

Rancho Palos Verdes

Grandview Park / Lower Hesse Park

Community Workshop #3 - September 25, 2010 - Summary

Overview:

Workshop #3 was held on September 25 at the Fred Hesse Jr. Community Center. The workshop was held from 9 to 11:30 a.m. The format of the workshop was a presentation on both park projects given by both the City representatives and ML+A followed by two break out groups, one for each park site. The sessions were an open format and allowed participants to visit both rooms to review the concepts and provide their input. There were approximately 60 residents in attendance, along with Rancho Palos Verdes staff and ML+A. In attendance from the City of Rancho Palos Verdes were Mayor Stefan Wolowicz, City Manager Carolyn Lehr, Deputy City Manager Carolynn Petru, Administrative Analyst Katie Howe, and Recreation Supervisor Nancie Silver. ML+A were represented by Mia Lehrer, Project Manager Michelle Sullivan, Jan Dyer and Melissa Guerrero. An overview of City Council goals was given by Mayor Wolowicz and a presentation of the park projects and an overview of the concept design process and where we are now in that process was given by City Manager Carolyn Lehr and consultant Principal Mia Lehrer.

The following are comments shared by workshop participants:

Lower Hesse

I. Traffic:

- Do not place speed bumps on Locklenna –though the traffic does need to be slowed down on that street.
- Street parking is an issue – explore issuing permit parking for residents.
- A traffic engineer needs to be involved and needs to look at the number of accidents along Locklenna.

II. Trails:

- The proposed connection to the baseball fields is a good improvement – creates a nice loop.
- When looking at the path connecting to the Upper Hesse Park athletic field to Lower Hesse Park, look at the value of the path versus the cost to be sure it is worth the expense.

III. Programs:

- Of the two plans, the Pacific Plan was the preferred option for the majority of participants.
- There had been an exercise par course in the park previously, and it was never used.
- A community swimming pool is needed.
- When looking at adding trails, be sure to maintain the existing trail system.
- Preserve the creek.
- Placing the active park uses along the edge will contribute to high traffic along Locklenna.
- More onsite parking is needed as street parking is a problem.
- The picnic area seems to be too far from parking.
- The upper park has areas for children – is there a benefit to adding more children's play areas?
- There is no breeze at the lower portion of the park so kite flying cannot occur in this area.
- There is a desire for bocce ball or croquet.

IV. Dog Park

- Some participants voiced support for a dog park. Some participants did not want a dog park.
- Concern that Dog Park might generate a lot of traffic
- Some participants felt that dog parks should not be imbedded in active parks.
- The landfill is the ideal location for the dog park as it would provide approximately five acres of space.
- There was discussion about what happens in a dog park – whether or not it is noisy. There was a concern that dogs residing in the adjacent residences will bark creating a noise problem.
- Is one acre too small for a dog park? A small area designated for the dog park will limit the number of dogs that visit.
- Can the site next to City Hall be used for the dog park?
- The city should collaborate with adjacent cities on the location of a dog park or series of dog parks.
- Residences adjacent to the park do not want a dog park.
- If you talk about several small dog parks as a strategy, this is a start.

V. Tennis Courts

- Use the terrain and move the tennis courts below the Upper Hesse Park athletic field – this will help minimize the impact of the tennis courts and protect views.
- There is a need and desire for tennis courts.
- Concern that the tennis court fencing will block the views of the ocean – how high is the tennis court fencing?
- A third alternate design should be looked at without tennis courts and without the dog park.
- The tennis courts and related lighting will be invasive visually and noisy.
- Do not let the tennis court fences block the views.
- Perhaps the tennis courts can be dropped a few feet to protect views.
- The tennis courts serve only 2-4 people at a time. Perhaps that area could be used by more people if alternative uses were explored.
- It needs to be remembered that the tennis court usage is based on 2 to 4 people per hour per tennis court.

VI. Amenities:

- There is a desire to have plant material identified by signage. This is an educational opportunity.
- The question was asked what size building is planned and what will it be used for? The city explained that the building is very small and activities will happen outdoors. The building would be for storage, a maintenance office, and restrooms.
- There was a recommendation made to have an outside phone at the building which will connect directly to the community center for security and communication purposes.
- If planning solar, keep in mind that there is a lot of fog here and not a lot of sunny days.
- There was a suggestion for small BBQ areas in or near the picnic areas.

VII. Maintenance:

- The current watering of plants in the park creates a lot of runoff. Be sure that any planted areas are properly irrigated and do not contribute to runoff.
- There is a desire for durability in materials for site furnishings.

GRANDVIEW PARK

I. Dog Park:

- Concerned that dog park not included in either of the two schemes presented.
- People use preserve as a dog park, which is harmful to habitat, so there is a need for a designated dog park where people are allowed to bring their dogs; and there is a need for a dog park in several locations.
- It was expressed that the potential for a dog park to be located on the County Landfill Site dog park is on hold until June 2012.
- Grandview Park lends itself to a dog park because it is secluded. A flat area should be graded into the topography.
- 800 signatures were collected in support of having a dog park in Rancho Palos Verdes.
- A Dog Park should not be located in Grandview. Participants were concerned about who will clean up after dogs, and how to manage misbehaved dogs. A fence is necessary in the planning of a dog park.
- The topography of the Grandview site does not lend itself for inclusion of the dog park program to be located in this park.
- Dog Park adds substantially to the parking count.

II. Site Character:

- If topography is graded, the character of the site will be lost.
- Leave the site alone
- Want to retain natural character
- Like the natural character, supportive of the balanced approach to the programs and their integration on the site.

III. View Area:

- Review of View Node early in work session it was discussed that it was not at the correct location and that there should be one for the mountain view and one for the ocean view. In further review of the concept plan, people agreed that view area is at the correct spot.
- People go to Grandview Park to view fireworks.
- The planting that buffers between Chopra's house and the viewing area should be the height of Chopra's house and no more.

IV. North Edge (At Via La Cuesta Dead End)

- There is a private property lot at the top of the site, which is why access cannot occur at Via La Cuesta.
- Could an easement be put there?
- There are already footpaths there, indicating pedestrian use.

V. Eastern Edge of Park

- Path along the eastern edge of the site should respect the privacy of the homes. You don't want people looking into your home.
- The lower this path is in the topography, which is better for privacy.

VI. Other Comments

- Put picnic area where there are views.

- Put something in the western canyon
- There is a request for a model or a 3d view for the City Council meeting so the community can understand the site and design better.
- A lot of noise will be created during the construction period while re-grading the topography.
- Restroom building is too tall.
- Traffic concerns exist regarding entering the park site. Suggestions include a stop sign and left turn lane.
- An individual expressed not wanting parking in the park.
- Others do want parking in the park.
- Site activities will bring noise.
- There should be native plantings to educate homeowners on which plants to use.
- Can there be access from Ironwood?
- Can you clarify pedestrian access into the park?
- Why do we have to have a Mountain Bike flex area?
- The Oak Plan was the clear favorite because the bike paths were in the western canyon.
- Participants like the gate at the park entrance.
- Ironwood entry will be a problem.
- There was a fire in '88. The mustard plants get dry in the summer and create a lot of fire fuel.
- The attendees expressed that the designs are addressing the community's concerns, with the programs that were to be included in the park.
- Montemalaga has a natural drainage ditch that terminates on the Barkstone Drive.
- Clarification of day camp needed.
- The community likes simplicity and openness.
- An individual expressed that there were too many amenities crammed into this park and wants less activity, more natural and more open space.
- Can the plan be phased depending on demand?
- Should talk to the other city about putting an entrance at the top of the site.
- Ironwood Parking – need permit parking there.
- Why is there no active recreation here?
- This area is being overdeveloped. The city is putting too much here.