

5/6/81 *Run Shut*

# Board puts roadblock before Wingspread

The elaborate Wingspread development proposed for the Porter-Sesnon property in Midcounty was clipped so severely by the Board of Supervisors Monday that it may never get off the ground.

With Midcounty Supervisor Robley Levy leading the way, the majority of the board agreed to place a parks and recreation designation on the property, with conditions that would exclude any private development of the scope of Wingspread on the 66-acre parcel.

The property has been leased from the University of California by the Palo Alto development firm of Hare, B r e w e r

Related story on page 18

and Kelley, the firm that built Pajaro Dunes. The firm has devised a plan to develop a complex project on the property that would include a community cultural and performing arts center, along with other recreational and residential facilities.

Environmentalists and others who believe that the development would overtax the county's resources have opposed the project.

Supervisor Levy had taken no public position on Wingspread until Monday, when she made the motions that would kill the project if the approval they won Monday is made final. The action came as the supervisors resumed their consideration of a Local Coastal Program, the document that will regulate the use of coastal land in the unincorporated areas of the county when finally adopted.

Ryland Kelley of Hare, Brewer and Kelley, called the board's action "a devastating thing" as far as the Wingspread plans are concerned.

He said he believed the action to be illegal in that it amounted to a "taking" of private property, leaving open the possibility of a lawsuit to overturn the action. He also noted his company has the option of trying to get the action overturned by the

Coastal Commission, which must ultimately approve the county's LCP.

But Kelley said he still has hopes the board will "reconsider" the matter before it takes its final action on the LCP, which is scheduled for May 14.

In explaining her position, Mrs. Levy said that the Porter-Sesnon property had long been focused on "for some kind of public parks and recreation use," that the people in the neighborhood supported that sort of use and that the county's parks and recreation commission had recommended the land be designated as a regional park.

As for the Wingspread project, Mrs. Levy said it constituted "a very, very sophisticated and ingenious proposal." But she said it would involve "a highly intensive use" that simply could not be accommodated by the available services such as roads, water, etc. The proposed project, she added, "really evokes a dream for the community"

without some truly specific plans to scrutinize.

"I find it hard to address the dream first and the realities later," she said.

That meant, she said, that the land-use designation placed on the land by the board in the LCP should be only for uses supportable by existing resources — a criterion she said Wingspread could not meet.

Mrs. Levy was joined by Board Chairman Gary Patton and San Lorenzo Valley Supervisor Joe Cucchiara in placing the parks designation on the property.

Soquel-Live Oak Supervisor Dan Forbus and Pajaro Valley Supervisor E. Wayne Moore Jr. opposed the restrictive designation. Forbus sarcastically noted that the arguments used by Mrs. Levy in seeking a parks designation for Porter-Sesnon were the same ones he had used in trying to get a similar designation for the Granite Rock property in Live Oak. He reminded them in that instance the dominant "liberal"

triumvirate had refused to lift an alternate designation that would allow housing on that property.

Moore said he just believed adding more and more parkland to the county was a mistake.

"I feel we're putting all too much property into county and state parks," he said. He added that the Wingspread project would in great measure serve tourists who would bring revenue into the county without requiring massive increases in services and that those revenues would pay for whatever additional services might be needed.

In his reaction to the board's move, Kelley said it was impossible for him to understand why the county would simply foreclose any use of the property without learning more about available alternatives. He noted that his project would have to be approved through the regular land-use processes, so that a designation that would allow it in theory would by no means assure its approval.