

FEEDBACK FORM - Griffith Park Master Plan DRAFT (March 2005)

The Draft Master Plan Text and Maps can be found at:
<http://www.laparks.org/dos/parks/griffithPK/masterplan2005/masterplan2005.htm>

Notify Me About:

All Griffith Park
Park Issues

Master
Plan

Name _____

Street/Apt _____

City/Zip _____

e-mail _____

preferred
contact

preferred
contact

Please feel free to answer questions or submit comments in all or any of the sections below. You can turn in multiple forms as you continue to study the Draft plan.

GENERAL IMPRESSIONS

- | | | | | |
|---|-----------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Overall organization of draft plan made sense. | Check One | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> 3- Agree |
| 2. Draft plan is readable and understandable. | Check One | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> 3- Agree |
| 3. Headings and sections in each chapter flowed and made sense. | Check One | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> 3- Agree |
| 4. Appearance is attractive and appropriate. | Check One | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> 3- Agree |
| 5. Strongest Chapter 1-9 was: | | List Chapter # | | |
| 6. Weakest Chapter 1-9 was: | | List Chapter # | | |
| 7. Griffith Park should have its own Superintendent. | Check One | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> 3- Agree |

8. Comments:

.....

.....

.....

VISION

- | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. The Vision accurately describes Griffith Park as I would like it to be in 25 years. | Check One | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> 3- Agree |
| 2. The Objectives support the Vision. | Check One | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - Neutral | <input type="checkbox"/> 3- Agree |
| 3. Which, if any, Objective did not seem to support the Vision? | | | | |
| 4. Was an appropriate Objective missing? | | | | |

5. Comments:

.....

.....

.....

.....

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

- 1. Sufficiently covers native landscapes and habitat. Check One 1 - Disagree 2 - Neutral 3- Agree
- 2. Needs stronger protections for environment, such as no-access zones. Check One 1 - Disagree 2 - Neutral 3- Agree
- 3. Park Ecologist is needed. Check One 1 - Disagree 2 - Neutral 3- Agree
- 4. Trail use and preservation plan is good. Check One 1 - Disagree 2 - Neutral 3- Agree

5. Comments:

MOBILITY

- 1. Aerial trams should be considered as a possibility. Check One 1 - Disagree 2 - Neutral 3- Agree
- 2. Traffic calming plans will be good for the Park. Check One 1 - Disagree 2 - Neutral 3- Agree
- 3. Parking structures are good ways to consolidate many existing surface parking lots. Check One 1 - Disagree 2 - Neutral 3- Agree
- 4. Off-site parking will be an important solution to park crowding. Check One 1 - Disagree 2 - Neutral 3- Agree

5. Comments:

BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND DESIGN GUIDELINES

- 1. Liked the 7 geographic area names used to describe physical relocations in the Park. Check One 1 - Disagree 2 - Neutral 3- Agree
- 2. Liked the 4 design zone names used to establish design themes for areas in the Park. Check One 1 - Disagree 2 - Neutral 3- Agree
- 3. Too many relocations and consolidations of existing facilities. Check One 1 - Disagree 2 - Neutral 3- Agree
- 4. Prohibition is clear against constructing more facilities outside the limits of the current developed footprint. Check One 1 - Disagree 2 - Neutral 3- Agree

5. Comments:

