

**Supplemental Exhibit U**  
Letter of Opposition [March 1, 2023]

To: Jose Valenzuela

From: Gerry Mirassou

On Wednesday April 12<sup>th</sup>, myself, my attorney, Christopher Hall and my real estate broker, Zack Kaufman met with the developers of the proposed car wash, Mohammad Assad, his father, his consultant, Orlando Ramirez and his real estate broker at the office of Christopher Hall. We reiterated our concerns regarding the impact of the project on Airport Village, i.e., using our parcel to accommodate their use and the impacts the car wash would have on our existing and future use of the property. We also questioned them on why we were not notified during the planning stages of the project so as to avoid the present conflicts between the two sides. After approximately an hour and a half of discussion we concluded the meeting with no progress toward a resolution of our differences.

Although they offered to remove two of the vacuum stalls along the driveway and convert them to handicap parking spaces to mitigate their use of our property we were resolute in our insistence that they cannot use our site at all to develop their car wash. They cannot remove parking spaces, change the driveway location or relocate the handicap parking spaces. We also stated that the car wash would disturb existing tenants of our building due to noise from the car wash machinery, radios, and constant automobile traffic and stacking.

We emphasized that the car wash is not compatible with our current uses or other potential uses allowed in Airport Village and that their proposal to remove spaces from our site would severely limit future uses since we would not be able to meet parking requirements. Furthermore, we emphasized that approval of the car wash conflicts with **SEC, 15-1301 PURPOSE (Employment Districts)** of the Fresno Municipal Code which states that uses in these zones *“provide for the appropriate location of businesses that may have the potential to generate offsite impacts, while providing to ensure compatibility in use and form with existing and planned uses.”* We strongly asserted that the proposed car wash is not compatible to our use and should be a reason for denial. They stated that the car wash would help us because it would bring in more traffic.

The developers asked us that since we were opposed to the car wash, what other uses might we agree to. We mentioned that a sandwich shop, coffee shop or retail business would be compatible uses as that was what the original site development plan for the parcels envisioned. During our discussion of potential uses, if not a car wash, we discussed that us buying their parcel was a possibility; however, the price they mentioned was too far out of line for our consideration. We were somewhat surprised that they offered to sell the property since they stated that they had a solid deal with the **Surf Thru** company. It makes us wonder if they really do have a deal with Surf Thru or if they are just using this proposal as a pretext to leverage a sale to us.

As far as I recall, these were the salient points of our meeting with the developers of the proposed car wash. We steadfastly oppose its approval and considerate its negative impacts to our property very significant and contrary to Sec.15-1301 PURPOSE (Employment Districts). Approval of this car wash project would, in effect, severely limit the use of our property now and in the future.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter and we are available to answer further question or provide further information.

Sincerely,

Gerry Mirassou. Co-owner of Airport Village