



Vision Plan

Rancho Palos Verdes Coast

Issues Summary from Public Comment

This Vision Plan Issues Summary has been generated based on a compilation and analysis of the public comments captured at the November 10, 2007 RPV Coast Vision Plan workshop/City Council meeting. In addition to the comments collected and recorded at the meeting itself, other letters and email correspondence were received by the City Council and City staff between November 10 and December 14, 2007, and have been included in this analysis and summary as well.

In summary, 103 comment statements were captured by people speaking at the November 10, 2007 workshop on the Vision Plan or providing written comments during the comment period following it. (Note that some people spoke multiple times or spoke as well as provided written comments.) Because individuals addressed multiple key sites or vision plan issues, their comments were further broken down, pulled apart and analyzed by each key issue being raised. The following table provides a summary of the number of issues expressed relating to each key site, as well as the number of issues expressed that were general, or about the Vision Plan design guidance material, or expressing new ideas relating to the Vision Plan. The table also breaks down the number of issues that were expressed in support of, or opposed to, the Vision Plan proposals, those that were conditional, indicating support if changes were made, and those that expressed specific concerns or incorporated suggestions.

Comment Categories

- KEY SITES**
- Upper Point Vicente
- Lower Point Vicente
- Abalone Cove
- Gateway Park
- Del Cerro Park
- DESIGN GUIDANCE**
- NEW IDEAS**
- GENERAL/MISC.**

Topic Area	Position and Number of Issues				
	Support	Oppose	Conditional	Specific Concern/ Suggestion	TOTAL
Upper Pt. Vicente Concept Plan	--	2	--	5	7
Lower Pt. Vicente Concept Plan	35	16	5	4	60
Abalone Cove Concept Plan	--	1	--	3	4
Gateway Park Concept Plan	2	1	3	2	8
Del Cerro Park Concept Plan	1	--	1	7	9
General Comment	5	1	--	7	13
Design Guidance	--	--	1	3	4
New Ideas	--	--	--	13	13
OVERALL TOTAL	43	21	10	44	118

As the table above indicates, 118 issues were studied in this process. Of these, 43 were in support of proposals in the plan, 21 expressed opposition to proposals in the plan, 10 expressed conditional support for proposals, and the majority of the comments, 44 in all, made specific suggestions about changes to proposals or indicated concerns about specific elements within the Plan proposals. The matrix on the following pages includes only the issues expressing opposition to Vision Plan proposals, those conditionally opposed to proposals, or those making suggestions or adding new ideas to consider in the Plan. Responses to the comments, together with recommendations (highlighted in yellow) for Vision Plan changes or refinements are included in the matrix as well.

Note that those entries included in this matrix that are considerably shortened from the text provided by the commenter are indicated with a *. A full public comment record is available for those interested in reviewing all of the comments submitted, including those in support of Vision Plan concepts and proposals. Also note that responses to issues on this matrix may refer to "VS" or "G" statements, followed by numbers. These references are to specific Vision Statements or Goals developed for the Vision Plan, and are compiled in a separate document also part of this response to comments package.

Issue

Response/Recommendation

KEY SITES

Upper Point Vicente

<p>1 In opposition to the conceptual plan for the Upper Pt. Vicente site; concerns with buildings and parking lots on prime open space area, lack of an astronomical observatory, band shell and size of the Village Green.</p>	<p>RESPONSE: Specifically, the goals for the Upper Pt. Vicente site direct that a range of uses will be accommodated, including the Palos Verdes Art Center, a City Hall, a pool/gymnasium complex, a village green (shown in the conceptual plan at 200' x 400' in size) centralized parking, and an amphitheater. These uses were selected based on public input at three public workshops conducted during the development phase of the Vision Plan. While specific uses, such as an astronomical observatory or others were not understood to be part of the program of uses for the site, and therefore are not called out on the concept plan, these could be incorporated in a community/recreation facility developed on the site. Further, though this site is one of three within the Vision Plan identified to accommodate new public uses, the vision statement and goals developed for this Plan, as well as the design guidance material, clearly recommend open space and view preservation within the RPV Coast, as well as context sensitive building and site design. Part One of the Design Guidance prepared as part of the Vision Plan addresses sensitive site and building design as well. Also, see specifically VS1, VS3, VS7, VS11; G7- G11; G17; G24. Construction of all or part of the Plan will require Planning Department review and approval of entitlements such as conditional use permits.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The concept design for the Upper Pt. Vicente site shall be further refined to depict both a short term and a long term scenario for the use of the site. While in the short term financial limitations may dictate surface parking continue on the site in order to serve an interim reconfiguration of uses, a long term scenario will describe consolidated and covered/structured parking as a solution, together with the relocation of the City maintenance yard off this site. Further, the City should initiate a formal master plan of the site, which would include creating a space program to serve a range of possible uses, and parking needs analysis, and utilize the study of utility constraints that is presently being undertaken for the site.</p>	<p>Sunshine</p>
<p>2 Overall design too crowded and did not leave enough open space. How is City going to implement? Would like to see a decent City Hall before any of these items are added; how about using the Coast Guard site as new City Hall site? What will happen to the Studio or the PVNet trailer? Is there an area for Emergency Preparedness Team? How smart is it to put a swimming pool on the down slope of a slippage area; why put gym and pool on one of the best view areas? - tuck them back towards the road. There needs to be more open space available; do not think grassy amphitheater area is a good idea - who will maintain? Where will Walk on the Wild Side and 4th of July celebrations take place? What about parking? What's going on large dirt lot used for event overflow parking? Why not move all or part of City's maintenance yard to Eastview Park?</p>	<p>RESPONSE: See response above. Also note that outdoor community festivals could be accommodated on the Village Green envisioned on the site. Certainly a community facility/pool complex developed on the site would be sited an appropriate distance away from the bluff edge, but should also take advantage of the views the site features. Furthermore, the proposed improvements will require review and approval by the Planning Department, Building and Safety, the City Geologist, and the City decision makers. Multiple community users, from arts, cultural and recreation groups, to cable TV services, to non-profits and the like could be accommodated in a facility such as this. At present, the Coast Guard site at the Pt. Vicente Lighthouse is not in City jurisdiction, so cannot be considered for a City Hall complex. The Plan will be implemented over many years and will likely require funding via public/private partnerships to accomplish.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: See recommendation above.</p>	<p>Betty Riedman</p>
<p>3 I advocate an unobtrusive approach to building on the Upper Pt. Vicente site.</p>	<p>See response to comment #1 above.</p>	<p>Barbara Sattler</p>
<p>4 Please restore the astronomical observatory to the UPV vision plan as it was in the preliminary vision plan. If not at UPV site, at some other favorable site. RPV is in a unique position to further study/appreciation of the night sky and science of astronomy due to its location and geographic assets. The So. Bay Astronomical Society envisions an observatory as furthering the educational outreach programs it has undertook for the past 10 years with school children and the public at large.</p>	<p>See response to comment #1 above.</p>	<p>Joseph Fierstein</p>
<p>5 At the Villa Capri Complex we can hear all noise around City Hall. Please take into consideration how development of UPV will affect nearby residents in terms of noise. Look at how architectural design and hours of operation can help mitigate noise.</p>	<p>RESPONSE: Specifically refer to the guidance in the Vision Statement associated with the Plan, as well as G24. Proposed improvements will require planning review, at which time, impacts to surrounding properties, such as, but not limited to, noise and hours of operation, will be addressed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: A section addressing noise control in the Vision Plan area can be added to the Design Guidance. Any project approved on this site in the future would be guided by appropriate conditions of approval relating to limiting noise impacts.</p>	<p>Rowland Driskell</p>
<p>6 Build pool big enough for swim meets.</p>	<p>RESPONSE: The pool facility shown as part of the Upper Pt. Vicente concept plan is envisioned and sized to accommodate competitive athletic events, though this would not preclude community recreational use.</p>	<p>[no name given]</p>

Issue

Response/Recommendation

<p>7 In the developed areas of Upper Point Vicente, construction should be limited to the City Offices, the Nike Site Art Center and an amphitheater nestled into the slopes. Surfaces of parking areas for celebrations and events should be permeable. Hard surfaces should be kept to a minimum. The developable area may provide picnic grounds, a kiddies playground, ball fields, view points and other recreational features. A dog field, gym and pool, are not appropriate here. Palos Verdes High School is in need of a pool. Perhaps with financial help from RPV, something could be done in cooperation with the School System, to provide a pool for school use and public use after school hours and on weekends. The non-developable areas must remain untouched as wild-life habitat and rugged trails for nature study and hiking.</p>	<p>RESPONSE: See response to items 1 and 2 above. Also note that in an interim condition in which additional surface parking was constructed on this site, it is recommended that permeable surfaces would be used to the extent feasible and that other stormwater best management practices would be employed in parking areas as well. No dog park, nor ball fields are included in the concept design for this site. The non-developed area of the site, as called out in the NCCP Preserve, is to remain in its natural condition, with trail connections linking it to this site, and the rest of the RPV Coast.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: See recommendation relating to item 1 above.</p>	<p>William Tolliffe</p>
<p>Lower Point Vicente</p>		
<p>8 In favor of Animal Care facility in our neighborhood. There aren't enough animal hospitals on the Peninsula and a local facility would enhance adoption and pet ownership. An adoption center would attract residents to adopt companion animals; people adopt if it is convenient and easy for them. We can set an example for other facilities and take the burden off Carson Shelter and LA Animal Services in San Pedro. Perhaps accommodate all of the Peninsula animals, including wildlife such as raccoons, at proposed Animal Care facility?</p>	<p>RESPONSE: <u>Native wildlife and native planting</u> – The Annenberg facility will focus both on companion animals and indigenous animals of the Peninsula. Educational exhibit space both inside and outside the building will provide information about both groups, and the relationships between them and human populations. Any landscaping done as part of the site design will be native and coastal in character, not comprised of manicured turf or exotic plants.</p>	<p>Laureen Kocsis</p>
<p>9 Asked that a wildlife rehabilitation center or at least a receiving center be included in the Vision Plan, and that public education be included regarding the coexistence of domestic animals and wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Connection with local wildlife rehabilitation and rescue groups</u> – Facility will accommodate the drop off of indigenous wildlife in emergency situations, though it will not accommodate wildlife rehabilitation on site.</p>	<p>Lynn Petak</p>
<p>10 Like the idea of the Animal Care Center - will compliment the mission of PVIC - but should not usurp that of PVIC. The educational components should enhance those of PVIC not compete with them. Use only native plants, not sod or large trees. Where will Whale of a Day be held? Concerned that the proposed parking will focus on Animal Care Center and not PVIC. Will incessant barking of dogs disrupt peace and tranquility? Will animals be housed inside at night? Would like to see a drop-off or holding area for injured wildlife and work with various organizations that care for and rehabilitate these animals. Animal Care Center is a very large building - there appears to be a large greenbelt between proposed center and PV Drive West. Could it be moved further towards road so not in such close proximity to PVIC? In present configuration, it overshadows PVIC.</p>	<p><u>Size of facility and relationship to PVIC, program for outdoor areas</u> – In order to accommodate the following uses, the program for the Annenberg facility is presently envisioned as requiring a structure of roughly 30,000 sf, on two levels, with a footprint of roughly 15,000 sf. If the existing 10,000 sf of PVIC is included together with the proposed 15,000 sf footprint of the Annenberg facility, this results in a roughly 2.6% lot coverage. Indoor uses to be included are: museum quality educational exhibit areas drawing community and school visitors, multipurpose classroom spaces for community, professional, and school groups, space for limited companion animal care and socialization, as well as a multipurpose theatre space which could be used for learning both on site and long distance, via video conferencing and weblinking, and community and civic events and meetings. Outdoor program areas to be included are: companion animal socialization/demonstration area for supervised activities, outdoor gathering and seating in a promenade and plaza spaces, outdoor history museum exhibit areas (as envisioned by the PVIC documents) including Tongva village, geology display, interactive archaeology exhibit, dry farming/water wise landscaping demonstration, as well as an exhibit focusing on the ecology of the Peninsula and the continuum of marine, coastal, blufftop and terrestrial life within it. Whale of a Day and other events can easily be accommodated in the spacious promenade and plaza areas connecting PVIC and the Annenberg facility.</p>	<p>Betty Riedman</p>
<p>11 I support an animal care center and its educational value, but do not agree with the proposed location for the facility.</p>		<p>Jim Knight</p>
<p>12 The Companion Animal Center could be located at Upper Pt. Vicente</p>		<p>Joan Kelly</p>
<p>13 Support shift towards wild life and education because that links much better with nearby sites. Reduce square footage of Animal Care to 10,000 sf. Why does it need to be 25,000 sf!</p>		<p>[no name given]</p>
<p>14 Reported that in the recent past the Open Space Task Force and the City Council rejected a proposal to place a Girl's Softball Field in Lower Point Vicente because it was not a passive use of the property. Opined that the current proposal for the Companion Animal Center was not a passive use and requested that the Council carefully consider the retention of raw nature and open space.</p>	<p><u>Right facility/Wrong site</u> – The vision and goals developed for the RPV Coast Vision Plan identify the Lower Pt. Vicente site as an interpretive, educational, learning and community hub linking significant open space areas within the City. This is consistent with the City's Coastal Specific Plan, which identifies this area of the coast as an attractor/generator, given that the uses in this area and have been predominantly public-serving or publicly accessible (see Page S2-1 of the City's Coastal Specific Plan.) The program and mission of the Annenberg facility are entirely consistent with this, and the concept plan suggests weaving the new facility together with the existing Interpretive Center, so that the site design for PVIC is completed, and the infrastructure and amenities for both are consistent, high quality, and context sensitive. The Upper Pt. Vicente site, which has been suggested as an alternative location for the facility, is identified in the Vision Plan as the civic and cultural heart of the community, emphasizing arts and community uses and activities.</p>	<p>Lynn Swank</p>

[continued on next page]

Issue

Response/Recommendation

15	In opposition to the Companion Animal Center.		Ruth Hattersley
16	The community has not asked for the Companion Animal Center; it belongs at another site, not Lower Pt. Vicente, which should be preserved as open space.		
17	The coastal area is not the right place for the Companion Animal Center.		Alfred Sattler
18	Keep the land around the PVIC in a natural state with walking trails; an Indian gathering place would be more in keeping with the Peninsula-oriented educational aspect of the area. The PVIC area is not the place for an adoption center.		Stephanie Brito
19	Preserve our most valuable ocean front park and museum property and locate proposed Annenberg facility at a place other than Lower Point Vicente. Preserve the little open space we do have. People love our small museum because of its beautiful, peaceful setting and because it does not overwhelm the senses with too much information. Homeless pets do not appreciate ocean views, whale watching and tranquil setting, but people do. Be patient and wait for other donors who do not want to use land for their own pet projects and make Lower Point Vicente into a concrete jungle. Annenberg proposals are well done but use them in a place other than Lower Point Vicente.		Helen Gorey
20	At Lower Point Vicente, the Interpretive Center and surrounding picnic area provide an informative and enjoyable way to learn of the history and natural elements of the Peninsula. Plants and wildlife must be the emphasis in the non-developable area. The idea of a Companion Animal Center is contrary to habitat preservation.		William Tolliffe
21	Companion Animal Facility appears to be a world-class facility and tremendous asset, but disappointed that designers did not consider any other location for the facility other than Lower Point Vicente. The land proposed for the building site is some of our last undeveloped, precious coastal land. Visitors to the PVIC remark on spacious, peaceful setting beside the ocean. Animal Care facility would use most of the remaining open land and greatly increase noise and activity level of the area. Other Los Serenos docents agree. Another site for the Companion Animal Facility would be more desirable, perhaps at Upper Point Vicente if designs are modified. UPV provides spectacular views for visitors and would be a fitting location for the Annenberg Companion Animal Facility. There are many of us in RPV that would very much like to have the facility available to the community.		"Juned," Los Serenos docent
22	* The proposed Companion Animal Center is inappropriate for this location, LPV. Vital that we preserve what little undeveloped coastline remains. The Annenberg facility would be inconsistent with the Los Serenos docents' plans for minimal improvements to the site, such as outdoor historical exhibits, would be nearly twice the size of the current museum, and with attendant parking lot, impact the natural environment of this location. Although the generosity of Annenberg Foundation for undeveloped land acquisition and vision planning is commendable, as are the goals of the Companion Animal Center, I'm sure there are other more appropriate locations for the Center to be built. We should be patient; there are other foundations willing to promote the PVIC mission of natural history education without inappropriate conditions, I.e. the recent donation of \$180,000 to PVIC from the El-Hefni Foundation. Urge City Council to preserve this most valuable ocean front site and not permit any further major building construction at LPV.		George Neuner
23	LPV is the jewel that everyone calls it because of its location and the open land where people can enjoy the scenery, take walks, even over the bridge (thanks to RPV) picnic, and enjoy the outdoors. More buildings are not needed and would make LPV a trashed jewel. Agree with George Neuner in his comments. Annenbergs should purchase commercial land for the dog place.		Emily Reeves
24	Although admirable in design, the proposed pet rescue center is not an appropriate addition to the LPV site. The site was designated for open space by the City with the exception of the PVIC. Note the proposal for girls' softball a year ago was turned down because it was not a passive activity. Feedback from the public indicates they like it that way...any additional buildings would detract from PVIC.		Beryl Tilley
25	Not in support of the Annenberg proposal, however well intentioned it may be, as it overwhelms existing efforts and PVIC. Let's wait for a more generous donor or proposal that's truly in line with what we're about: open space to see whales; green flashes; sunsets; stars; natural plants, all with the necessary but hopefully minimized impact of explanatory exhibits. We are not about developing Point Vicente.		Derek Wallentinsen
		<p><u>Nature, loss of open space</u> – The Annenberg facility will add 30,000 sf of developed, indoor space at this over 20 acre (or 950,000 sf) site. The facility is intended to be a green building; LEED gold rating will be sought, and sited in such a way that it is visually unobtrusive and integrated into the site. It is even conceived as featuring a green roof planted with appropriate native materials. The outdoor spaces envisioned will complete the PVIC phase III design, as well as complement the Annenberg facility, and will be constructed in a sustainable fashion using local and recycled materials, permeable surfaces, and native plant materials. Any site lighting will be dark skies compliant. Further, the site design envisions employing best management practices for stormwater management which may even improve the condition and function of the existing drainage channel on the northern edge of the site, reduce flow through to the ocean, and at the same time improve the habitat value of the site.</p>	
		<p><u>The Concept Plan conflicts with NCCP and precludes a wildlife corridor which was "left out" of the Preserve</u> - The open space preserve now in existence in the City of RPV is the result of a collaborative effort between the City and the PVPLC, as well as the generosity of private donors. A Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) was developed as the foundation for the preserve design, which is scientifically based, and has been developed and approved in order to preserve an identified list of endangered plants and animals. Most of Lower Point Vicente (except for the coastal bluffs) was purposely left out of the Preserve. The Resource Agencies have approved the City's Preserve design as a sufficient wildlife corridor as provided with the current design for Lower Point Vicente. No wildlife corridors required to meet the preserve design requirements were therefore left out of the plan design. Development at the Lower Pt. Vicente site is not in conflict with the NCCP as the site is outside the preserve, and site design will be rooted in sustainable principles. The Lower Pt. Vicente conceptual site design, as presented, including the Annenberg facility, provides the desirable trail connections across the bluff from Ocean Front Estates to the north, through the Lighthouse site to the south, and across PV Drive to the preserve areas landward on the slopes below the Upper Pt Vicente site.</p>	
		<p><u>Active vs. Passive Open Space</u> – The Lower Pt. Vicente site is zoned Open Space – Recreational. According to the City's zoning code (chapter 17.34), various recreational uses, which can be considered "active" or "passive" are allowed with approval of the appropriate discretionary permits. The City's zoning code defines "Active Recreation" as "outdoor recreation activities that are structured in nature and/or organized such as team sports, golf, tennis, etc." and defines "Passive Recreation" as "outdoor recreation activities that are nonstructured in nature such as picnicking, sightseeing, nature study area, etc." In January of 2004, the City Council decided that Lower Point Vicente should not be used for an active recreational use such as softball and instead should be used for passive park uses. The City's General Plan land use map identifies the land use for Lower Point Vicente as "Passive Recreational". The General Plan defines "Passive Recreation" as "outdoor recreation activities that are non-structured in nature (picnicking, sightseeing, nature study areas, etc.)". Clearly, the existing and recently expanded Pt Vicente Interpretive Center has been judged consistent with this land use designation, though it is comprised of a sizable structure that attracts and educates visitors daily. The Annenberg facility, sharing many of the same attributes as the PVIC, should fall into the same category.</p>	
		<p>RECOMMENDATION: The Annenberg Foundation should forge strong connections and relationships with local wildlife rescue and rehabilitation groups which already have recognition and support in the community, such as the South Bay Wildlife Rehab group. These groups should participate in the further refinement and advancement of the Annenberg facility and Lower Pt. Vicente site design, as must City staff and the PVIC docents. The name of the Annenberg facility should reflect its community educational mission. [see text above]</p>	

Issue

Response/Recommendation

26	<p>Against putting Companion Animal Center at LPV. PVIC is a quiet area and whale watching center. Proposed facility is more than twice as large as PVIC and will dwarf and overshadow PVIC as well as dominate the area making museum and whale watching secondary. Would be able to see manicured planting, paved parking lots, buildings, and non native trees and things that don't belong. We need wild areas that are not built up - wild animals and birds need habitat for hunting and a place to live. Would be much better located near Angel's Gate near the Marine Mammal Center or somewhere else. People from other areas would see this animal companion center in all its luxury and would think that the rich people on the hill, the City, and the City Council care more about the dogs and cats than they do the visitors, children and habitat. Once open space by the cliffs is gone it can not be replaced.</p>	[see text above]	Yvetta Williams
27	<p>The Annenberg proposal for Lower Point Vicente does not fit for two reasons: the size and the lack of strong educational components. It would consume much of the free, open and natural space. Education is PVIC's primary mission focusing on history, geology, marine and land animals and plant life on the Peninsula. Suggest that Companion Animal Center be only a small part of a much stronger educational offering that would enrich and complement the original intent of the property and existing PVIC. Strength could be gained in the inclusion of issues that affect all the diverse creatures that live on the Peninsula. Inclusion of live species would be immensely popular, as well as a connection with the local Wildlife Rehabilitation Group.</p>		Jo Woods
28	<p>Voiced concern with modification of indigenous animal behavior, over-development on the Peninsula, loss of open space, and liability issues if the animals in the Companion Animal Center cause injury.</p>		Beverly Ackerson
29	<p>Needs balance; not clear if the pet center speaks to the uniqueness of the peninsula; it would dwarf the truly unique interpretive center; focus of pet center is not on people or serving the broadest possible population; a campground here would serve a much larger RPV population than an equestrian center; an astronomical observatory would take advantage of our unique site.</p>		Diane Hayden
30	<p>* <u>Coastal Experience</u> Companion Animal Center is a wonderful idea but not appropriate for the Lower Point Vicente area and does not fit into the coastal experience for one visiting this site. Lower Point Vicente should be a unified coastal experience; vision should include: marine, geological, indigenous flora/fauna, and historical elements. Should also include wildlife corridor. <u>NCCP</u> Even though LPV is not included in NCCP it is important as a wildlife corridor. CAC could permanently rule out such a connection. <u>City Guidelines</u> General Plan and Coastal Specific Plan support natural coast experience. [<i>Sites several policy guidelines from Coastal Specific Plan Natural Environment and Agriculture Element</i>] <u>Coastal Commission</u> Coastal Commission also has regulations that take sensitive species/habitat into account [<i>Sites sections from Article 5 - Land Resources</i>] <u>Vision Plan</u> Regarding Meléndrez conceptual plan drawing for Lower Point Vicente, it shows the Companion Animal Center as taking up most of the Lower Point Vicente acreage and dwarfs the PVIC which really should be the focal point of the site. It does not include or leave room for many components such as the Docents' Plan or habitat corridor. The Animal Care Center at LPV went from a possibility, to an alternative, to being the plan throughout the workshop process; it's not clear from staff report where a majority of public input drove the plan in this direction. The Animal Care Center could be incorporated into the new Civic Center Vision Plan. Illustration 5-47 of the Vision Plan shows area such as section E that could accommodate the Center and this location should be presented as one alternative to the Plan. <u>Full Evaluation</u> A full evaluation of the coastal experience and wildlife corridor enhancement on LPV and inclusion of NCCP, City and Coastal Commission guidelines needs to be a part of this Coastal Vision Plan. Important to address these issues now before moving on with approval of the vision plan; even though conceptual, it nonetheless begins to create a life of its own as it moves along the approval process & people get attached to it.</p>		Jim Knight
31	<p>* A California Fish and Game or qualified biologist should be consulted for a science-based decision as to habitat/wildlife corridor value at LPV. The LPV area was left out of prior analysis (NCCP) and now is the time, since the City now owns the land, to explore with the experts the habitat/corridor value of LPV. Restoration of Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS) for a strip of land along the northern section of LPV would restore a vital and previously determined wildlife corridor. If all of the proposed structures are built at LPV, it might preclude a continuous wildlife corridor. However, hiking trails/educational opportunities, habitat and wildlife corridors can coexist. This approach is also consistent with our General and Coastal Specific Plans. Also, habitat restoration adds to coastal experience by preserving natural open space, one of the treasures of our City.</p>		Jim Knight
32	<p>Expressed concern with the Companion Animal Center proposal and the obligation implied by accepting a grant from the Annenberg Foundation. Opined that the project belongs at another site, not Lower Pt Vicente which should be preserved as open space.</p>		Barbara Sattler

Issue

Response/Recommendation

Abalone Cove

33 Abalone Cove should not be changed. Keep the existing trail natural. The rugged trail provides a sense of adventure and is more of a nature experience. To make the trail wheelchair accessible would defeat its appeal. The tide pools are not wheelchair accessible but if feasible, a permit system could be arranged for shuttle access to transport the handicapped to the shore.

RESPONSE: The concept design presented for Abalone Cove describes minimal change to the site, including only adding an ADA accessible trail looping the top of the bluff area, adding an overlook, selectively replanting the site with native vegetation, and adding shade for the picnic area at the site. Signage marking trail connections and/or beach access is also a part of this concept. Further, interpretive signage could also be added at this location, though given that the roadway pull out/parking area and signage are already located here, this is not a likely high priority. No change is contemplated relating to the trail from the bluff to the ocean.

William Tolliffe

34 Abalone Cove and open space areas in the Portuguese Bend Nature Preserve need time to heal from bike use.

RESPONSE: Access to and use of the trail system in the Preserve is a matter for the PUMP Committee and ultimately the City Council to decide..

Joan Kelly

35 Supports the use of native plants in the Abalone Cove area and suggests signage for the tide pool areas.

See response to Item 33 and Vision Plan goals for Abalone Cove Key Site.

Betty Riedman

36 Would like to see mostly native plants, large PV stone boulders and paths. Can not have sod because it has to be watered and cliffs will eventually slump off. How about gazebo or structure for picnics? Use rubber mulch made from old tires as it is much heavier and will not blow off or change color. Do not wish to see a public road to the shoreline as it will endanger the Abalone Cove tide pools.

See response to Item 33 and Vision Plan goals for Abalone Cove Key Site.

Betty Riedman

Gateway Park

37 Could be a parking problem as people will utilize the lots for activities other than to use the Park. Who will pay for maintenance and upkeep? Terrific that there will be equestrian uses; perhaps other cities with horses could contribute to the maintenance.

RESPONSE: Parking to serve both the identified equestrian park and the gateway park uses as been considered in the concept design for this site. Parking is envisioned as integrated both into the site itself and located in flat areas which are within the site's boundaries but located adjacent to PV drive outside the entrance to the site. Maintenance and upkeep for the equestrian park will be provided by the equestrians themselves. Since the outdoor education and interpretive uses are not yet designed or funded, the maintenance entity for those elements is not yet identified. Any development that would occur on this site in the future would require detailed site design plans and design review and permitting by the City. During this process critical design and operational details would be resolved.
RECOMMENDATION: Authorize the Equestrian Committee, or other City Council approved sub-committees, to proceed into detailed design of the equestrian park portion of the site once the Vision Plan concept is approved, so that design and operational details can be resolved. City Planning and Parks and Recreation staff should be part of this design process to ensure that the gateway park uses envisioned at the site as well are not compromised by the equestrian users, and that adequate parking and support facilities can be accommodated for all future uses.

Betty Riedman

38 Councilman Wolowicz asked about parking and circulation of traffic at the Gateway Park site and inquired if there would be too much at the site with the portal and Equestrian Center.

See response and recommendation above.

Councilman Wolowicz

39 Councilman Clark spoke in support of the proposal and asked about the geological instability of the land; whether the educational center on the site was to be a portable structure; if the educational component would include information about the history of the Peninsula; and, the potential need for enforcement and rangers in the Portuguese Bend Nature Preserve and surrounding areas.

RESPONSE: Given that the site is located within the City's landslide moratorium area, its geological instability is a design constraint for any use considered here. Any facilities located on the site would be temporary and portable and would comply with City regulations for building in this area. The design guidance portion of the Plan identifies educational or interpretive themes for each of the key sites, as well as the amenity areas identified within the Rancho Palos Verdes Coast areas considered within the Vision Plan. Since this site is identified as the gateway to the preserve, the preserve itself, the ecosystems of the preserve and the natural environment of the Peninsula are the identified themes at this site.

Councilman Clark

RECOMMENDATION: As the detailed design of the Gateway Park elements of this key site concept design proceeds, ensure that future additional impacts on the Preserve itself, due to the enhanced access to it provided at this site, is considered and plans for mitigation (including ranger patrol or the like) are included.

Issue

Response/Recommendation

<p>40 A portal is important; equestrian facility good idea; keeps area focused on our rural heritage; is consistent with appropriate use of surrounding trails; Youth Camp a good idea if low-impact; bicycle park is a bad idea because it's such a high-impact use that will put surrounding hills, habitat and other users in a marginalized position.</p>	<p>RESPONSE: The outdoor education area envisioned at the Gateway Park may be an area where indoor and outdoor education facilities, such as classroom space in a movable building, or a shade structure with tables outdoors, on the upper shelf at the southern end of the site, could be used by scouts or other youth groups.. Overnight camping is currently permitted in the City (through an approvals issued by Parks and Recreation) at Upper Point Vicente and Ladera Linda. RECOMMENDATION: The City should continue to consider and approve requests for overnight camping at existing, approved locations within the City.</p>	<p>[no name given]</p>
<p>41 Gateway Park, proposed as an equestrian center, would intrude into the Preserve and is not needed since there are established equestrian facilities on the Peninsula. The Gateway site could be more suitably named "Preserve Gateway" and would be ideal for a scout facility which could feature camping, hiking, and orienteering with the Klondike, Portuguese Bend and Forrestal Preserves. There is parking alongside PVDS, while a small primitive campground could be formed with little disturbance of habitat. The site, being natural and primitive, would provide a camping adventure and opportunity for youth to have an outdoor experience while not too far from home. Scouts would learn consideration for habitat and wildlife, leaving only footprints and packing out their gear, litter and waste.</p>	<p>RESPONSE: The equestrian uses proposed at the Gateway Park key site are located within the boundaries of this site, which are outside the boundaries of the Preserve. The gateway park area is purposely excluded from the Preserve to allow uses and activities described in the Vision Plan. The Resource Agencies approved the design that excludes the Gateway Park. These proposed uses would therefore not intrude into the Preserve. R.e. the proposed scout uses, see the response and recommendation above.</p>	<p>William Tolliffe</p>
<p>42 Voiced concern with extreme bikers' use of the Gateway Park site.</p>	<p>RESPONSE: Extreme biking uses are not incorporated into the concept design for the Gateway Park key site.</p>	<p>Al Edgerton</p>
<p>Del Cerro Park</p>		
<p>43 Del Cerro Park as a donor recognition site should be kept simple with a permeable parking area, a bluff top fence and an adequate pathway to the view overlook. PV stone should be used for a recognition wall (see Wayfarer's Chapel and its roadside wall on PVDS for examples of PV stonework).</p>	<p>RESPONSE: This PVPLC donor recognition site at Del Cerro Park was conceptually approved by the City Council in concert with the approval of the Preserve itself. The existing parking lot at the Park (which is not permeable) is intended to remain, but be upgraded to accommodate ADA access. The pathway from the parking area up to the Donor Recognition overlook will begin at the "coastal" end of the parking area, and end at the overlook at the top of the bluff. Neither the pathway, nor the entry signage introducing the Conservancy and the overlook at the start of the path will intrude on the open play area of the park. The pathway location has been dictated by the constraints of the site's grades, and the need to ensure ADA accessibility. Instead of providing a loop trail, in an initial phase of construction, a single 5' wide path up to and back from the overlook will be provided. One overlook will be constructed, in the vicinity of the bench already existing at the overlook. Overlook walls will be 36" high or less, with integrated signage, and the two walls themselves have been shortened to roughly 20' in length. Bench seating clad with PV stone, and PV stone banding will be used in the overlook as well. The design does not incorporate lighting or planting. The initial overlook, and any second overlook and trail extension which may be added in the future, will be sited in order to avoid conflicting with the landing zone required by the silent flyers as is feasible. RECOMMENDATION: Include a revised concept plan for the Del Cerro site, incorporating the changes described, in the Vision Plan. City and PVPLC staff should continue to keep open channels of communication with residents and other stakeholders as the final design for this overlook is developed.</p>	<p>William Tolliffe</p>
<p>44 Reported that the site was currently used by the Peninsula Silent Flyers Club and outlined the Club's efforts with the Land Conservancy in order to accommodate the utilization of the park site for their continued activities.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>John Spielman</p>
<p>45 Voiced concern with the increasing uses of Del Cerro Park, the size and location of the proposed donor recognition site and the related safety and privacy issues.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Iva Hackwell</p>
<p>46 Reported on the history of the park and its intended use as a passive park, with no benches, tables, etc. His concerns included night use of the park; parking related issues; lack of traffic and landscaping studies related to the proposed donor recognition site; the vast scope of the proposed donor recognition site; aircraft safety problems; and the lack of timely response by the Sheriff's Department to reported security issues.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>Thomas Olson</p>

Issue	Response/Recommendation	
<p>47 * Please protect nearby homeowners from safety issues posed by remote control aircraft flown at Del Cerro park. Ironic that the Conservancy is proposing constructing a 1000' long/6' wide pathway with 30' and 24' walls and benches on open space land the Conservancy is ostensibly charged with protecting. Also, our Park Place Homeowners Association was not notified of the two visioning workshops. Two recommendations regarding the donor recognition site: scale back the current proposed concept to alleviate concerns over preservation of open space and safety issues raised by the remote control aircraft; identify alternative construction sites in or near Del Cerro Park, or elsewhere, in order to preserve the passive use integrity of the Park. Alternative sites could be in Del Cerro near the entry on Park Place at Crenshaw Blvd. where the "Park Recognition Site" plaque is located; further down the trail, just past Burrell Lane at the end of Crenshaw Blvd. where the first overlook could offer the same views; at the entrance to acquired land where people could enter; City Hall where there are other recognitions; other sites to be determined and scoped.</p>	See response above.	Tomas Olson
<p>48 1. Maintain integrity of planted grassy area by not cutting through access trails; it is an uninterrupted playing surface used extensively and particularly on the weekends as well as a safer environment for weekend athletes or young soccer players. A change from grass to dedicated trail might pose a safety issue for soccer players and other users of the planted grass area. 2. Consult with the County of LA Department of Fire Services to make sure proposed plan would not have an impact on emergency services, such as use as staging area for brush fires and rescues. 3. Perhaps make donor recognition wall transparent so that it doesn't provide cover for those who want to avoid being noticed.</p>	See response above.	John Girardi
<p>49 Asserted that Del Cerro Park was an outstanding site to view astronomy events and asked for an allowance from the City and neighbors for the site to be used occasionally for nighttime astronomy observations.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION: The City could consider modifying the municipal code to allow controlled nighttime access to public park facilities for a specific use, such as astronomical observation, with City approval.</p>	Al Sattler
<p>50 Council and staff discussed issues related to security problems, the Sheriff Department's response, and potential problems for vandalism at Del Cerro Park. Councilman Clark noted that the proposed donor recognition site at Del Cerro Park was wonderful in concept, but the application would prove to be a challenge.</p>	<p>RESPONSE: Existing security problems associated with the Park should continue to be addressed by the cooperative efforts of the Sheriff Department, the City of Rancho Palos Verdes, and the neighborhood residents.</p>	City Council Meeting Minutes
DESIGN GUIDANCE		
<p>51 Tracy Albrecht, Interpretive Specialist, California Coastal National Monument, Bureau of Land Management/U.S. Department of the Interior, presented informational materials regarding signage design to inform the public about the rocks and reefs off of the coast of Rancho Palos Verdes which are a part of California's national monuments and the goals of the organization.</p>	<p>RESPONSE: Interpretive materials relating to this National Monument are intended to be incorporated to the Fishing Access site, which affords views of monument areas. Educational materials about the Monument are already available at PVIC.</p>	Tracy Albrecht
<p>52 Coordinate the plans for all Peninsula Parks and Preserves maintaining the emphasis on Open Space. PARKS are for Public recreation with playing fields, picnic grounds and other amenities. PRESERVES are for wildlife and habitat with limited access for nature study and adventure hikes. In all cases retain the natural topography, avoid cut and fill and construct buildings only in areas designated developable. For signs and markers, use natural materials such as PV stone, boulders, wood and logs. Use permeable surfacing. Avoid asphalt and concrete. In Preserves keep signs to a minimum in size and quantity, with simple, legible lettering.</p>	<p>RESPONSE: Comments seem to echo values articulated in the Vision Statements, Goals, and Design Guidance for the Plan. Specifically reference VS1-10; G17-24, and Part 1 of the Design Guidance document.</p>	William Tolliffe
<p>53 Vertical road signs are not safe - it's hard to read a sign with vertical printing, especially for visitors. Important to put City's logo on signs. Signage we have now for our parks (particularly Abalone Cove and PVIC) is woefully inadequate. Even if you Google PVIC, you will shoot past it unless you know exactly how to get there.</p>	<p>RESPONSE: The signage concepts included in the Design Guidance materials to be included in the Vision Plan are conceptual at this stage, and will continue to be refined, should a signage program be funded for the Rancho Palos Verdes Coast. Vertical signage is only intended in potential gateway installations, but is not intended for wayfinding signage in which legibility is an issue of paramount importance.</p>	Betty Riedman
<p>54 Palos Verdes stone, stucco and European classic architectural and mission styles preserve the unique quality of Coastal California.</p>	<p>RESPONSE: Comment seems to echo the values and goals articulated in the Plan to date. See the Design Guidance materials in the Plan. Specifically note the suggestions about materials and styles.</p>	[no name given]

Issue

Response/Recommendation

NEW IDEAS

55	Spoke about her efforts towards building an outdoor scout education center and campground and asked the Council to provisionally reserve a space in the Rancho Palos Verdes Coastal Vision Plan for the project.	<p>RESPONSE: Multipurpose rooms which may be developed as part of a community facility at the Upper Pt. Vicente site could be made available for scouts to reserve for meetings. The outdoor education area envisioned at the Gateway Park may be another area where indoor and outdoor education facilities, such as classroom space in a movable building, or a shade structure with tables outdoors, on the upper shelf at the southern end of the site, could be used by scouts. Overnight camping is currently permitted in the City (through an approvals issued by Parks and Recreation) at Upper Point Vicente and Ladera Linda.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The City should continue to consider and approve requests for overnight camping at existing, approved locations within the City.</p>	Diane Hayden
56	Asked that the Rancho Palos Verdes Coastal Vision Plan include an outdoor campground.	See recommendation above.	Shera Domatz-Finkle
57	Mentioned that California Coastwalk has camped at the Ladera Linda Community Center's lower field for several years and suggested that the Girl Scouts consider this location.	RECOMMENDATION: The City should continue to consider and approve requests for overnight camping at existing, approved locations within the City, one of which is Ladera Linda.	Sunshine
58	Asked for the Council's support in the creation of a scout house at Upper Pt. Vicente and camping facilities at Gateway Park.	See recommendations in response to comments 55 and 57 above.	Kathy Johnston
59	Spoke in support of including a scout house at the Upper Pt. Vicente site.	See recommendations in response to comments 55 and 57 above.	Laura Raab
60	Emergency Preparedness: Provide direction to include restricted use scout camping area as these groups have a large impact on community emergency preparedness.	See recommendations in response to comments 55 and 57 above.	Richard K. Smith
61	Youth group/scouts meeting facility is a great idea at UPV; youth could benefit from being this close to nature, govt., gym and pool.	See recommendations in response to comments 55 and 57 above.	[no name given]
62	Please consider Scouting Community Proposal for a multipurpose Environmental Education Center and campground. And provide direction on how our groups can best address the city at the upcoming Vision Plan meeting and Vision Plan process in general, as City planning department has not returned phone calls or emails.	See recommendations in response to comments 55 and 57 above.	Diane Hayden
63	* Peninsula Girl Scouts, Palos Verdes Hills Girl Scouts, and the Los Angeles Area Council and Pacifica District of the Boy Scouts of America propose the development of an environmental education and multipurpose Scout center. Facilities would include: Scout house, group campsite and outdoor recreation activities.	See recommendations in response to comments 55 and 57 above.	Scouts
64	Include scouting facilities in plan. The ability to have permanent facilities and overnight camping opportunities would be a great asset to the youth of the greater South Bay. Scouts will give back to your city by performing many community projects, conservation projects, and other activities.	See recommendations in response to comments 55 and 57 above.	Tom Shortridge
65	Unfortunately late input for Scout Camp does not consider Fire Season on a nature conservatory related area. Local winds easily carry fire embers beyond 1/2 mile on coast. Winds and canyons and natural plan growth make firestorms on PVP likely if campers are allowed.	See recommendations in response to comments 55 and 57 above.	[no name given]
66	Spoke in favor of an astronomical observatory being provided on the Palos Verdes Peninsula.	RESPONSE: Specifically the goals for the Upper Pt. Vicente site direct that a range of uses will be accommodated on the Upper Pt. Vicente site, including the Palos Verdes Art Center, City Hall, a pool/gymnasium complex, a village green (shown in the conceptual plan at 200' x 400' in size) centralized parking and an amphitheater. While specific uses, such as an astronomical observatory were not understood to be part of the program of uses for the site, and therefore are not called out on the concept plan, a use such as this could be incorporated in a a community/recreation facility developed on the site.	Joe Fierstein
67	Coastal Clean Up Project Opportunity Ideas: Remove structure at the end of Pointe Vicente [near Lighthouse and Coast Guard site]; Seek County, State or other funds for coastal beautification to remove rocks and debris dumped by County workers over Hawthorne Boulevard cliff	RESPONSE: The City sponsors annual clean-up days. Grant opportunities could be utilized to conduct more clean-up projects.	Sharon and Jeane Burke

Issue	Response/Recommendation	
GENERAL/MISC.		
68 Well presented, professionally developed plan that is totally disconnected from the history and buildings of the PV Peninsula. Great, but wrong vision.	RESPONSE: Vision, goals and design guidance developed for the Plan call for context sensitive design respectful of both the natural environment and built environment and architectural history of the City of Rancho Palos Verdes.	[no name given]
69 A complete alignment of the California Coastal Trail is not included in the current draft of the Vision Plan. The RPV Coastal Vision Plan should include the whole RPV Coast and show how the three braids of the California Coastal Trail could best get from one end of the City to the other.	RESPONSE: The trails component of the Vision Plan depicts the trail alignments developed by the PUMP Committee for areas within the Preserve, as well as conceptually indicates other trail connections needed to complete the California Coastal Trail, including connection through the Lower Pt. Vicente site, the Lighthouse property, Terra-nea, and the trail connections already constructed through Trump National.	Sunshine
70 Spoke about the Vision Plan in general, voiced concern with preserving the City's open space, and suggested Council's careful consideration of future growth and providing adequate parking for future uses.	RESPONSE: The Vision and Goals developed for this Plan express commitment to open space preservation, limited, context sensitive and sustainable development. Parking is addressed in the concept plans that have been developed for each key site. Specifically, reference: VS1; VS2; VS3; VS4; VS5; G4; G11; G14; G17	Ken Dyda
71 Are we extending our vision to connect to San Pedro, Torrance, Redondo Beach?	RESPONSE: The scope of the Vision Plan is limited to the coastal area of Rancho Palos Verdes.	Diane Hayden
72 Needs a lot of work; move slowly; many good ideas; consider what is most precious about the community - feeling of serenity looking out over natural vegetation, please keep as much of natural vegetation as you can for as long as possible.	RESPONSE: Specifically reference VS1-7	[no name given]
73 The plan does not emphasize the preservation of habitat and open space. Instead, plans for buildings, facilities and amenities intrude into the Preserves. Preserves must remain natural, undisturbed habitat for wildlife and trails.	RESPONSE: With the exception of some directional signage and trail head or overlook improvements, the Vision Plan focuses on lands outside the Preserve.	William Tolliffe
74 Please manage Portuguese Bend Preserve so that all private residents maintain their privacy and private property rights. Many hikers and mountain bikers trespass on our property even though we have signs posted.	RESPONSE: Comment is related to PUMP, not the Vision Plan	Dan and Vicki Pinkham
75 Trojan Water Polo Club is very interested in seeing a pool as part of the RPV Vision Plan. It is extremely important to us that a pool be built that could accommodate both a sports team such as water polo while still providing space for community use. There is currently no pool for local high schools to play CIF games in, and building a pool minimally of CIF regulation size would be a tremendous benefit to the families of RPV.	RESPONSE: The pool facility shown as part of the Upper Pt. Vicente concept plan is envisioned and sized to accommodate competitive athletic events, though this would not preclude community recreational use as well.	Lisa Vavic