

**City of Rancho Palos Verdes – Ladera Linda Park Master Plan
Community Outreach Meeting**

- Date:** Thursday, September 22, 2016
- Time:** 6:00pm – 8:00pm
- Location:** Ladera Linda Park – 32201 Forrestal Dr., Rancho Palos Verdes, CA
- City Staff:** Recreation: Cory Linder, Daniel Trautner, Matt Waters, Mona Dill & Mary Hirsch
Public Works: Ron Dragoo, James Flannigan
- Consultant:** *Richard Fisher Associates:* Dick Fisher, Jim Collison, Taylor Smith
- Topic:** Requesting the input of the community members utilizing Ladera Linda Park for their ideas and suggestions regarding the renovation of the park.
- Summary:** City staff began with an overview of the City's 2014-2015 public outreach efforts that focused on city-wide Park Master Plan and identified the park and community center elements and the need to upgrade the infrastructure. Dick Fisher then discussed the current Master Plan process that includes specific site planning for the park and its potential improvements. An open discussion of questions, comments and concerns for the renovation followed.

Community Comments / Questions / Concerns:

(Questions with a "Response" indicate replies that were given by City / RFA staff at the meeting)

General Comments

1. Is this revenue driven?
Response: No. Want to make it functional and safe.
2. Are federal funds going to be used for the construction of this project?
Response: The City will be looking at grant funding but that has not been determined at this stage.
3. Who participated in the online survey?
Response: It was an informal online survey (Survey Monkey) that drew over 500 response. The great majority of respondents self-identified as RPV residents.
4. Would like passive use amenities only.
5. Less is BETTER! Want to maintain its current low-key community feeling, not a magnet for large parties.
Response: Staff and RFA are well aware of Council's direction. This direction is why the Parks Master Plan section for Ladera Linda does not include a gym, pool, or dog park. Intent from beginning of process was to maintain neighborhood feel.
6. City is not currently doing basic maintenance at the park. Need to fix the water fountain. Asphalt being used for wheelies and throws gravel onto courts and they are not being swept up.
Response: Staff said that these reports would be looked into and noted that the park should still be maintained while it goes through the Master Plan process.
7. Preserve old growth trees (especially 2 outside school room).
8. Need shade to be considered in new design.
9. This should be a NEIGHBORHOOD park, not a Community park.
Response: This will continue to be a neighborhood park; not adding a gym, pool, dog park or any other amenity that would turn it into a large Community park. The Council-approved Parks Master Plan spells out that impact on park-adjacent residents and maintaining a low-key community feel is vital to any future park projects.

**City of Rancho Palos Verdes – Ladera Linda Park Master Plan
Community Outreach Meeting**

10. Why is there not a committee that includes the HOA's or a charrette? Residents should have more say in the design process.
Response: Staff responded that significant outreach has been done including several workshops in 2014 and 2015. One of the challenges of a plan like this is taking input from meetings and summarizing the information into just two plans. There has been significant outreach efforts done already through the Parks Master Plan. The removal of several active elements is a reflection of the outreach effort.
11. Just want a little private community park not more people, traffic and burglaries from outside. Don't make any changes to the park – we like it as it is
12. If you build it they will come. What is the community this building is intended to serve? Is there a large group in the City that is looking for a space and will come in and take care of their needs at City Hall.
13. If you don't spend the budgeted money for the new community center will that money be lost?
Response: No, there is no money currently budgeted for this project. A budget will be developed as part of the process. The only budgeted funds are for RFA.
14. Can we save old growth trees?
Response: Process is not at that stage but if they can be saved, they will be. RFA works with a professional arborist.
15. Question about RFA's experience in park planning.
Response: Dick Fisher reviewed his extensive experience in park planning and design. Majority are in Southern California/Orange County

Park Users

16. Can the City publish current use of the facility so that the residents can understand what is in use and what is needed?
Response: Yes, the City will post that info on its Ladera Linda Master Plan webpage in a timely fashion. RFA noted that architect will write up a program of existing usage on site as part of the design process.
17. Consider existing use of upper fields by AYSO so as not to add users to the existing park. Area is already impacted and we don't want more programs scheduled here on the weekends.
Response: Staff is very aware of this issue and will work to avoid conflicts with large uses such as AYSO.
18. Who are the "Stakeholders"? The Stakeholders are the residents not the users (YMCA, etc). Can the City publish a list of stakeholders?
Response: The City uses the term "Stakeholders" to identify the various groups that use the park and facility. We absolutely agree that the voice and opinions of residents and Ladera Linda neighbors are of primary importance in this process. Staff identified the "stakeholders" as PVPLC, LL HOA, Seaview HOA, PVPUSD, Docents, Instructors, Lomita Sheriff, Las Candalistas, YMCA, and Ladera Linda instructors. Reaching out to interested parties helps determine current use and identify issues and concerns.
19. Are any weights placed on changing demographics over next 10 years?
Response: That's why the City and RFA are meeting with all the users so that it doesn't serve just one user group.
20. Is this a neighborhood park for Ladera Linda or a community park for RPV that Mediterranean neighborhood can use?
Response: Using public funding so park is open to public and is used by many residents of RPV that do not live in the surrounding neighborhood. It is a hybrid of a neighborhood and a community park.

**City of Rancho Palos Verdes – Ladera Linda Park Master Plan
Community Outreach Meeting**

21. "If you build it, they will come." Strongest feature of existing facility is that it doesn't accommodate large groups in one area.
22. No movie nights.
23. Social media (Santa Monica hiking club). Don't advertise free parking on City site!
24. Unauthorized use of facility (i.e. same group using open field for soccer and bringing their own goals; bicycle run; hiking groups, etc.)
Response: Staff is aware of these situations and is working to address them at all City parks. Staff discussed a new City special event policy and encouraged residents to report large-scale uses to City Staff.
25. Address indirect users/unapproved use.
Response: Driven by social media. Staff is working on this, Residents encouraged to reach out to staff if they see inappropriate use.
26. Need to consider implications of being next to preserve. Del Cerro Park wasn't envisioned to handle crowds currently using it thru social media. Need restriction in times for residents/non-residents?

Community Center / Nature Center

27. Who has use of community center? Who allows scheduling of bands and live music? What time can they use it until? Don't want users playing music late. Need set regulations for users to follow.
Response: The community center is open to the public. There are restrictions on hours and music. Staff will work with community on allowable uses and policies.
28. Do not want to attract graduation parties, weddings, etc. Want a subdued center.
Response: Intent is for future usage to mirror current usage.
29. Will there be a separate facility just for the Nature Center? Just want a room not a huge building.
Response: Nature Center may give the impression of a very large building. Nature Room, similar in scope to the Discovery Room that has been at this site for decades, is more accurate,
30. The artifacts in the Discovery Room and the Docent storage room are temperature sensitive. Need to preserve them throughout this renovation process. Will it be temperature controlled to preserve the artifacts?
Response: Staff is aware that the artifacts are fragile. Great care will be taken to ensure their safety and condition through this process. Staff will be meeting with the Docents to discuss this issue next week.
31. Nature Center needs work area and storage.
32. Need lots of storage. Can we define who the storage is for and how much they will need?
Response: Storage is often not properly planned in park design. Want to plan for it in early stage. Current storage usage and potential future storage will be addressed and defined during the process.
33. Can the City post online how much square footage is actually used/needed for the new facility?
34. Can City provide breakdown of disaster preparedness requirements?
Response: This can be discussed with the City's Emergency Prep staff person and the Red Cross. Rooms aren't used on a permanent basis but would be utilized by Red Cross in case of an emergency. LL is only emergency/evac center east of the landslide.
35. Emergency Helicopter Pad Training needs to be considered as well.
Response: Not part of Master Plan Note: The Fire Department has used the upper fields (school district property) for fire-fighting exercises in the past.
36. Concern about what the Red Cross' needs are
Response: Red Cross will bring supplies in and will not store onsite.

**City of Rancho Palos Verdes – Ladera Linda Park Master Plan
Community Outreach Meeting**

37. We don't need ADA pathways from street. They can drive in!
Response: It is federally mandated to make the facility ADA accessible but not being funded by the federal government.

Traffic / Parking

38. Traffic impact on Forrestal & emissions from soccer users needs to be considered. Will a new traffic study be done? An emissions study?
Response: Studies have been done, but Staff does not believe they included an emissions study-staff will look into.. A new traffic study will be done if necessary.
39. Traffic is extremely dangerous on weekends with AYSO & docent trail hikes. Lots of parking issues.
40. Impact of social media on traffic and parking.
41. Need a traffic light.
42. Need 4-way stop at Pirate and make entrance at Pirate.
43. Discussion of Del Cerro parking issues. Don't add too much parking. Need to put in parking restrictions here in park and on streets for CITY residents.
Response: These issues and ideas can be explored. The square footage of a building dictates the number of parking spaces. There will likely be more parking at the new facility. RFA noted that they are going to be conservative with parking.
44. Expand parking and make it environmental.
45. Can you design entrances to the park that help slow down traffic?

Security / Safety

46. Want staff here on weekends for security and deterring users.
Response: Staff are on duty whenever the building is open, including during any events and rentals.
47. Night time loitering – drugs, alcohol, noise, etc.
48. Trash from outside users (empty water bottles from hikers & soccer users) left in front yards
49. Inappropriate to put in a sheriff sub-station.
Response: A small drop-in office for sheriff personnel is being considered, not a sub-station. There is currently a sheriff drop-in office on site at this time.
50. Need more security - (4) burglaries in past year.
51. Add cameras and security.
52. Concerns about recent crime and burglaries in area.
Response: Building would be constructed with security in mind. Having Sheriffs around and additional staff hours would also be a safety enhancement.
53. Add lights on timer so safer at night.
54. ADA Access:
Response: RFA noted that Federal Govt. mandates that public facility must accommodate access from public right of way to front door. Handicap-accessible spaces will be provided adjacent to entrance.
55. Remove upper gate. Do not like how the gate operates.

Next Steps

Dick Fisher discussed next steps. Review of current usage and proposed usage during information-gathering phase, followed by design process, creation of two design alternatives based on input, presented to Council for feedback. Based on feedback, plan will be refined, cost estimates created, and brought back to Council for approval. Six month process for Master Plan-completed in April 2016. Total pre-construction, demolition and construction timeline would be approximately 18 months to two years.

56. Request for additional public meeting.
57. Question about architect for project:

City of Rancho Palos Verdes – Ladera Linda Park Master Plan Community Outreach Meeting

Response: Architect is Meyer and Associates who specialize in Recreation and Civic projects.

Additional Input provided by Comment Cards

General Comments

58. Have RVP staff develop park policy strategy simultaneously so that the park re-opens with set rules.
59. Develop a committee to keep in touch with the process.
60. Do not mention Ladera Linda on Facebook or other social media.
61. Potential improvements are great. This keeps the theme of existing park a community. It has needed a remodel for a long time. It is used by local and other communities on a regular basis. I do not see any problems with the increased traffic or crimes. It appears that your proposal for the PUBLIC PARK meets the needs and desires of ALL neighboring residences. Unfortunately, some of these people are narrow minded.
62. Keep it simple – keep it small.
63. Maintain the existing facilities while the process is going on.
64. We very much agree with “less is more”. This should be for the surrounding neighborhoods – not drawing people and traffic from everywhere.
65. Do NOT overbuild this site to attract crowds please.
66. The community should be able to review the program BEFORE you move further into master plan design!

Park Amenities / Design

67. The concept of three-tiered cohesive park with ADA trails is a great concept. This will not only assist with ADA needs, but also with families with young children and strollers. I would encourage the plan, however, to keep in mind the privacy needs of the Seaview community below to ensure the proposal does not have easy sight lines into backyards (i.e, use hedges along the fence). This is particularly true of the proposed Community Center – it should be positioned to maintain privacy.
68. Upgrade the park/buildings but keep current amenities (basketball, volleyball/paddle tennis, etc) without adding any new amenities that may attract traffic and crime from outside (a 3-4 mile radius) areas. AYSO can't be controlled by City but there ARE adult games/leagues from outside area that are using open grass area. Do not want additional soccer fields added to park. No additional organized sports groups need to use the park.
69. I would encourage expansion/renovation of the two children playgrounds (including updated groundcover and shade sails). Shade is very important given skin cancer/sun allergy concerns. Have shaded seating area for parents/family members near the play equipment is similarly important.
70. Clear division between open space and community center.
71. Placement of the activities (basketball, volleyball, etc) kept to one area.
72. “I support the renovations that support neighborhood connectivity – classrooms, a small track, stairways for exercise”
73. Check out the playground at Tongva Park in Santa Monica. It is very in tune with the natural elements with equipment that encourages open play among children.
74. The staircase to Dauntless needs some updating (including some possible downlighting for safety).
75. More tables and benches for picnics and connection.
76. Currently, there are perhaps only 2 or 3 picnic tables. Please do NOT add more. The surrounding community can go home for lunch. My observation at other parks is the picnicking increases trash and vermin. Adding more workers to deal with these things is NOT responsive to the taxpayer. NO BBQs!

City of Rancho Palos Verdes – Ladera Linda Park Master Plan Community Outreach Meeting

77. Please trim current dead / dry foliage. Our concerns regarding fire is valid.
78. Because of geographical features in the area, please consider the impact noise would have on the neighborhood. In the past, there have been picnic groups using bullhorns and flag football teams whose coaches used shrill whistles which echo throughout the neighborhood because the cliffs act as an echo chamber. Such uses have been discontinued and, hopefully, will remain so.
79. Please do not move the entrance to where the Forrestal Dr. gate (west side) currently is.
80. Reduce building structures and improve hiking, walking and outdoor recreation, within reason.

Community Center / Nature Center

81. Please consider the nearest neighbors when placing buildings, outhouses, lighting in areas that would impact those of us directly across from the park on the eastside of Forrestal Dr. Thank you for considering the wishes of the neighborhood residents and for your hard work on our behalf!
82. We need more information about the current usage of this facility well in advance of specific floor plan being presented.
83. Before any plans are presented to City Council, there needs to be an additional opportunity for input from the community.
84. Build storage at PVIC (not containers)
85. As part of the Nature Center, please expand the butterfly garden that Leslie Williams started. It is wonderful!
86. We need a basic native plant garden for: 1) cording, 2) food, and 3) Native American uses for mulefat, elderberry-lemonade berry, toyon, etc. Use native plants for landscaping (white sage, other sages, buckwheat, lupine, poppies?).
87. Take pictures of what is in the Discovery Room to be able to reassemble the room, tables and displays. Teach about nature! The Discovery Room has displays of what you see on the trails – birds, native plants, reptiles, minerals, insects, bird nests – who built them, movie on raptors, hummingbirds, peacock photos, fossils, Indian artifacts on how the Tongva lived.
88. We would like to see the Nature Center as part of the Community Center – not a separate building.
89. We are really unclear as to the program of the Community Center. What activities are we trying to support – that should be part of the discussion. Do we really need 18,000 sf – that is a lot of square footage!
90. For the Community Center, I would encourage designing some special use rooms: 1) dance studio with proper flooring and mirrors; 2) activity rooms by age group (toddler, elementary, teenagers); and 3) quiet room for reading, homework and personal thought (if this room had a view that could be dramatic) – large comfortable seating would also add appeal to this room.

Traffic / Parking

91. Parking spaces need to be increased in park. Should be along the periphery, not inside the park area.
92. The high light car glare in the evening is very dangerous with Trumps exit, directly opposite the Forrestal exit in the evening. It calls for a light to help make a left or right turn. As more visitors come, we will have many more serious accidents in the evening. Cars arriving at Trumps exit drive up a long drive without any light along the drive. Most have their bright lights on when they arrive at the exit.
93. Please do a realistic traffic study on the weekends when soccer is in season and also weekdays after 4pm when there are soccer practices, kids and adults returning from school/work, and 8 am weekdays when kids/adults are leaving for school/work.

**City of Rancho Palos Verdes – Ladera Linda Park Master Plan
Community Outreach Meeting**

94. Parking plans need to be carefully considered, especially due to proximity to preserve areas (we do not want another “Del Cerro parking fiasco” here).

Security / Safety

95. Provide additional security for areas around the development to avoid burglaries and robberies that has happened since the soccer field has come into existence. My single street has had 4 home robberies in the last 2 years.
96. Better security & lighting.
97. Safety lighting, in general, needs updating.

Additional Input provided by Emails

98. I attended the meeting at the Ladera Linda Center, and respect the view of various Ladera Linda neighbors, but the views expressed in the meeting are not the only ones.

I wanted to express my support for the redevelopment of the property to include a modernized community center/nature center, with easier access and more useable open space. I have spoken to several other residents in the general area who agree with these thoughts and wanted me to speak on their behalf. I believe there are many more families like us, with small kids, who may not have been able to attend the community meetings but share our views.

Family Space. This area of RPV is in a state of transition. There are numerous residents who have lived in the area since it was originally developed (40 years plus). We respect these folks and their desire for peace and quiet, but there also are a growing number of people like us who have more recently moved into the area with children. We love the semi-rural feel of Rancho Palos Verdes, but do not believe that lower impact development means no development. The LL park should include areas for families to use and for kids to play. The current basketball courts are in disrepair and the park also could use a nice jungle gym. Despite the level of disrepair, we regularly use the Park to play ball and to ride around on scooters and the like. We hope the re-designed space includes these elements.

Neighborhood and Community Space. LL park is the only park in this part of RPV and it should be available as an area where members of the community gather. Not to be simplistic, but if you live across from a park, there is going to be some traffic and noise. I am not saying we should hold rock concerts every weekend, but there should be both outdoor and indoor spaces where people can gather together. These types of community spaces are important to foster and develop a sense of community, especially for those of us who are relatively recent arrivals. When I heard people shout down the idea of holding a movie night, it really bothered me. Again, I am not suggesting that we build a movie theatre or have nightly or even weekly movie nights, but we have a couple of movie nights per year at Mira Catalina School and they are a wonderful way for people to meet each other and socialize. This creates community. Why can't we have a couple of movie nights, or something like a meteor shower or astronomy night? Reasonable restrictions on noise easily could be enforced.

Ample Parking. We live up in Mediterranean, which used to be directly connected to Ladera Linda but now is accessible only by driving down the switch-backs and around to the park. There is a need for significant parking which is better organized and easier to access. This doesn't mean we are asking for a

City of Rancho Palos Verdes – Ladera Linda Park Master Plan Community Outreach Meeting

Disneyland size parking lot, but we are asking for reasonable access for people who live outside of the Ladera Linda neighborhood. I actually think some of the apparent overflow into the Ladera Linda neighborhood could be alleviated if there was more and improved parking at the Park, which would be visible as you drive in.

More Usable Space. The current multi-level and disconnected property simply is not usable. While I am not in favor of cutting down all the trees and grading the entire site, it would be wonderful to better connect the spaces in a more logical and usable manner. Improving views (and security) would be an added benefit.

Community Center and Nature Center / Museum. We strongly support having indoor spaces which could be used for a variety of purposes, including at least one room with a significant capacity (perhaps one large room which could be divided using a movable partition most of time). We also support a high-quality museum or nature center, housed in up to date structures which reflect the surrounding area. Striking a reasonable balance between a huge attraction catering to outsiders, and a high-quality lower impact set of structures, should not be that difficult. As discussed at the meeting, the current structures are in disrepair and were designed as a school. A single structure with different areas, or a small number of separate structures, might actually cover a total area smaller than the current structures with the ill-suited space between them. I personally was very interested in making sure the historical society has storage space and hope they also could have some display space to share their wonderful collections with our kids.

Use By Other Groups Like YMCA. We feel that the YMCA and similar groups (including the folks who host the yoga and other community classes) are “stakeholders.” As parents with 3 boys, we have been members of the YMCA, AYSO, and also are becoming involved with scouting. These organizations represent those of us with kids who use and would use the LL park. They are not “outsiders.” Several of us either have taken yoga classes or plan to. Having space for low-cost or free classes is important. There simply is no other such space on this side of the hill.

Balance Already Struck. In my review of other options, I personally would support the development of a community pool and recreation center. We don’t have a private pool, and there is no community pool or community recreation center in the area. We do appreciate, however, that a number of LL neighborhood residents are concerned about these higher density uses and the City has struck a balance by deciding against them. Now that a balance has been struck, it seems certain LL residents want to renegotiate that balance and push back even further. They are entitled to their opinion, but we are entitled to ours. Please work with all of us to continue to strike the right balance. I personally expect to live here for another 30-40 years and hope the re-designed LL Park serves all of us for many, many years.

Maintenance in the Meantime. I think everyone agrees that RPV needs to step up its investment in maintenance and security during the transitional period. Sinking money into repairing the structures seems a waste, but proper sanitation and refuse collection, as well as maintenance and security, all are important concerns. We can’t let things get worse while we wait for the planning and construction to be completed.

City of Rancho Palos Verdes – Ladera Linda Park Master Plan Community Outreach Meeting

Thank you for your consideration of our opinion. If necessary, I could obtain signatures from a significant number of other folks who support the same basic approach.

99. I was just given a brief summary on tonight's meeting by my husband. I was extremely surprised to hear that you are giving "stakeholders" input on Ladera Linda Park's Master Plan. The YMCA, the PVPUSD, nor any LL Community Center Instructors (to name a few), should not have any say on what goes on here. They have no stake in our community they come work then leave. We, the LL residents should be the only ones you should be seeking input from, we live here and will have to put up with the increased traffic, parking issues, and noise impacts on a daily basis (something we already deal with, but will increase). That being said I hope that you give the residents that live in LL the highest weight in making decisions.
100. Primary input should come from the 4 local HOAs. Any input from groups who rent the facilities (YMCA, classroom instructors, etc.) should carry very low weight. The goal of this facility should not be to generate income from renting it out. Clearly defined rules about rental of the property should be spelled out in writing and agreed upon by the city council, with resident input in the form of a public hearing, BEFORE any finalization of plans for a community center.

I am hoping in any proposal, clear definition, consideration, and solid solutions to parking will be considered, taking into account:

- a. Proximity to the reserves and hiking trails
- b. Spillover parking into residential areas

Any staff report to the city council should devote a section to this topic. It is a big concern for residents.

I have suggested in the past that Pirate, Phantom, and Sea Raven should be considered for "parking by permit only" restrictions, and that perhaps parking along Forrestal be limited to one side only (and perhaps have time limits on it, say 2 hours maximum). I think this discussion should be occurring now, regardless of any longer term project earmarked for the community center and park. My views and ideas for a solution may not be exactly the same as other Ladera Linda residents, but I think the majority of residents feel something needs to be done to improve the current situation.

I am not against the general public utilizing our beautiful parks and hiking trails – after all, these are public areas. I do not think, however, that the city has any obligation to provide unlimited, or even large amounts, of parking, nor encourage use of these areas thru social media. It's time to get this situation under control, and also develop some very good plans for the future community center.

Any areas designated for storage need to be clearly identified (for whom, for what purpose), and, should be maintained as storage areas. Any change in usage in the future should be decided by the City Council in a duly noticed public hearing.

As discussed, I am looking forward to some specific detail about current usage of the facilities, including days, times, what groups, and amount of square feet, whether these groups pay rent or not, etc. It is very important that the 4 local HOAs and residents know exactly what the current usage is. This critical information will help the HOAs render informed feedback. I believe ultimately this

**City of Rancho Palos Verdes – Ladera Linda Park Master Plan
Community Outreach Meeting**

will also be very important information to include in a staff report going to the City Council, when it gets to that stage.

There seemed to be some eagerness on the part of the Parks Department to move relatively quickly on this project....conceptual work completed by next spring and “ribbon cutting” in about 2 years. I say there is no need to rush....if it takes a few months longer, with some additional community meetings showing interim or preliminary concepts and thinking, then it is worth it. Going to the City Council with no additional community meetings is, in my mind, a recipe for a disastrous and contentious City Council meeting.

Speaking of ribbon cutting, when we get to that point, please, please, please don't have some big deal event with food trucks, beer and wine garden, social media publications, etc. etc. The residents do NOT want that! Keep everything low key, including the opening of the park. If, after a couple of years of construction the park gate simply starts getting unlocked for usage with no announcement at all, I would be completely happy with that. Believe me, local residents will know about it without the city saying a word....

101. Attached [below] is a good example of a large, organized group that came and completely filled the LL Community Center Parking lot this morning [Friday, September, 23, 2016] at 7:15 a.m. (and parked a fair way down Forrestal). I estimated 50-60 hikers when they finally all assembled and headed out, and it's not even Saturday morning! I think it will be extremely important for you, working with the consultant, to come up with good, creative solutions to ensure parking at any new facility is reserved for actual users of the facility, not for large groups going on hikes in the preserve. I also trust that, in this process, you will be thinking about solutions to overflow parking onto Forrestal and onto Pirate, Phantom, and Sea Raven Drives.



102. Hi Matt. I was at the mtg. on Thurs. also. Thank you (and Cory) for being so gracious acting as human punching bags for the various gripes. The new community center is shaping up to be a VERY contentious project with some in the neighborhood pushing for a refurbishment of the current center instead of a replacement (I'm not in that group). As you saw from the turnout, there's a LOT of concern about the project.

[Comment #92 above] is absolutely right about the parking. The immediate and intuitive thought is to provide enough parking for the largest gatherings/events, but this is exactly what we don't want. I'm currently involved in a large project for the County (replacement of Men's Central Jail) and parking (4000-5000 spaces) is a costly and problematic issue. There is a philosophy that says limiting or reducing parking capacity forces car pooling, public transportation etc. Basically, if you build it,you know the rest.

**City of Rancho Palos Verdes – Ladera Linda Park Master Plan
Community Outreach Meeting**

I would suggest REDUCING the square footage of the new center (achieved, in part, through multi-purpose spaces) if that is the driving force behind the required number of parking spots. If the number is 18,000 sq. ft. (as I think I heard), it's WAY to big. We should be looking at 10,000 or smaller, instead. The current center is seldom used and then, only a small portion at a time. There should not be an INCREASE in the current number of parking spots. If you increase the number, you will increase the number of people visiting....period.

Using [Comment #92 above]'s suggestions to deal with the overflow into Ladera Linda and on Forrester, we could restrict parking there also. Parking here IS the limiting factor and should remain so.

Like our National Parks, which are currently experiencing an increasing crush of visitors, the Ladera Linda area is being "loved" to death. Trails are overrun, there's increasing trash and crime and our neighborhood is bearing the brunt of it.

103. I moved to RPV with my family about 4 years ago. We have a daughter who just turned 5 and the LL park has been her favorite park for the past 4 years. We go there at least once a week. More during the summer holiday.

We live on Coolheights Dr, above LL, about 20mn walk from the park. We try to walk there as much as possible, through one of the trails that arrives just across the entrance of the center. The playgrounds (and the grounds in general) are usually mostly empty. On Saturday afternoon, there is usually one or two other families in the area.

Most of the families we know in RPV have children and moved to RPV to raise them. I understand and truly appreciate the community the first homeowners built here. We love our peaceful, safe and beautiful neighborhoods.

But I also think the city needs to look ahead and start building for the future and for all the kids (and their parents) who will be using these facilities for the next 20 years. LL is a great asset, and could be a much better park. It should be used by a lot more people than 2-3 kids on a Saturday afternoon.

I'm 100% in favor of enhancing the views at the park and removing the 3 layers to make it a larger single space. I would love for this space to be a place where both kids and elders feel at home, and where all neighbors meet regularly (the Easter party there is nice but could be so much better).

I am, with a lot of parents we talked to, a silent minority in the community. We all moved there very recently. We all plan to stay here for probably the rest of our lives, yet we do not want to impose our views to people who were here long before us and have done an unbelievable job at building this amazing city.

But I do hope that we could all look ahead and try to bridge the gap between those who don't want anything to change (or are afraid of what could happen), and those who want to improve our city to make it even better without compromising any of the values we all love.

Prepared By: Richard Fisher Associates

**City of Rancho Palos Verdes – Ladera Linda Park Master Plan
Community Outreach Meeting**

Date Prepared: 10/06/2016