



TO: HONORABLE MAYOR & CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS
FROM: CITY CLERK
DATE: MARCH 20, 2018
SUBJECT: ADDITIONS/REVISIONS AND AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA

Attached are revisions/additions and/or amendments to the agenda material presented for tonight's meeting.

Item No.	Description of Material
2	Emails from: Benoit Hochedez and Kaylee Hong; Mickey Rodich; Carolynn Petru; Ginette Aelony; Pam Andresen; Patricia Stenehjem; Sandra Valeri; Amanda Wong; Six Comment cards as submitted by attendees at the February 21, 2018 Ladera Linda Master Plan Workshop
5	Emails from: Barry Rodgveller; Kirk Hyde; John and Denise Girardi; Niels Pedersen Sr.; Dottie Lancaster Hashizumi; Brian Oney; Thomas (Tom) Olson

**** PLEASE NOTE: Materials attached after the color page(s) were submitted through Monday, March 19, 2018**.**

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Emily Colborn". The signature is written over a horizontal line.

Emily Colborn

From: Benoit Hochedez <hochedez@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2018 5:02 PM
To: CC
Cc: Matt Waters
Subject: LL Master Plan

Dear Members of the City Council,

We already reached out a couple times to speak in favor of the proposed Ladera Linda Park Master Plan in the past 18 months. The city staff along with the architect have made great progress on the plan, taking into account the hopes and concerns of the local community. While we would like more amenities at the park, we understand that neighbors who live close by want less and have safety concerns. The current plan is a good compromise and it seems like staff and the consultant have listened to everyone.

At this time, we hope the City Council can finally approve the recommendation of the city staff and move forward with this long overdue project.

We live near the park and have one child in 1st grade and another child on the way. It's time for the City to look ahead and build facilities for the future and for all the kids (and their parents) who will be here for the next 20 years. LL is the only city asset on this side of the hill, and deserves to be a great park and facility for the local community.

If the City decides to do a traffic study it should not stop the project from moving forward. It seems like the park project will not result in much more traffic, especially since this used to be a school for the entire neighborhood. Instead the traffic issues have more to do with AYSO and Trump National and traffic on PV Drive generally. Please don't allow a small number of people to use this issue as an excuse for more delay.

Regards,

Benoit Hochedez and Kaylee Hong

From: Mickey Rodich <mickeyrodich@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2018 6:30 PM
To: CC; Matt Waters
Subject: Ladera Linda Park Master Plan

The Ladera Linda Park Master Plan is on the Agenda for next Tuesday's Council Meeting. This will be an opportunity for you, our City Council, to practice what you preach. I have sat in numerous meetings on this subject and have heard our City Council direct Staff to follow their guidelines. Some of which were:

- 1) "Less is More".
- 2) This Park is to be designed to fit the needs of our City.
- 3) Listen to the input from the affected residents adjacent to the Park.
- 4) Design a Park that will not draw large crowds and create traffic headaches like Del Cerro Park.
- 5) Do not advertise our parks on Social Media, after the Santa Monica Hiking Club flooded Ladera Linda with 100 cars one Saturday, when there was no soccer and the gate was locked.

As I sat through these meetings I heard resident after resident make worthwhile suggestions and now with this final Plan nothing has changed. The Staff's proposal is exactly what they proposed from the beginning. Staff has not listened to the residents input.

We still have a 9,000 sq. ft. building with costs approaching \$9,000,000. A ~7,000 sq. ft. would be more than adequate. Proposed costs are excessive

We do not need a dry river bed and a bridge, but should have ADA access parallel to the entrance driveway.

The Park has been designed to fit Staff's wishes. Present usage (5 events per week), or even a 200% increase in usage does not justify 5 classrooms. The Discovery Room uses the Park perhaps 12 times per year.

Why a 1,000 sq. ft. storage room? Less expensive storage can be developed

Staff has had many meetings, where residents contributed their input, but none of it is included in this final Draft.

Residents have repeatedly asked for a Traffic Study to be conducted during AYSO games and now with adding a new Park it is even more important. Staff tells us that this should not be part of this new Park Plan, but they will do one after the Park is approved. Traffic has always been a problem at Ladera Linda and must be addressed.

Staff's proposal will create a destination Park that will draw crowds from all over the LA basin creating a traffic nightmare on Forrestal and PVDS.

RPV's rural atmosphere is not conducive to heavy traffic and large crowds. Advertising on Social Media has always been a big problem for RPV. The City Council instructed Staff to not advertise City events on Social Media. Obviously that message has been ignored because the Staff uses Facebook, Next Door (which by the way reaches way beyond RPV). uTube and others.

Staff has not followed the guidelines you had given them for the Ladera Linda Park Master Plan. Although staff held a lot of meetings, your instructions were ignored. It is now up to you to bring some reasonableness to the Ladera Linda Park Master Plan project.



From: Carolynn Petru <carolynn.petru@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2018 11:08 AM
To: CC
Cc: Cory Linder; Matt Waters; Elias Sassoon
Subject: Agenda Item No. 2: Ladera Linda Park Master Plan

Honorable Mayor and City Council -

I've been following the progress of the Ladera Linda Park project with interest for the last several years. Finally, there's a master plan for the site that has been carefully considered, beautifully designed and developed with the resident's needs at heart. It transcends the "less is more" philosophy and instead embodies "less, but more functional, safe and inviting." I strongly urge the City Council to approve it and move forward with redeveloping the park into something the whole community can be proud of.

However, while the City has sadly neglected this site for many years, it has also failed to address the collateral issues that have grown up around it. Therefore, while I want to see the City move forward with approving and implementing the Ladera Linda Park Master Plan, there are several issues that need to be addressed before the first spade of dirt is turned. Please consider taking the following actions now:

- Conduct the traffic study. It will be no surprise if a traffic signal is needed at PVDS/Forrestal;
- Implement an AYSO traffic control plan;
- Limit parking on Forrestal Drive and restrict parking in the adjacent neighborhoods if needed;
- Create a Reserve parking area with a second gate;
- Implement the proposed park rental restrictions; and,
- Increase park staffing levels, as recommended.

Most of these actions have nothing to do with the park and everything to do with the community's level of dissatisfaction that their other concerns are not being addressed. As a result, some seem to be taking it out on the nearest target and are trying to whittle the park down to non-existence. Please take a wholistic approach to the problems this neighborhood is experiencing and help create a space for Ladera Linda Park to thrive.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Carolynn Petru
Rancho Palos Verdes

Matt Waters

From: Gabriella Yap
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2018 7:15 AM
To: Cory Linder; Matt Waters
Cc: Kit Fox
Subject: Fwd: Ladera Linda "project"

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "G_ZITPA" <gzitpa@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Mar 3, 2018 at 8:41 AM -0800
Subject: Ladera Linda "project"
To: "CC" <CC@rpvca.gov>

It looks to me that the "project "is not going the way the residents want.
Our opinion is asked for "show" but without any intention of listening to our needs.
As usual ,the unintended consequences will happen and "OH ! my , Surprise "
Please ! all we wanted was a working water fountain !

ginette aelony

Matt Waters

From: Matt Waters
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2018 11:14 AM
To: Pam Andresen
Cc: Matt Waters; Cory Linder
Subject: RE: Ladera Linda Plan

Hi Pam,

Thank you for your email and your involvement. Your comments about the project, including your thoughts on keeping the Discovery Room, the ADA ramp expense, and other issues will be incorporated into the March 20th City Council report.

Sincerely,

Matt Waters
Senior Administrative Analyst

City of Rancho Palos Verdes
Recreation and Parks Department
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
www.palosverdes.com/rpv
mattw@rpvca.gov - (310) 544-5218 p – (310) 544-5291 f



From: Pam Andresen [mailto:andresen.pam@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2018 5:24 PM
To: Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov>
Subject: Ladera Linda Plan

Matt-
I apologize for the late reply, but hope my comments can be entered.

I was unable to attend the last workshop, but did attend the ones prior. I am very surprised to see the park even smaller in size than previously aligned by most at the last workshop. While the "less is more" concept prevails over this design, it should not mean less usable. The removal of the discovery room is one such example of removing usable amenities and I recommend that this be included to encourage the community to have a convenient place to gather. The relocation of the ADA ramp seems to have a significant cost compared to the benefit. A reasonable location was proposed on the prior map which can align with the "less is more" concept.

This is an opportunity to have a safe place for current and future generations and unfortunately the lack of acceptable community parks in this area continue to deter new families and residents from moving in. It's also

disappointing to see that after moving here a year and a half ago, the nicest park to bring my neices and nephew is in San Pedro. I don't have kids so was not too concerned before moving here, but those with families are very aware and is often part of their home location decision.

Thank you

-Pam

Matt Waters

From: Matt Waters
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2018 11:24 AM
To: Patricia Stenehjem
Cc: Matt Waters
Subject: RE: Ladera Linda Park

Hi Patricia,

Thank you for your email about the Ladera Linda Park Master Plan. Your thoughts about basketball court noise and location, foul language, sightlines, keeping the Discovery Room, and other issues. Our consultant did do sightline analysis for a number of vantage points throughout the site, but they don't show the exact view from every home site. I can see if they can offer a professional opinion about what you would see from your address. Please feel free to send me your address.

I'll check with the Park Supervisor to see if there was any additional information about the Feb, 20th gate issue.

Thanks,

Matt

-----Original Message-----

From: Patricia Stenehjem [mailto:patsyanntoo@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2018 1:38 PM
To: Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov>
Subject: Ladera Linda Park

Hi Matt,

Just to follow up on the other emails I have sent you, as well as some questions and comments regarding the Park plan: I am still concerned about noise and lack of privacy; as I mentioned to you at the 2/21 meeting, the basketball courts do generate noise, not so much from the activity, but because many of the young men playing are loud and foul-mouthed. Surely the courts could be located elsewhere on the property, away from both our neighborhood and Seaview. Also, I would prefer that the picnic table(s) be located farther from Forrestal, because of noise & trash issues. I have observed instances when visitors have moved the old tables, or brought their own, and put them near Forrestal for their convenience, with resulting noise and trash affecting our neighborhood.

I am in favor of keeping the Discovery Room; 4 generations of our family have enjoyed visiting it over the years. Parking is another issue generating noise and trash; I support no parking on either side of Forrestal, from the gate south to the end of the park boundary. I oppose adding additional parking above the Forrestal gate; it makes more sense to incorporate those spaces into the park footprint.

Parking and traffic issues will only be exacerbated when a new and improved facility is opened at Ladera Linda, and I think those issues should be addressed by the city before going ahead with building a new facility.

Also, regarding privacy, if the area on the west side of Forrestal is cleared of vegetation and law enforcement can have a clear line of sight, it would work both ways- visitors to the park would have a clear line of sight to my home and yard; not so secure for me! Concerning that issue, I had sent you an email message last week about trying to interpret the renderings of the facility as it would look from my property's vantage point, and inviting you &/or the architect to my home to demonstrate or explain what I would be seeing when it's built. I hope you received that message, as I haven't received a reply yet.

On another note, please advise me what transpired with the Forrestal gate lock change; fyi, the following day, 2/20, the lock was secured again.

Regards,
Pat Stenehjem

Sent from my iPad

Matt Waters

From: Matt Waters
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2018 11:34 AM
To: Sandra Valeri
Cc: Matt Waters; Cory Linder
Subject: RE: Comments to Ladera Linda Master Plan

Dear Ms. Valeri,

Thank you for your email and for your involvement in the Ladera Linda Park Master Plan process. All of your comments have been shared with project Staff and the consultant and will be incorporated in the report being considered by City Council on March 20th.

A few points. The main room, is approximately the same size as the existing room, especially if you include an adjacent storage area, which could be used for gym mats and other equipment as you suggest. The plan does include a small kitchen.

Resident feedback about relocating the basketball court will be included in the Staff report as well as the issue of Preserve-dedicated parking and red-striping sections of Forrestal Drive.

Again, thank you for your ongoing participation and I hope you can attend the March 20th meeting.

Sincerely,

Matt Waters
Senior Administrative Analyst

City of Rancho Palos Verdes
Recreation and Parks Department
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
www.palosverdes.com/rpv
mattw@rpvca.gov - (310) 544-5218 p – (310) 544-5291 f

-----Original Message-----

From: Sandra Valeri [<mailto:smhvaleri@cox.net>]
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2018 6:13 PM
To: Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov>
Subject: Comments to Ladera Linda Master Plan

To RPV Parks Department and other City officials,

Thank you for the outreach meeting concerning the planned updates for Ladera Linda park. A lot of good information was presented.

First I want to say that I am all in favor of upgrading the facility. I think the the renderings for the new building look beautiful. As a community volunteer I have used the park over the years, reserving small rooms for monthly Cub Scout Den meetings and occasional Girl Scout meetings. For several years I reserved the large room for the full Cub Scout Pack from Mira Catalina Elementary school to hold their annual Pine Derby races. And with the Girl Scouts, we used the facility to receive large Council orders for cookies, which had to be regrouped into orders for each Troop in the area. I appreciate the park's availability for these community activities, and I hope it will continue to be available to help in these same capacities.

I am concerned that the main room is getting smaller. In fact I am concerned that it may be too small to host the local dance and fitness classes that our neighborhood as enjoyed here for years. While I don't want a Taj Mahal, I don't want to build something that is too small for our needs. I hope that you have communicated with the people who teach the various dance and fitness classes to ensure that the reduced room size is adequate for the classes that they provide. And there needs to be storage for gymnastic mats, dance bars, etc. A couple hundred square feet can make a difference.

I was also surprised to learn that there would be no kitchen included in the plans. This seems very short sighted. A kitchen area is an absolute must for any community center. You need refrigeration and plumbing, you must have a kitchen sink. While cooking appliances may not be wanted at this time, it is poor planning not to include the space and electric or gas lines to allow a range or oven to be added later in time if the needs and desires of the community warrants it. This could be as simple as a cabinet area, that is wired so a cooking appliance could be installed later. Plan now for a possible minor kitchen upgrade later IF the community wants it.

Unlike some of my neighbors I have no objection to a "Discovery Room" which is designed to help house and maintain part of the city's historical and cultural artifacts, and can be used for student involvement.

I could not see the play equipment areas on the area renderings. I think having good play equipment for children is a crucial need that must be met. These play areas should have good access to the restrooms, and also easy stroller access from the parking lot. From the drawings I have absolutely NO IDEA if these basic accommodations are met or not. A good play area is essential to a family park.

One area where it was clear that the Park department was NOT listening to the neighbors, was in regard to the location of the basketball courts. The neighbors near the park have asked that these be moved up closer to the paddle tennis courts to prevent excess noise in their homes. The Parks department was completely disrespectful and dismissive of their concerns.

We heard that the designer feels they were instructed to put the BB courts next to the children's play area, period, regardless of any other input or concern. Apparently the idea is that some parents would like their older kids to be able to practice ball on the courts while the younger ones are in the play area. One neighbor stated that the men who use the court are often loud and use vulgar profanities, and she doesn't want to hear in backyard anymore. So why do the park planners think it is a great idea to have loud profane and cursing men play BB next to the little children? Who will want to let there kids play there if loud men are shouting profanities right next to them?

It was suggested to put the full play BB court/s up next to the paddle tennis court to pull the loud games up that way, but a small practice half court could be left next to the children's play area to meet the other concern. The residents in the room seemed to like the idea, But the concept was summarily shot down, and we were emphatically TOLD that ALL COURTS WILL BE PUT NEXT TO CHILDREN'S PLAYGROUND - END OF STORY. Wow. What is the purpose of the meeting if you absolutely REFUSE to accept any input whatsoever? This was very disappointing. The message was load and clear - This meeting was a one way street only for the city to show us their concept, and if the residents don't like it they can pound sand.

Most important the residents have made it abundantly clear that they do Not want this park to become an attraction that will bring in increasing numbers of out of area visitors. The Park planners insisted that the usage would remain

about the same, but how in the world can they back up that assertion? And if you really don't believe that usage is going to increase, then why are you more than doubling the amount of parking spaces? Clearly you are not creating parking spaces to meet CURRENT need. You are creating parking to meet an anticipated greater increased usage. Don't say one thing and do another. Be HONEST Please.

The addition of 28 parking spaces for the Preserve, while not technically part of the Park, will be an instant draw for additional out of the area visitors to come use this facility as the new trail head of choice to access the Preserve. Current counts of cars parked along the road to access the preserve is typically 8-12, so why do we need 28 spaces?

Matt asked what was the survey response to the parking issue; the truth is that there was NO QUESTION on the survey regarding the parking. I asked if one could be added, but I was told by the writer of the survey that "HE" personally thought 28 spaces was good, so he wasn't going to add that question to the survey, but if people had concerns about parking, they could write them up in the general comment section. After this, I personally refused to answer the survey. because I don't like rigged games.

I suggest that the city pave and prepare the strip for 28 parking spaces, BUT initially mark and designate only 12-16 spaces since that appears to be plenty to meet the current usage. Mark the rest of that parking area, reserved maybe for oversized vehicles or maintenance vehicle parking. If/when the need arises then more parking spaces could be easily and inexpensively marked and added later. This tactic would prevent the instant creation of a giant open parking lot to attract lots of new users, while retaining flexibility to grow with increased demand. I also stress that this parking must be combined with the red striping of Forrestal, so we move the hikers into the new lot area, not just create more parking in addition to existing street parking. Finally we need to be sure that this lot will be available for hikers especially during the weekends and will not become an AYSO parking lot, pushing the hikers back into our neighborhood. How can we ensure that these spaces will be used for the Preserve and not taken over by AYSO?

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments. I hope that you take them into consideration.

Sincerely, Sandra Valeri

From: Amanda Wong <kiwi_esq@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2018 3:32 PM
To: CC; CityClerk
Subject: Ladera Linda Park Master Plan - Comment

Dear Mayor Brooks and City Council,

First let me thank you for the attention and time you have given to the Ladera Linda Park Master Plan. The plan that has been proposed by Parks and Recs is a significant financial investment which affects every RPV resident – and more directly, affects not only the quality of life in the Ladera Linda (traffic, crowds and noise) neighborhood but more significantly, its safety.

I have attended the two prior City Council meetings where Ladera Linda was on the agenda, and was heartened by the Council's thoughtful responses to community member concerns. I have also attended several of the community meetings where design concepts were discussed and community input solicited, as well a small group session, which did not alleviate my concerns.

From those meetings, here are my primary concerns:

INCREASED USAGE ANTICIPATED

Community opinion is largely in support of the new community center. But our wish was for something that would replace the existing buildings and most importantly - maintain the status quo – NOT expand the programming and usage. To simply compare square footage and say that the new design has a smaller footprint and reduced number of rooms avoids the real issue – that Parks and Recreation anticipates increased usage and programming at the new community center. The February 2018 Parks & Rec presentation states that “poor condition has been a deterrent to rentals . . . usage will likely rise due to improved condition / newness factor.” Including up to two evening programs per month, with up to 125 people and the potential for alcohol!
Increased usage is not maintaining the status quo.

EFFECT ON NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY

The security analysis covers design aspects of the community center and park, but fails to address the impact on our neighborhood. With a new community center, removing plantings to allow beautiful ocean views, increased patronage due to newness, increased programming, a large discovery room, allowing for evening rentals, and publicity on the parks and Recs website, it is inevitable that our local community park will become a draw to crowds from outside the community. One only has to look at the cars parked at Founders Park every evening at sunset to know that Ladera Linda Park will become the attractive and comfortable new place to congregate in the evenings. We already play host to AYSO crowds and large groups of hikers headed up into the reserve.

Thankfully the current condition and discreet “tucked-away” nature of the park makes it a place that does not attract visitors to linger. Building beautiful new facilities and cutting away the 6-foot hedges is both an advertisement and an invitation. Simply put, if you build it, they will come. My Number One Concern is for the safety of my family and my neighbors who have already been exposed to criminals coming into the neighborhood from other areas. One good friend and neighbor is already moving out of the neighborhood, in part because of concerns over safety. To date, no one from the city has addressed our concerns over how increased patronage at the park will affect the safety of our neighborhood, our families and our properties.

INCREASED TRAFFIC

The community concerns over increased traffic and the parking situation have been well documented. I am in favor of red-curbing Forrestal. However, I foresee that this will push more traffic into the surrounding streets of Pirate & Sea Raven because it is human nature to park in the closest spot they can find. I would be in favor of restricted parking for residents / parking permits in the immediately surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you for your continued consideration of this matter,

Amanda Wong

The following six (6) comment cards were submitted by attendees at the February 21st Ladera Linda Park Master Plan Workshop at Ladera Linda. While a summary of the comment cards is included in Attachment C (Public Input Summary), the originals should have also been included in Attachment D (Master Plan Correspondence).

Matt Waters

Recreation and Parks Senior Administrative Analyst

March 20, 2018



LADERA LINDA PARK MASTER PLAN

PUBLIC WORKSHOP

February 21, 2018

COMMENT CARD

Please write down and submit your comments regarding the proposed Ladera Linda Park Master Plan design.

If you wish more time for submitting comments this evening, please indicate your thoughts and forward them to the City by **March 2**. You may also share this opportunity with your neighbors who were not able to attend this evening's meeting.

Comment cards can be turned in at tonight's meeting or dropped off/mailed to:

Rancho Palos Verdes City Hall
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
attn: Recreation and Parks

Comments can also be emailed to Mattw@rpvca.gov

The proposal for this new park plan is really good. It seems to address major issues to compromise between "users". I think the proposed number of rooms is good to bring groups (scouts, pre-schoolers, education & dance groups) back to a "neighborhood" center. The Discovery Room should remain a fixture - it is unique to the area. It is a great place to show children and adults artifacts relating to the cultural, geological, and natural aspects of this beautiful area.

Sue Walsh, Los Angeles Decent



LADERA LINDA PARK MASTER PLAN

PUBLIC WORKSHOP

February 21, 2018

COMMENT CARD

Please write down and submit your comments regarding the proposed Ladera Linda Park Master Plan design.

If you wish more time for submitting comments this evening, please indicate your thoughts and forward them to the City by **March 2**. You may also share this opportunity with your neighbors who were not able to attend this evening's meeting.

Comment cards can be turned in at tonight's meeting or dropped off/mailed to:

Rancho Palos Verdes City Hall
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
attn: Recreation and Parks

Comments can also be emailed to Mattw@rpvca.gov

It would help if the speakers could raise their voice and not speak in low monotone. They also should get instruction on how to use a microphone. They don't think to speak into a microphone, but use it around their chest area. Also, they forget to use it, and then mumble on. It would be a help if we could hear when they are talking directly towards the other side of the room. They look at the screen and talk to the audience on that side of the room.



LADERA LINDA PARK MASTER PLAN

PUBLIC WORKSHOP

February 21, 2018

COMMENT CARD

Please write down and submit your comments regarding the proposed Ladera Linda Park Master Plan design.

If you wish more time for submitting comments this evening, please indicate your thoughts and forward them to the City by **March 2**. You may also share this opportunity with your neighbors who were not able to attend this evening's meeting.

Comment cards can be turned in at tonight's meeting or dropped off/mailed to:

Rancho Palos Verdes City Hall
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
attn: Recreation and Parks

Comments can also be emailed to Mattw@rpvca.gov

- ① how much red marked off parking on Forestal Dr.
- ② playground-size
- ③ more creative outdoor space / use / tables
- ④ trail usage / signs / trash bag pick up
- ⑤ storage long term renters
- ⑥



LADERA LINDA PARK MASTER PLAN

PUBLIC WORKSHOP

February 21, 2018

COMMENT CARD

Please write down and submit your comments regarding the proposed Ladera Linda Park Master Plan design.

If you wish more time for submitting comments this evening, please indicate your thoughts and forward them to the City by **March 2**. You may also share this opportunity with your neighbors who were not able to attend this evening's meeting.

Comment cards can be turned in at tonight's meeting or dropped off/mailed to:

Rancho Palos Verdes City Hall
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
attn: Recreation and Parks

Comments can also be emailed to Mattw@rpvca.gov

DO NOT OPEN THE VIEW OR REMOVE FORESTED
BUSHER
CREATE A PUBLIC "DISCOVERY AREA" OR
SMALL SIZE — RE DEAN DANA BUILDING
I CONTINUE TO BELIEVE THE SIZE IS
TOO LARGE.



LADERA LINDA PARK MASTER PLAN

PUBLIC WORKSHOP

February 21, 2018

COMMENT CARD

Please write down and submit your comments regarding the proposed Ladera Linda Park Master Plan design.

If you wish more time for submitting comments this evening, please indicate your thoughts and forward them to the City by **March 2**. You may also share this opportunity with your neighbors who were not able to attend this evening's meeting.

Comment cards can be turned in at tonight's meeting or dropped off/mailed to:

Rancho Palos Verdes City Hall
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
attn: Recreation and Parks

Comments can also be emailed to Mattw@rpvca.gov

- ① Noise Abatement needs to be addressed. Water reverberates sound.
- ② Open the park at 9:00 AM + close at Dusk, like the rest of the parks on the hill.



LADERA LINDA PARK MASTER PLAN

PUBLIC WORKSHOP

February 21, 2018

COMMENT CARD

Please write down and submit your comments regarding the proposed Ladera Linda Park Master Plan design.

If you wish more time for submitting comments this evening, please indicate your thoughts and forward them to the City by **March 2**. You may also share this opportunity with your neighbors who were not able to attend this evening's meeting.

Comment cards can be turned in at tonight's meeting or dropped off/mailed to:

Rancho Palos Verdes City Hall
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
attn: Recreation and Parks

Comments can also be emailed to Mattw@rpvca.gov

Very Good info
We want this plan.

Morie Gross - 310 541-6345



TO: HONORABLE MAYOR & CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS
FROM: CITY CLERK
DATE: MARCH 19, 2018
SUBJECT: ADDITIONS/REVISIONS AND AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA

Attached are revisions/additions and/or amendments to the agenda material received through Monday afternoon for the Tuesday, March 20, 2018 City Council meeting:

Item No.	Description of Material
E	Email from Sunshine
2	Emails from: Marty Foster; Edward Stevens; Herb Stark; Gary Randall; Bill Foster; Email exchange between Staff and Gary Randall
5	Letter from Romas and Angela Jarasunas

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Emily Colborn". The signature is written over a horizontal line.

Emily Colborn

From: Marty Foster <martycrna@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 14, 2018 11:10 AM
To: CityClerk; CC
Subject: Ladera Linda Master Plan

Dear Mayor Brooks and City Council Members

You all have been listening for some time on this subject. We appreciate the real listening you do in person and in print.

It seems once again we are at an impasse. The city staff and architect have plans not at all in line with resident needs and wants. In fact the two parties have totally opposing agendas.

The prominent resident concerns have been neighborhood security and traffic problems on Forrestal and PVDS. Yet, what the staff intends absolutely increases those concerns in terms of the planned increased usage of the site. Thus, more programming, more groups leasing space including evening events, not only does not address residents concerns but actually exacerbates them.

We are glad to see the proposed traffic study but would like resident involvement in the design and execution of the study.

We fear the two agendas as outlined above are incompatible. Please follow your dictum...less is more.

Best wishes
Marty Foster

Sent from my iPad

From: Teresa Takaoka
Sent: Wednesday, March 14, 2018 2:51 PM
To: CityClerk
Subject: FW: The City Council's "Less is More" is not being followed for the Ladera Linda Park Improvement.

Late corr

From: Edward Stevens [mailto:ezstevens@cox.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 14, 2018 2:39 PM
To: CC <CC@rpvca.gov>
Cc: Mona Dill <MonaD@rpvca.gov>; Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov>; Sean Larvenz <SeanL@rpvca.gov>; RPV CODE ENFORCEMENT juliep@rpvca.gov.
Subject: RE: The City Council's "Less is More" is not being followed for the Ladera Linda Park Improvement.

Dear City Council,

My friend Mickey wrote an Excellent email that I wish you would take the time to reread.

The City Council's "Less is More" is not being followed for the Ladera Linda Park Improvement.

The City Staff does not listen to you the City Council or the Residents. It seems they just continue to bully everyone & just do whatever they want done.

I wonder how many of the City staff are residents of Rancho Palos Verdes. If they were residents I bet that they would not be doing what they continue to do.

Another example is forcing the Expanded bike lane in front of Seaview when there is already a nice bike lane. There are other areas along PV Dr S that need attention before Seaview.

Thank you

Edward Stevens

I was unable to attend the Workshop on Feb. 212018, but I was able to discuss the Workshop with some neighbors that attended the meeting and I also was able to review your online presentation. Even though I was not able to hear your verbal presentation, I think I got a good idea of what transpired.

During the City Council meeting on Nov. 18,2016, that you referred to in your presentation, the City Council instructed your department to adhere to the City Council's "Less is More" guidance approach along with incorporating the immediate residents idea's and concerns in the design of the new Park. That Agenda Report also stated "The recommendations on what to include (and what not to include) were strongly influenced by resident feedback received via survey, emails and Workshops". That statement was true only for the initial Workshops, held prior to this meeting with the discussions centered on swimming pools, gymnasiums, skate board park and a dog park, which were rejected by the City Council and they then provided you with new guidance to listen to the desires of the residents.. At that point, after many resident comments, Staff recommended a 9,000 sq ft building. During the first Workshop meeting it was the architect that suggested that there was a possibility of adding up to 40 parking places on Forrestal, but we were told that that was not in the scope of this project. However later, for some reason, 28 parking places and an upper gate became part of this project.

Prior to the City Council meeting on August 1.2017, you held additional private meetings with residents and users to further define what amenities to include in the new Park building. I attended one of these meetings and reaffirmed the concerns expressed by our residents during their meetings such as: total cost, security cameras, do not make another Del Cerro Park fiasco, 7,000 sq ft building to meet community needs, relocation of noise generating basketball and children's play area, relocate ADA access, provide traffic control and left turn accelerating lane at Forrestal and PVDS, and retain existing landscape as much as

possible. At this City Council meeting you made another presentation on the Ladera Linda Park planned design concept. Again the City Council told you to work with the residents to determine the amenities for the new Park building. One of the biggest issues was the size of the building. The nearby residences preferred a 7,000 sq ft building, based on the average usage of 4 to 5 per week along with a much lower parking place requirement. We at Ladera Linda HOA recently conducted a survey to reach a consensus as to the preferred features for the new Park and the over 80 responses were overwhelmingly in agreement on the amenities as detailed in my correspondence to you prior to this last meeting.

Reviewing what transpired during the meeting made one thing perfectly clear: The plan that you originally proposed 2 years ago has not changed at all. You have not listened to our residents for our input. Your minds were already made up from the beginning. Your answer to our suggestion to provide traffic control and a left turn accelerating lane at Forrestal and PVDS was that it is not in the scope of this project, however it is a very critical part of this project and should be considered as part of it. This new park will create traffic problems at PVDS.

After reviewing the artist renderings I see that the "Less is More" mantra imposed by the City Council does not apply to this project:

1) On your Floor Plan (page 20), you still show 5 meeting/classrooms. The usage does not justify 5 meeting/classrooms. We only need 3

meeting/classrooms. Also we do not need a Discovery Room. The usage does not justify a Discovery Room. It can operate just like it does at PVIC.

2) The multipurpose room is chopped off at a sharp angle and has a 261 sq ft staging area, in the middle of the gallery and not connected to outside

access. There is no minimal kitchen area shown in your plans either.

3) One would think that the Storage areas shown (240 and 295 sq ft) would be connected to each large room instead of being on the opposite side of the

gallery. Maybe you are planning to use them as future offices?

4) On pages 24 and 25 you show a dry river bed with a bridge. We are not duplicating a downtown Music Center. I see this feature as being a liability

and not an asset. With all of the architectural (high) concrete steps, river rock, depressions and a bridge, I see a large liability factor for injuries.

Seniors and small children will have difficulty navigating this area. The daily gardening maintenance costs will be very high. Whats wrong with a grass

lawn and gentle slopes? This area could even someday become our skate park. Eliminating all of these unnecessary features could more than pay for

relocating the ADA access to be next to the entry driveway.

5) The Lobby desk should be located so that Staff has unobstructed views of the galleries and likewise the outside perimeter should not be full of nooks

and crannies for security reasons.

6) The entry court is way too large. You are talking about the Sheriff having line of site access, but this leaves blind spots.

I am against P3 financing for this project. The 18% to 20% interest rates are a detriment. The total cost for financing will be far more than double the initial cost of the project. The same question arose when the San Ramon Canyon project was to be financed. What's wrong with traditional debt financing or If the City has the funds, as there is in this case, then there is no need for any kind of financing?

I think there is still time to make this project acceptable to us residents. But again, up till now, nothing was changed as a result of resident input. After all of the meetings and Workshops, your initial proposal still stands; nothing has changed to include resident input. Again, no one has paid attention to the residents.

From: grapecon@cox.net
Sent: Thursday, March 15, 2018 8:13 AM
To: CC; CityClerk
Subject: RE: Ladera Linda Park

Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers:

I received the email below from a neighbor and it is so well worded and reflects my sentiments that I really could not do better, so I figured I would just indicate that I agree 100% with the comments made below by Herb Stark.

During the public comment period, I sent a letter suggesting a two phase approach of solving some existing and longstanding issues in phase 1 (some of which have been "punted" down the road for many years now), and then in a second phase developing the actual park itself. My actual letter was unintentionally omitted from Appendix D, but I have spoken to Matt and he has assured me my letter will appear in the "late correspondence" section for the upcoming meeting with a note indicating I actually submitted it during the open period. I hope you will read that letter as well and seriously consider a two phase approach to this project.

Thank you

Gary Randall

From: Herb Stark <pt17stearman@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 15, 2018 8:00 AM
To: CC <cc@rpvca.gov>; cityclerk@rpvca.gov
Subject: Ladera Linda Park

March 20, 2018, City Council Meeting
Regular Business Item 2

Dear City Council,

I suggest that the city council review the August 1 city council meeting discussion on the Ladera Linda Park conceptual design. http://rpv.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=5&clip_id=2852

What the residents wanted was a low profile community park that does not impact the community's quality life. What they did not want is a Gateway or Del Cerro Park. The City Council directed staff to refine the elements of the facility and address the concerns of the neighborhood. What they got was a defense of what they presented at the August 1 City Council meeting.

The City Council directed staff to perform traffic and acoustical studies, neither was done.

A community survey was sent out to the residents of Ladera Linda in which almost 50% responded. They wanted a smaller building, eliminating the museum and one classroom. The one thing they did want is a large community room so that they could hold community functions. What

they got was an enlarged museum and a community room that is smaller than the present community room with a shape that cannot be efficiently used.

They requested that the noise generating activities be moved away from the residential areas. This was not done.

The residents requested that something needs to be done about the parking and traffic on Forrestal and at the intersection of Forrestal and PV Drive South. The best Staff could do was to suggest that the curbs on Forrestal be painted red and that the traffic was the result of AYSO and the reserve. They contend that the new park will have very little impact. Yet the plan provides for full view of the ocean from the park which will certainly attract more visitors along with the new and expanded amenities of the facility.

The City Council should reject Staff's recommendation and direct them to go back to the residents and resolve these and the other outstanding issues.

Herb Stark
Ladera Linda Resident

From: Herb Stark <pt17stearman@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 15, 2018 8:00 AM
To: CC; CityClerk
Subject: Ladera Linda Park

March 20, 2018, City Council Meeting
Regular Business Item 2

Dear City Council,

I suggest that the city council review the August 1 city council meeting discussion on the Ladera Linda Park conceptual design. http://rpv.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=5&clip_id=2852

What the residents wanted was a low profile community park that does not impact the community's quality life. What they did not want is a Gateway or Del Cerro Park. The City Council directed staff to refine the elements of the facility and address the concerns of the neighborhood. What they got was a defense of what they presented at the August 1 City Council meeting.

The City Council directed staff to perform traffic and acoustical studies, neither was done.

A community survey was sent out to the residents of Ladera Linda in which almost 50% responded. They wanted a smaller building, eliminating the museum and one classroom. The one thing they did want is a large community room so that they could hold community functions. What they got was an enlarged museum and a community room that is smaller than the present community room with a shape that cannot be efficiently used.

They requested that the noise generating activities be moved away from the residential areas. This was not done.

The residents requested that something needs to be done about the parking and traffic on Forrestal and at the intersection of Forrestal and PV Drive South. The best Staff could do was to suggest that the curbs on Forrestal be painted red and that the traffic was the result of AYSO and the reserve. They contend that the new park will have very little impact. Yet the plan provides for full view of the ocean from the park which will certainly attract more visitors along with the new and expanded amenities of the facility.

The City Council should reject Staff's recommendation and direct them to go back to the residents and resolve these and the other outstanding issues.

Herb Stark
Ladera Linda Resident

From: Bills Cox Email <bfos@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2018 2:08 PM
To: CC; CityClerk
Subject: City council meeting Ladera Linda park decision

Dear Council members,

I am writing you to express my concern on what appears to be the final decision on Ladera Linda Park. I have attended work shops and presentations over the past few years and it seems that although the project has been minimized to an extent, it final plan is still not addressing many of the local residents of Ladera Linda and Seaview's concerns. I believe a majority of the residents concern is the increased traffic and use of the proposed expansion of the park. The final plan is going to convert the park into an attractive nuisance and it seems that staff feel like that their mission is to provide increased usage of the facility. We need to just look at the dilemma and impossible cure to the problems of Del Serro park and realize that is in store for Ladera Linda with the present plan.

The staff has not addressed the impact this project will have on increased traffic. I believe no official traffic study has been performed as yet and before any decision is made on the park this should definitely be done.

It is curious that in so many of the meetings, the topic of financing has come up and at all the meetings we were told that is was not a problem. I remember a council meeting last year when Councilman Duhovic commented that he wasn't aware of exactly where staff was going to get the money for this project. 7 million dollars doesn't just magically appear and I am sure our city budget is like all the other neighboring cities that have financial problems. At every meeting we were told the money was not an issue. Whether it is financed or raised by bond measures, its still money that the tax payer will owe.

With all of our other city problems with roads ,city hall, etc. wouldn't this money be better used?

Bill Foster
32451 Searaven Dr
Rancho Palos Verdes, Ca 90275

Sent from my iPad

From: Matt Waters
Sent: Wednesday, March 14, 2018 1:39 PM
To: CityClerk
Cc: Nathan Zweizig; Cory Linder
Subject: FW: Ladera Linda Park Master Plan Input

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Late correspondence for LL Park Master Plan

From: Matt Waters
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2018 3:03 PM
To: grapecon@cox.net
Cc: Cory Linder <CoryL@rpvca.gov>; CityManager <CityManager@rpvca.gov>
Subject: RE: Ladera Linda Park Master Plan Input

Hi Gary,

Thanks for the email, for attending the workshop, and for your kind words. It has been a long process and there is a long way still to go.

All of your comments on potential phasing, views, levels of visitation, parking, traffic, security, trailhead realignment, etc... have been considered by Staff and RFA, and will be included in the report to City Council on March 20.

Thanks again for your ongoing involvement and I hope to see you at the Council meeting.

Sincerely,

Matt Waters
Senior Administrative Analyst

City of Rancho Palos Verdes
Recreation and Parks Department
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
www.palosverdes.com/rpv
mattw@rpvca.gov - (310) 544-5218 p – (310) 544-5291 f

Parks
Make
Life
Better!

From: grapecon@cox.net [mailto:grapecon@cox.net]
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2018 2:33 PM
To: Matt Waters <MattW@rpvca.gov>

a.

Cc: Cory Linder <CoryL@rpvca.gov>; CityManager <CityManager@rpvca.gov>

Subject: Ladera Linda Park Master Plan Input

Hello Matt:

I would like to thank you and Cory for the hard work you have been putting into the Ladera Linda Park Master Plan. This has not been an easy process, as there are many concerns and opinions from the community. I also want to thank you for presenting an update at the February 21st workshop and for fielding some of the questions and concerns from the residents.

After attending the workshop last week, I could not help but feel that some significant concerns raised by residents are not being fully addressed, discussed, and resolved.

I could be wrong, but I believe everyone is in agreement that if this new facility is constructed as proposed, and sweeping views cleared for visitors, that usage of the park will increase over current usage. Of course, how much it will increase is the subject of much debate. Parks staff and some residents feel usage will increase only slightly above current levels. Others fear that large crowds will come to the facility to enjoy the new basketball courts, walking trails, expansive views, paddle tennis courts, kids play equipment, and of course the welcoming and inviting community center with its modern coastal style architecture, copious glass walls, and Discovery Room.

Whether the usage increase is at one of these extremes, or somewhere in between, is anyone's guess right now, but I have not heard a single person (resident or staff member) deny there will be some increase. Any increase in usage should be cause for concern and pause.

Currently, there are issues with existing visitor and traffic level. These include, but are not limited to:

- a. Parking spillover onto adjacent residential streets, especially on weekends, which is impacting residents who live closest to the park. Proximity of the area to the reserves exacerbates this issue.
- b. Increased traffic over the years on Forrestal, Trump National Drive, and PVDS. Making a left turn from Forrestal onto PVDS can be very dangerous, especially during rush hours, weekends, during soccer season, etc.
- c. Existing organized groups (adult men's soccer) taking over the field area on Sunday mornings, despite City assurances this would be stopped.
- d. Security issues and criminal activity in and around the community center.

I would like to submit that you consider dividing this project into two phases. Phase 1 would involve solving some of the current issues of traffic, parking, usage, and security. After Phase 1 is complete, some analysis could be done and then a Phase 2 discussed. This second phase would focus more on new facilities and surrounding landscaping.

This would seem to be a much more prudent approach to this site.

For phase 1, here are some suggestions:

1. Go ahead a red stripe the curbs on Forrestal as proposed in the latest "plan" presented by Parks staff.
2. Proceed with adding a second gate above the current gate across Forrestal, and adding parking spaces equal to those lost by red striping.

3. Work with residents on Pirate, Sea Raven, and Phantom to develop restricted parking in front of their homes. How this would be implemented should be closely coordinated with the actual residents that would be immediately impacted (i.e. those living on those streets).
4. Work with all user groups having locks on the gates, and the security company, to develop a rock solid plan on consistent locking of the gates, then implement the plan and monitor closely (this has been an ongoing and recurring problem for several years now).
5. Improve security at the existing facility by adding cameras and by having sheriffs do more drive thru patrols
6. When larger groups are using the area (i.e. AYSO, city sponsored events, etc.) and the upper gates are open to accommodate more vehicles, develop a plan for traffic control during those times and implement it.
7. Enforce current rules regarding large, organized groups taking over facilities (especially those who are doing so on a regular basis).
8. Consider relocation of the Pirate trailhead to be further away from residences, and closer to parking spaces identified in item #2 above. Groups of hikers often congregate right at the trailhead and make significant noise that can be heard by residents. While moving the trailhead further up Forrestal will not completely eliminate this issue, it should be a big help.
9. Develop a solution for the left turn from Forrestal onto PVDS. This will likely be the most difficult item to solve, as there are many factors entering into this and many, many varied opinions on how to solve the issue. However, it is my contention that the city cannot keep "punting" any action on this. Does someone need to be killed while making the left turn out of Forrestal or Trump National to get the city to take action? I certainly hope not.

Items 1 thru 8 above could be implemented relatively quickly and with relatively small cost, and data collected. If any are not working and need refinement, that could again be done with minimal relative cost.

Item 9 is admittedly much more involved, but that is not a good reason to ignore it. This issue has been discussed for many years now with no action taken to date.

Once these items have been implemented (i.e. Phase 1 completed), the City would then be in a much better position of determine the best plans for the community center itself (Phase 2).

It is worth noting that, in the meeting last week, staff presented some comparisons of the Ladera Linda facility to Hesse Park, Ryan Park, and the PVIC. However, there is at least one major difference between Ladera Linda and these other three. Hesse Park, Ryan Park, and PVIC are all located on a major 4 lane street, with easy access and traffic patterns. Ladera Linda, on the other hand, is located in a residential area. The closest "main road" is PVDS, although keep in mind that PVDS is only a two lane street from the board of San Pedro all the way to Abalone Cove with no stop signs or traffic signals in that stretch. The physical location and access to/from Ladera Linda makes it a significantly more challenging location.

While I know some of the items I address in this letter are beyond the scope for the Parks and Recreation Department, they are not beyond the scope of the City Council. I believe the City Council should be recognizing the serious existing concerns and having various city departments working together to solve the phase 1 issues I have identified before a second phase buildout of a new community center.

Thank you for your consideration

Gary Randall