Blueprint for Live Oak

Bill Lovejoy/Sentinel

Supervisor Jan Beautz is hoping a general plan update will lead to improvements in Live Oak.

Beautz targets area's problems

By KEITH MURAOKA
Sentinel staff writer

5-13-90.

LIVE OAK — Ask Live Oak residents where they live, and more than likely, they'll tell you "Santa Cruz."

It's not their fault. It's just that many years of frustration makes them tell that little white lie. And the fact of the matter is, those residents are partially right. For instance, "Live Oak" doesn't exist in the mind of postal officials.

But Live Oak Supervisor Jan Beautz is getting tired of that ugly-stepsister image of her district. She is the first to admit that Live Oak has received more than its fair share of high-density housing, increased traffic, bad drainage and countless other problems over the years.

Yet Beautz is optimistic, saying that in the 16 months she's been in office "things are starting to turn around." She adds: "People

> 'I don't think there's any question the majority of people in Live Oak have been unhappy with how things have developed.'
>
> — *Supervisor Jan Beautz*

shouldn't feel that everything has been done to them, and they have no options."

Beautz seemingly goes out of her way to

avoid calling Live Oak a "dumping ground," even though those precise words have been used by many — even its own residents. She also refuses to blame her district's problems either on her predecessor, Dan Forbus, or Santa Cruz Supervisor Gary Patton, author of the county's growth-management ordinance. Patton detractors charge that Measure J resulted in dumping much of the county's urban development, including affordable housing, into Live Oak.

But Beautz concedes that Forbus — an 18-year supervisor — had a more "laissez-faire attitude" than she concerning land use. "The result was really bad," she says, "and now I have to deal with things the way they are."

Beautz adds that it really doesn't matter how Live Oak got the way it is. Her job is to deal with the present, she says, not the past.