

PVP Watch Newsletter – October 27, 2010

Vote November 2nd

PVP Watch urges RPV Residents to Vote YES on Measure P

We ask all to take a step backward and look at what has been going on in RPV and unfortunately elsewhere as well. For now and limiting ourselves to RPV, we should all be ashamed of how Marymount College has been treated by the RPV Council and their friends. For those who may not recall what has occurred for the past year or two, please go to the Newsletter page at www.pvpwatch.com to refresh your memory. That the RPV Council has participated in and allowed the vicious and repugnant political campaign materials generated by the SOC III and CCC/ME groups attacking Dr. Brophy personally as well as the College itself.

RPV residents must now decide; Do you want a vibrant college in our community or do you prefer that Marymount College could move elsewhere? Does anyone perceive that Marymount will accede to the RPV Council's dictates? If so, why the Initiative process?

RPV Mayor Wolowicz and fellow RPV Councilmen have been promulgating a myopic myth that they, the RPV Council, have approved all of Marymount College requests other than the desired dormitories. The facts do not support the Council's assertions of approval.

Two facts vs. RPV Council myths. The athletic field is now (planned) where the Planning Commission approved it. The Council "tinkered" with the athletic field location and approved it in different and unrealistic location. The Council again designing the Marymount Campus "on the fly" lopped off a large section of the gymnasium roof under the pretense of meeting view ordinance requirements. Their actions ignored that Marymount had already committed that they would follow usual view ordinance procedures by placing silhouette flags and make the final design conform to actual findings. Placing onerous restrictions is not granting approval. More misrepresentation of the facts by the RPV Council. The list goes on.

It is outrageous that the majority (possibly all) of the RPV City Council members, and the self designated community leaders, are participating in and driving the anti Marymount No on Measure P campaign. They dispense falsehoods and innuendos using scare tactics to stir up RPV residents. Measure P opponents have stated that when Measure P is approved, RPV City Hall will lose control of the Marymount campus. Question: how much control by RPV City Hall is needed?

For those who have experience in obtaining plans approval at RPV City Hall can undoubtedly relate to the \$millions spent by Marymount attempting to obtain RPV City Hall approvals.

According to RPV City Attorney Carol Lynch; *If approved Measure P would allow improvements that included renovating existing buildings (auditorium / fine arts studio, faculty office, student union, and administration building) and constructing six new buildings (two dormitories with connecting gallery, library, maintenance buliding and athletic building).*

Substantial changes, generally defined as deviations from developmental standards by more than 5%, would require either approval by the City through its discretionary processes or voter approval."

Question: Does not the ballot statement written by RPV City Attorney Carol Lynch repudiate all of the *doom & gloom* whining, "robo" calls and other nonsensical pleadings by RPV Councilmen that Armageddon has arrived in RPV if Measure P is approved by the voters?

It seems to us that what is really occuring with the approval of Measure P is DEMOCRACY in action. The real core issue is the egos of the RPV Councilmen and that a citizen is challenging a decision by appealing to the Council's superior body, the electorate of RPV. One can only speculate what actions the Council might try to take if Marymount does not have the protection of a voter approved Initiative.

We urge ALL RPV residents to be informed and the best way to do so is to closely read the Initiative for themselves. A link is provided at www.pvpwatch.com, go to the bottom 3 items on the Current Issues page and read the Initiative and other clarifying information.

PVP Watch congratulates the Peninsula Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors for having the wisdom to support Yes on Measure P.

That the local Republican Party has allowed itself to be dragged into a non partisan issue may have caused serious repercussions for the future as many RPV Republicans who are voting YES on Measure P are questioning why the local Republican Party is demonstrating such poor leadership.

RPV residents, whether or not they are Democrats, Republican, Libertarian or Independent, who believe in limited government and individual property rights should vote **YES** on Measure P (ballot number 198) in support of Marymount College, a true asset to life in RPV.

The Annenberg Project.

We have been advised that there will be a meeting on November 9th between Annenberg and RPV to address the arrangement for construction of the approved improvements at PVIC that Annenberg has offered to construct and pay for. We presume this means the parking lot or does it?

The following letter was written by RPV resident Sharon Yarber and is posted with her approval.

October 18, 2010

Mr. David Siegenthaler
United States Department of the Interior
Nation Park Service
Pacific West Regional Office
1111 Jackson Street, Suite 700
Oakland, CA 94607

Re: Annenberg Project, Rancho Palos Verdes, CA

Dear Mr. Siegenthaler:

As a resident of Rancho Palos Verdes who is opposed to the Annenberg Project, I would like to express my sincere gratitude for your having attended the Planning Commission meeting on October 12, 2010.

I would also like to personally express my concurrence with the views and opinions you have expressed in your letters of September 15, 2010 and October 8, 2010. It is incomprehensible to me that the City Planning Department staff could have taken the position that this massive project complies with the City's General Plan, Open Space Recreational Zoning and Passive Recreational Land Use designation. The General Plan classification, zoning and land use imposed on this property were presumably imposed so that the property would be and remain in compliance with the POU and Deed Restrictions, and just as you have concluded, this project does not comply, in my opinion, with the POU. Likewise, I do not find it to be in compliance with our General Plan or zoning and use designations.

I hope you will continue to find this project to be violative of the POU and Deed Restrictions, and that any future analysis performed and submitted to you by the City Council or staff that purports to articulate a community need for this project that would justify a modification to the Deed Restrictions or POU would be looked at with the utmost of strict scrutiny. As I am sure you perceived from your attendance at the meeting, there are passionate opinions on each side of this very controversial project.

When looking at land mass throughout the world, the portion thereof which is located on a coast is minimal, which is why we here in California have a Coastal Commission and special coastal zones - to protect and preserve this type of unique and limited property. While I can certainly appreciate a desire to improve this parkland to increase access to it and further its utilization, the contemplated project is not appropriate.

I highly doubt that any residents have ever expressed a need for a terrestrial animal center with an emphasis on companion animals be developed on this site. This is a vision of the Annenberg Foundation, and please note that the Foundation is ONLY interested in locating the project on this particular piece of property precisely because of its special location and beauty. While the project may have engendered some considerable support in the community now that it has been proposed, such support does not indicate a pre-existing community recreational need that requires addressing. I have read many of the letters that have been submitted by residents in support of the project. Several of them, I note, indicate resignation to the fact that, regardless of whether development is really wanted by the community or not, development will inevitably ensue, so the feeling is that this project would be better than a lot of alternatives that might someday manage to get approved by this or another City Council. I do not think such qualified and reticent support should be given any weight in evaluating the extent of support and perceived "need" there may be in the community.

I understand the City will be looking at what your position is within the NPS and what authority you had to make the findings set forth in your letter. I hope your position is not subject to being overruled, as I am confident that, to the extent your opinions are subject to review by your superiors, such review will be sought. I hope that anyone to whom this matter is sent for further review and findings will have the same understanding that you do of the importance of this property to not only residents of Rancho Palos Verdes, but to all visitors to our beautiful area, and will construe the intent and requirements of the POU in the same manner that you have.

As I understand it, previously an application was filed with the Planning Commission to use this property for a girl's softball field, but such application was Mr. David Siegenthaler denied because the use would be too "active" in this passive recreation zone. I find it ironic that a softball field in this open recreational space is too active, yet this massive structure with acres of surface parking and hardscape, with lots of room for indoor educational (not outdoor recreational) activity, could be acceptable to the City.

Thank you for your consideration of the views expressed herein above.

California Measures

Following are the Ballot Propositions on the 2010 ballot with a consensus by respected commentators.

PROPOSITION	TOM Mc CLINTOCK	DAILY BREEZE	JARVIS & Co.	PVP WATCH
19. LEGALIZES MARIJUANA for people for their <u>personal use</u> older than 21	NO	NO	X	NO
20. ADDS CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS to tasks to be done by state re-districting committee	YES	YES	YES	YES
21. ADDS \$18 FEE TO VEHICLE LICENSE FEE to help fund state parks	NO	NO	NO	NO
22. PROHIBITS STATE FROM USING TRANSPORTATION funds for other state uses	YES	YES	YES	YES
23. RELAXES AIR-POLLUTION CONTROL LAW until unemployment drops under 5.5% for a year	YES	NO	YES	YES
24. REPEALS LEGISLATION THAT WOULD ALLOW business to reduce their tax liability	NO	NO	NP	NO
25. CHANGES LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENT FOR BUDGET PASSAGE FROM 2/3 to simple majority	NO	NO	NO	NO
26. REQUIRES THAT CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL FEES be approved by a 2/3 vote	YES	YES	YES	YES
27. ELIMINATES STATE COMMISSION APPROVED BY CITIZENS to perform redistricting	NO	NO	NO	NO

RPV MEASURE "P"

YES

Permanent Absentee Ballot

For those who might prefer to vote and mail in their ballot, the Permanent Absentee Voter application is also posted at www.pvpwatch.com. For those that might have difficulties getting to the polls on Election Day, an absentee ballot does simplify the process.

Newsletter Responses

Reader comments are welcomed and should be sent to info@pvpwatch.com. Newsletter responses are posted with names removed and no editing other than obvious grammatical changes. These are subscriber thoughts and opinions and PVP Watch does not vouch for those opinions. That so many have sent their comments has made the Newsletter more interesting and we appreciate the input.

We have been reminded that not ALL subscribers are aware of the PVP Watch website; www.pvpwatch.com. Lots of good info posted here.

Responses to October 16th Newsletter.

Annenberg Project

Thanks for the prompt delivery of your 16 Oct 2010 PVP Watch Newsletter. I found that the most interesting moment of the planning meeting came when our CITY PLANNER CHIEF Mr. Rojas confirmed my suspicions. The entire RPV or PV Vision Plan is a hoax. It was a violation of the PUBLIC TRUST to sponsor a back door obfuscated push to approve a "vision" plan proposed and paid for by outsiders---the ANNENBERG'S. This is a clear violation of every citizen on the hill regardless of PARTY affiliation or feeling about this illegal project violating DEED restrictions. This VIOLATION of public trust and the illegal back door action by the CITY COUNCIL and PLANNING COMMISSION must be stopped immediately. Please feel free to refer this information to the US Government agencies responsible for protecting the last acres of open park space on the bluffs of the PVP. The EPA must be made aware of this attempt to poison our children with this huge LEAD excavation project that could also destabilize and cause millions of dollars of damage to the residents adjacent to the proposed project.

If any of your readers are looking for the true definition of OXYMORON----I have found it! The Palos Verdes Land Conservancy.

RPV Charter City Proposal
RPV Friends,

This is a repeat sending of attachment "2010-08-02 Adopting the city charter.pdf". I have been in discussion with (name removed), and it caused me to review the attached documents. The

idea of being a charter city scares me. The draft of the city charter opens the door to all sorts of shenanigans. Please read it and be prepared for battle.

Neighbors

Those of you who lived here when the city was formed may recall that many of our neighbors asked me to follow behind another neighbor, (name removed), who was our logical person to run for the first RPV City Council but was unable to do so due to the press of his business commitments. I did and was involved as a member of Save Our Coastline and the PV Advisory Council with the process that led to the decision to put the proposed city on the ballot as a General Law City rather than a Charter City. While the latter seemed clearly preferable at the time, the additional complexities of getting to the point of proposing a Charter City led to a decision to go the other route. At that time it was thought we could make a change later after having more time to think through the details and make a decision without the pressure of getting it done in time to get the proposed new city on the next ballot. Frankly, I am wondering why it took so long.

The recent Bell fiasco has muddied the waters, no doubt, and this should give us pause before making a final decision. But, I think the advantages are sufficient to go forward toward establishing RPV as a Charter City. The Council seems to realize that the Bell situation is an issue for us to consider and has put safeguards into the draft RPV Charter to protect against these things. There are probably other types of opportunities for malfeasance but there are some even with a General Law City. I think our city has enough citizen oversight that the risks are minimal and worth it. In my opinion, the more local control we can realize while making the State Of California less able to dip their fingers into our pockets, the better off we are.

PVP Watch – Newsletter List

A reminder to ALL PVP Watch supporters, should you change your e-mail address don't forget to advise PVP Watch of your new address. We suggest that pvpwatch.com be added to your computer address book to assure delivery of PVP Watch Newsletters.

PVP Watch – Contributions

PVP Watch thanks the many subscribers who have contributed to PVP Watch. Those desiring to make a modest contribution, please send checks to PVP Watch PO Box 7000-22 Palos Verdes Peninsula, CA 90274

Subscribers

The PVP Watch e-mail list continues to grow. For those who wish their addresses removed, please send notice to info@pvpwatch.com. Those who have topics of community interest are encouraged to bring those issues to PVP Watch.

The Editorial Committee