projects along Lincoln Boulevard (Lincoln) are intended to be both multimodal (now called "mixed-use") and pedestrian friendly. This intent is reinforced in the draft up-date of the Venice Community Plan where the subject parcel is designated "Village" along with all five blocks of Lincoln from Harding Avenue to Harrison Avenue. The Venice Neighborhood Council in July 2024 agreed but suggested that this designation be modified to "Neighborhood Center" in part to allow more residential development in this area. This carwash project, however, simply cannot be multimodal because of its nature and immediate noise impacts.

Guideline 1: The CDO does not mention noise but focuses on visual design. So this Finding's discussion is similarly oriented. But this is disingenuous in that the project's biggest impact is the noise generated by its industrial dryers. Having visited the Bellagio Car Wash in Carson, I can attest that the noise generated by the dryers is very loud,

---

<sup>2</sup> Lincoln Boulevard Community Design Overlay District, Ordinance #179,906, 2008, page 1.

constant, and definitely pedestrian-unfriendly. The Finding states that Guideline 1 does not apply because the project does not contain residential units. However, its noise generated must be considered pedestrian unfriendly.

Guideline 2: I agree that the project is consistent with the parking and vehicular access standards and guidelines.

Guideline 3: The Finding states that the proposed building facade at ground level consists of doors and windows that allow views into the building interior. However, there is no building interior! The entire one-block facade is a Potemkin wall of windows and minor articulations at most a few feet thick hiding (or viewing?) two lanes of cars waiting to approach the automated carwash tunnel. There is no discussion of why the windows are there except simply to meet glazing criteria.

Guideline 4: This guideline tries to encourage the massing and articulation of a project's upper stories. The Finding states that "*the proposed building contains three-dimensional variations in the overall building form at a quantity of one variation per story above the first. As such, the proposed project is consistent with the massing and articulation of upper stories standards and guidelines.*" Given that the project is one story, some of this wording is unclear. This guideline really does not apply.

Guideline 5: This guideline seeks whimsical architectural elements. However, nothing is whimsical about the noise put out by the project's industrial carwash dryers.

Guideline 6: Rather than the project meeting the guideline's emphasis on inviting building entrances, there are no building entrances and very little articulation to be considered "inviting."

Guideline 7: I agree that the Guideline on parking does not apply.

Guideline 8: The Finding states that Guideline 8 does not apply. It encourages a variety of building types that include residential and other land uses that minimize "*the potential for extended lengths of street front to discontinue[d?] commercial uses*". The project inherently fails to meet this guideline because its entire frontage has no commercial interest in the way the guideline intended.

Guideline 9: The Finding states that Guideline 9, which encourages awnings or canopies, etc., does not apply. In fact, it does apply and the project fails to conform.

Guideline 10: I agree that the Guideline on security grills does not apply.

Guideline 11: I assume that the project is consistent with the utilities, service areas, and mechanical equipment guidelines.

Guideline 13: This Guideline asks projects to "*create inviting spaces, provide shade within the public realm, screen unattractive areas, and enhance architectural detailing through the thoughtful and careful placement of landscaping*". Although the project "has incorporated planting everywhere that is not occupied by building, parking, or driveways", there is little about the landscaping that meets the intent of this guideline.

Guideline 14: The Finding gives measurements for the landscaped areas that do not seem to conform with the renderings provided in the project's plans.

Guidelines 15-21: The Finding states that no new signs are proposed as part of this request. This is interesting because it makes little sense to invest in such a project and have it unsigned. Other Bellagio Car Wash locations have impressive signage.

Guideline 22: The Finding's response to this guideline is, again, disingenuous because the amount of heat energy that this scale of car wash pumps into the environment is inherently substantial and entirely artificial.

Guideline 23: I agree that this guideline related to historic structures does not apply. The Finding's Final Comments: The Finding concludes with a defense of its 210' frontage. Much is made of the amount of glazing which is admittedly substantial. However, the glazing will only show the two lines of cars behind the façade waiting to be washed – hardly the display windows, etc., the CDO encourages.

**FINDING #2: FINDINGS SPECIFIC TO 12.24 W.4 - AUTOMOTIVE USES THAT DO NOT COMPLY WITH THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND OPERATING CONDITIONS IN SECTIONS 12.22 A.28**

This Finding replies to requirements for new or revised automotive uses that do not meet present guidelines.

**1. That the project will enhance the built environment in the surrounding neighborhood or will perform a function or provide a service that is essential or beneficial to the community, city, or region.**

The Finding states that *"the proposed new car wash will enhance the built environment in the surrounding neighborhood and provide a service that is beneficial to the community."* Its given reason is that there are approximately 1,378 households with at least one car in the project's census tract. The Finding also alleges that project will also provide jobs and contribute to the local economy and provide an *"amenity that is both locally and regionally demanded."* The meaningless statistics of Census tract 2378 can be generated for any location in Los Angeles. Moreover, how can these few potential customers justify such a large-scale project with 21 vacuum stalls? There is no further justification for the Finding's economic benefits. Missing is the fact that there already exists three car washes within 1/2-mile of the project site along Lincoln that are already serving: Beach Cities Car Wash, Millennium Car Wash, and Felipe's Car Wash. These will probably lose existing jobs with the new project. The project does not analyze why this existing level of service is inadequate and needs to be supplemented. One wonders if the project is intended to supplement or supplant the existing car wash businesses.

Missing also is the fact that the project will inherently generate very loud noise from the industrial-grade carwash dryers toward the end of the tunnel constantly roaring during weekday and weekend operating hours. Four neighbors adjacent to the Bellagio Car Wash in Carson describe the noise from a diplomatic "I wish it was quieter" to "I hate it and can't use my backyard". Kris Christensen and Pablo Perez, of 1160 Van Buren Avenue, have measured the noise at 90dB from the sidewalk at two Bellagio Car Wash locations.

Although I did not have a noise measurement device, the sound I experienced was very loud. In short, it is difficult to assert that the project will enhance the built environment regardless of any alleged economic benefits.

**2. That the project's location, size, height, operations and other significant features will be compatible with and will not adversely affect or further degrade adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the public health, welfare, and safety.**

The Finding summarily discounts any concerns by stating *"Taking into consideration the project's height, the extent of its new landscaping, and the amenity it provides, the project is compatible and will not adversely affect or degrade adjacent properties or the surrounding neighborhood, or public health, welfare, and safety."* This assertion is duplicitous.

While the properties along Lincoln Boulevard between Venice Boulevard and Washington Boulevard are zoned [Q]C2-1-CDO, it has been the intent of City Planning to reclassify this stretch as multimodal (mixed-use) commercial/residential. This is clear from the Goals and Objective statements of the Lincoln Boulevard Community Design Overlay document through present planning efforts. The proposed classification of these properties is to be "Village" meaning lower-level mixed-use projects. The Venice Neighborhood Council suggests changing the proposed classification to "Neighborhood Center" in part to increase the number of living units allowed. This project, if allowed to be built will make it impossible to build housing on the block south of Van Buren Avenue along Lincoln because the noise from the dryers is aimed directly at these properties. Although attenuated by distance, the noise can still be heard a block away.

The project will also directly negatively affect the proposed single-family home at 1186 Garfield (now a parking lot) and 1165 van Buren Avenue because the project shows no rear wall and the utility easement will not allow larger trees (according to the application). The home at 1164 Van Buren Avenue will also be directly affected because it faces the dryer end of the car wash tunnel.

Finally, access to the carwash will not only be along Lincoln Boulevard, but from many directions west of Lincoln Van Buren Avenue provides better access (and Garfield Avenue better exiting. These streets already have spaced speed bumps which indicates that speeding between Abbot Kinney Boulevard and Lincoln is already a problem. The project can only exacerbate this problem. Both streets are characterized by single-family homes.

**3. That the project substantially conforms with the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan, the applicable community plan, and any applicable specific plan.**

The Finding again paints a positive picture with dubious assertions: *"The proposed project will help to achieve both of these goals by (1) providing a commercial use along Lincoln Blvd that is more vibrant and viable, and that is more attractive to the current Venice demographic, and (2) by providing a landscape buffer, including ground planting and trees, between the front of the building along Lincoln Blvd, along the adjacent residential streets, Garfield Avenue and Van Buren Avenue, and along the rear of the of property abutting residentially zoned lots."*

As noted several times before, the project does not conform to the goals and objectives of the CDO, nor to City Planning's proposed reclassification for Lincoln Boulevard properties, nor to the desires of the Venice Neighborhood Council. The phrase "more vibrant and viable" is

undefined. A very loud, constant dryer noise may be more “vibrant” but probably not more “viable” than what exists there now. (What could be there instead – a mixed-use commercial/residential complex – would be even more vibrant and viable.) Moreover, the phrase “more attractive to the current Venice demographic” seems pure conjecture.

Finally, the verbiage on landscaping is inconsistent with the project plans. These show only groundcover landscaping for all but six trees. Four trees along the 210’ length of the frontage is nice but not meaningful. More importantly, there is absolutely no masonry or landscape buffer between the residential lots to the west blocking the noise and sight of 16 vacuum stations.

**ADDITIONAL FINDINGS SPECIFIC TO 12.24 W.4 - AUTOMOTIVE USES IN THE C ZONES THAT DO NOT COMPLY WITH THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND OPERATING CONDITIONS IN SECTIONS 12.22 A.28:**

- 1. That the project will not create or add to a detrimental concentration of automotive uses in the vicinity of the proposed automotive use.**

The Finding states that “*There are currently no other gas stations, car washes, or automotive uses on any of the lots in the vicinity of the subject site.*” In fact (see above) there are three car washes in the vicinity.

The reference of the exception given carwashes ignores the fact that the project violates the required noise requirements of Sections 111.02 and 111.03 as I understand them.

- 2. That based on data provided by the Department of Transportation or a licensed traffic engineer, ingress to, egress from and associated parking of the automotive use will not constitute a traffic hazard or cause significant traffic congestion or disruption of vehicular circulation on adjacent streets.**

The Finding simply repeats the requirement without actually indicating a report by a licensed traffic engineer. It should be noted that studies are underway to extend the bus lanes on Lincoln north of Rose south to Washington Boulevard and beyond. In time that will occur, although as yet it is not clear whether the dedicated bus lanes will be all day or only during peak periods. Regardless, increasing vehicular traffic across a dedicated bus lane cannot be helpful.

- 3. That the applicant has submitted an appropriate landscape plan setting forth all plant materials and irrigation systems, and a written maintenance schedule indicating how the landscaping will be maintained.**

Although such a plan may have been submitted, I have shown that it is inadequate to protect adjacent properties.

**FINDING #3: COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PROJECT IMPACTS LAMC 13.B.9.1**

I am commenting only on some of the responses of the Finding.

- 3. Will alternatives to private vehicle use be provided or facilitated? How will the development affect traffic on coastal access roads?**

The Finding notes that “Yes, alternatives to private vehicle use will be provided or facilitated by the project via 2 short term bicycle parking spaces.” Clearly, based on the size of the facilities being built, the applicant believes the project will attract substantial automobile trips to the project. This will add traffic to Lincoln, a busy coastal access arterial, and perhaps on Washington Boulevard. Two short-term bicycle parking spaces at a car wash facility will mean nothing in terms of coastal access.

**4. Is the development proposed within or in close proximity to an existing developed area? Will it be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas? If in a special community or neighborhood, how will it protect the unique local character?**

The project may be visually compatible with the surrounding areas as the Finding alleges, but it will add a high level of constant noise. It will also add a level of traffic movements in-and-out of the project that the surrounding area and its local streets have never experienced. The character of the area will be substantially changed.

**Section 30253 Minimization of Adverse Impacts.**

**b. The permitted development will not prejudice the City of Los Angeles to prepare a Local Coastal Program that is in conformity with Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act of 1976.**

The Finding states that: “The proposed project will conform to the existing Venice Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan and will not prejudice the City of Los Angeles to prepare a Local Coastal Program (LCP) that is in conformity with Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act of 1976.” This statement is false.

City Planning has been working to update the Venice Land Use Plan for several years. The Venice Neighborhood Council has also been actively involved. The intent of this effort along this stretch of Lincoln has been to encourage mixed-use development, commercial and residential within one complex. This idea is not a new one as it was a stated goal of the Community Design Overlay of 2008. The proposed land use classification for this type of development and the subject parcel is “Village”. The VNC has basically concurred with this classification suggesting that the residential component be increased. This project and its noise and traffic impacts will prejudice the proposed update of the Local Coastal Program. There can be no residential component to a massive car wash, and its impacts may well discourage “village” developments on adjacent blocks of Lincoln.

**FINDING #4: FINDINGS - LAMC 12.24 W.27 - CORNER COMMERCIAL CORNER DEVELOPMENTS**

**1. The project will enhance the built environment in the surrounding neighborhood or will perform a function or provide a service that is essential or beneficial to the community, city, or region.**

Part of the Finding response is that: “The proposed use is less impactful to the abutting residential neighborhood than the existing auto repair uses, which are usually associated with loud noise, as well as air pollution and ground contamination. The proposed uses will reduce these harmful impacts, and

*it will more adequately serve the neighborhood with a state of the art full-service automated car wash."*

The project, especially its Van Buren Avenue side, will be exceptionally loud – and constant throughout the day. Comparing its noise impacts to what exists now is like comparing the noise of a small plane to a jet engine. And I can personally attest that in walking on a sidewalk by one of Bellagio Car Washes, one is also aware of fumes and dampness blowing across the sidewalk and one's body.

Moreover, the noise level appears to be above the level required by Municipal Code section 12.22.A.28 as I understand:

*(13) Any automotive laundry or wash rack, in which power driven or steam cleaning machinery is used, shall maintain noise levels below the levels provided in Table II of Section 111.03 of this Code. The comparison between the noise emanating from the automotive laundry or wash rack and from Table II shall be made in the manner set forth in Section 111.02(a) of this Code.*

The Applicant must be aware of this issue but addresses the project's noise (favorably!) only once in the Findings, The paragraph above is one of the few times noise is mentioned at all.

- 2. The project's location, size, height, operations, and other significant features will be compatible with and will not adversely affect or further degrade adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood or the public health, welfare, and safety.**

The Finding states that the project conforms with the commercial corner development standards by building a 6' tall solid masonry wall and landscape buffer. However, the project plans do not show such a wall between the project and the two SFR-zoned properties it borders. The landscaping there is also low-lying ground cover, which would not be a visual or noise buffer.

#### **FINDING #5: VENICE COASTAL ZONE SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT PERMIT COMPLIANCE FINDINGS (LAMC Section 11.5.7-C)**

- 1. That the Venice Coastal Development Project is compatible in scale and character with the existing neighborhood, and that the Venice Coastal Development Project would not be materially detrimental to adjoining lots or the immediate neighborhood.**

The project in fact will be materially detrimental to the adjoining lots and the immediate neighborhood. The noise generated by the large dryers will directly affect 2501 Lincoln which is directly in line with the tunnel exit and therefore its noise and vapor emissions; other businesses south on that block will also be indirectly affected. Directly effected as well will be 1164 Van Buren and 1165 Van Buren (potential future) and 1166 Garfield (in Planning approval). Other single-family homes along Van Buren and Garfield will be indirectly affected by attenuated noise and increased traffic impacts. The 2467 Lincoln 4-story residential complex will be directly affected because some of its units have direct views of the property and to the noise and lighting of the carwash once it is opened.

**2. That the Venice Coastal Development Project is in conformity with the certified Venice Local Coastal Program.**

As noted previously, the project may conform with the present LUP but will not conform to the updated LUP. The project therefore will prejudice the completion of the Local Coastal Program.

**3. That the project incorporates mitigation measures, monitoring measures when necessary, or alternatives identified in the environmental review which would mitigate the negative environmental effects of the project, to the extent physically feasible.**

The Finding states that " *The project would not have the potential to significantly impact traffic, noise, air quality or water quality based on proposed site improvements and anticipated changes in occupancy.*" Noise impacts will be significant and is inherent in a facility using industrial-grade dryers mounted high up at the exit of a tunnel structure.

The Finding also states that: "*The proposed project will not exceed thresholds identified for impacts to the area (i.e. traffic, noise, etc.) and will not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts.*" That statement is also false. Whatever the ambient noise level is, introducing massive blow dryers high up in the tunnel structure can only significantly add to the noise in the surrounding area.

**Appendix A: Photos**

**Bellagio Carwash in Carson (Side View)**



**2499 Lincoln Boulevard**



## **Appendix B: Letter from Garfield and Van Buren Avenue Neighbors**

Dear Council Member Park, VNC, Mr. Silva, Mr. Lopez, and Mr. Stanger,

My Name is Kris Christensen. I am writing to bring your attention to a serious and urgent issue regarding the proposed Bellagio Express Carwash on Lincoln Blvd in Venice. Bellagio Express has submitted permit applications to construct a large express carwash on the entire west-side block of Lincoln Blvd between Garfield and Van Buren Ave, at addresses 2483-2499 Lincoln Blvd. LA City Planning Case # DIR-2025-2673-CDP-CDO of application for a coastal development permit. See attachment of notice of intent for more details.

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/search/casenumbr/DIR-2025-2673-CDP-CDO>

This project Violates LA's Planning Department's plans to make this part of Lincoln Blvd into Villages and Community centers with more walkability. This project is OUT OF SCALE for the community; it is not mixed use or address needs of housing or employment.

This proposal poses significant risks to the quality of life for the surrounding community – far beyond just immediate neighbors.

BELOW ARE KEY CONCERNS

### **1. Severe Noise Pollution**

Bellagio Express carwashes use multiple high-powered jet dryers that far exceed acceptable noise levels. I personally visited two existing Bellagio locations (in Carson and Eagle Rock) and measured decibel levels of 90 dB from the sidewalk – well above local sound ordinance limits. These sounds are constant and disruptive and cannot be effectively mitigated.

### **2. Traffic Congestion and Street Safety**

- The carwash would operate 364 days a year, 7:00 AM to 7:30 PM, introducing constant vehicle traffic. (Hours and days of operation shown in attached images)
- Cars queuing for the wash will have no legal place to line up on Lincoln due to the new dedicated bus lane coming soon and will inevitably overflow onto residential streets like Garfield and Van Buren.
- This will block driveways, reduce visibility, and create dangerous situations at intersections, particularly for pedestrians, cyclists, and turning vehicles.

### **3. Loss of Parking and Increased Spillover**

- The car wash's entrances and exits will eliminate existing street parking.
- Neighboring residential streets already face parking shortages due to nearby developments like Journey Apartments and Safe Place for Youth (SPY) – both of which lack sufficient on-site parking.

#### **4. Environmental and Watershed Impact**

Bellagio Express uses waxes, ceramic sprays, and other chemicals that remain on cars as they exit the facility. These substances drip onto sidewalks, roads, creating a sticky residue that eventually flows into our storm drains and into the ocean – a serious concern in a coastal community like ours.

See attached picture of car wash packages that shows all of the chemical products they use on the cars.

#### **5. Violation of Lincoln Blvd CDO (Community Design Overlay)**

This proposal directly conflicts with the intent of the Lincoln Blvd CDO, which aims to: *“Foster a cohesive, pedestrian-friendly, and vibrant mixed-use corridor – not an auto-oriented traffic zone.”*

An express carwash of this scale will only discourage foot traffic, diminish the area’s walkability, and undermine efforts to revitalize Lincoln Blvd as a multimodal, community-focused corridor.

#### **6. Economic Redundancy and Job Loss Risk**

There are already three carwashes within a short walk of the proposed site:

- Millennium Carwash (2454 Lincoln Blvd)
- Beach Cities Carwash (2303 Lincoln Blvd)
- Felipe’s Carwash (4075 Lincoln Blvd)

The submitted application indicates that there are no existing carwashes in the vicinity of the subject site. This is false. There are multiple carwashes as indicated below & via a simple google maps search of "car wash 90291".

See attached picture of map with highlighted existing car wash locations.

Unlike these businesses that employ multiple staff, Bellagio’s automated model may offer minimal job creation while threatening the viability of existing, long-standing businesses.

#### **Final Thoughts:**

Venice deserves **better**. Let’s protect the spirit of our neighborhood and push for a development that reflects our community’s values, not a disruptive, oversized, auto-centric chain that prioritizes volume over livability.

Lincoln Blvd Community Development Overlay

[https://planning.lacity.gov/Code\\_Studies/LincolnBlvdCDO/LinCDOadopted.pdf](https://planning.lacity.gov/Code_Studies/LincolnBlvdCDO/LinCDOadopted.pdf)

#### **Snippet:**

The purpose of the Lincoln CDO is to ensure that development along Lincoln Boulevard reflects the overall vision of a cohesive, pedestrian-friendly and vibrant commercial and

residential boulevard. Rather than serve simply as an auto-oriented commercial and traffic corridor, Lincoln is envisioned to become a multimodal main street for the Venice Community. Additionally, by encouraging a mix of retail, services, office uses, and housing, the CDO can help to generate concentrations of pedestrian activity to support both transit and an active street environment.

Sincerely,

Kris Christensen and Pablo Perez

1160 Van Buren

With Expressed Support from Neighbors listed below,

Rich Williams and Lisa Cederblom

1157 Van Buren

Ann Serapiglia

1149 Van Buren

Reagan Cook

1141 Van Buren

Jimmy Georgopoulos

1145 Van Buren

Brett Doonan

1130 Van Buren

Cristina Meyer

1137 Van Buren

Jazmine Rose

1156 #B Van Buren

Hali Wulff

1019 Van Buren

Julia and Magnus Morgan

1063 Van Buren

Michelle and Brennan Linder

1127 Garfield

Sarah Pasquin

1106 Garfield

Nancy Duckworth & Steve Banks

1110 Grant

Kathleen Beaton

1117 Harrison

Clarence Carter

1038 Harrison

Kathleen Conner

1157 Van Buren

Dave and Amy Fruehe

1153 Van Buren

Jennifer Rodrigues

1143 Van Buren

Brendon Garner

1148 Van Buren

Mary Marlow

1139 Van Buren

Christy Anderson

1156 #A Van Buren

Diana and Richard Spurlin

1023 Van Buren

Sheena Ahdoot

1051 Van Buren

Ingrid and Aaron Miles

1015 Van Buren

Sally Umstead

906 Garfield

Laurie Dolan

1149 Grant

Mike Fenster

1153 Grant

Karen and Brad Barber

1043 Harrison

Yolanda de Cordova

613 Victoria