

ASR

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

MEETING MINUTES

PROJECT: PALA VISTA PARK
COMMUNITY MEETING #1

DATE: MARCH 15, 2018

TIME: 6:00 P.M.

LOCATION: VISTA CIVIC CENTER

Below is the introductory information provided by the design team and followed by comments recorded at this first community meeting convened to review the proposed park with stakeholders and to solicit input as to desired programming.

1. The budget for the proposed park improvements is \$750,000.
2. The park will take into consideration the expansion of Civic Center Drive
3. There is a second meeting (same content) planned for Saturday March 24th at 2:00 p.m. to capture additional input from community members unable to attend the first meeting.
4. ASR provided some initial ideas to begin the discussion – this included ideas such as open passive space, a tot-lot(s), gateway ideas, art inclusion, site furnishings, pedestrian connections, safety and security.

The comments/items brought up include:

1. There is a sign on Civic Center – is there really a need for a second one on the park site (taking up usable program space)?
2. Some thoughts to include a half-court basketball court, murals, active recreation, rotating mural project, handball court (walls for murals?), Mediterranean planting, some recognition in the name of the park – “pala” means “dove”, splash pad with a bird cage theme?
3. Fenced off dog park on one corner – or just an open area where leashed dogs are permitted.
4. Non-traditional children's play area with art rather than spec structures.
5. Suggestion for a very SMALL area for dogs, could be open all the time to be activated.
6. Concern expressed for lighting and noise impacting the adjacent residential area.

ASR

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

7. Want to discourage any “buildings” that might encourage less desirable behaviors in the park.
8. Concerns expressed for graffiti – an ongoing problem in parks.
9. Desire to ensure protection (particularly for children) along busy Civic Center Drive side of park – i.e. balls rolling out into street being safety problem.
10. Would like to include canopy shade trees and natural shade in park.
11. Provide a sidewalk around any tot-lot and a barrier of some kind along Civic Center Drive.
12. Local business owner (adjacent) is excited about the park but would like to have a restroom included and noted that parking in the area is insufficient. There is no restroom at the Sprinter station and he therefore has a lot of foot traffic in his business. Is concerned about crime and policing.
13. If a fence/barrier is provided along Civic Center it should be decorative and not just a barrier.
14. Support for half-court basketball and some options for active recreation.
15. Question as to whether we could underground the power poles –very unattractive in view of park.
16. Suggestion to consider naming the park “Strawberry Park” as a theme given historic association.
17. Desire for succulents/xeriscape and drought-tolerant planting.
18. Would recommend having monetary fines for misbehavior posted on park signs as a deterrent to crimes.
19. Use of turf should be judicious – no desire for synthetic turf.
20. Suggestion to use low mounding with turf to help contain play areas.
21. Would like the park to have the “mom vibe” – family programming – to avoid nefarious activity and feel safe.
22. Parking on-site is impractical – but maybe some along street?
23. Possible for City to discuss with NCTD adding restroom/porta-potty to Sprinter station.
24. Would like to avoid fencing along Civic Center – just a berm with planting might be sufficient?
25. Small children do typically need access to a restroom when playing.
26. Could the City consider a future pedestrian connection from the park to the transit center?
27. Concern for trash – there are some corner properties right at the intersection of the SR-78 and Civic Center Drive that are always full of trash.

ASR

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

28. Would like to see a native palette of plants – colorful, aromatic (sage), native animal sculptures – hummingbirds, soft landscape, monarch butterflies, milkweed.
29. (ASR) We can consider earth moving on site and depress the site as well as berm it.
30. Would like to consider future development of amenities to keep current within budget.
31. Is sponsorship (buy a brick) by the public an option to augment the cost of the park?
32. Can there be educational elements (flora/fauna) built in? Interpretive ideas.
33. Could a sidewalk along Civic Center be inboard of the street with a parkway to provide better separation.
34. Suggestion of a community garden as a possibility – just a small one.
35. Can rainwater be captured for use?
36. Concern for ongoing maintenance – particularly for play equipment.
37. Can dog signs/refuse bags be installed now as an interim measure so people using the park site now will pick up after the dogs?