

Live Oak pool faces another obstacle

By JAMIE MARKS

Sentinel Staff Writer

SANTA CRUZ — It appears one more hoop has to be jumped through before the Santa Cruz Aquatic Team gets approval for a recreational vehicle/swimming pool park in Live Oak.

David Loomis of the state Coastal Commission said, "This week, we discovered quite by accident that most of the project site is in original (state) jurisdiction."

The result is that SCAT developers have to apply for a permit from the state Coastal Commission to build their project.

SCAT planner Steve Russell said the information caught him totally by surprise. For the past year, Russell had been under the mistaken impression that only county permits were required.

"I asked the county staff what was needed,"

said Russell, "but I never even bothered going down to the Coastal Commission."

He characterized it as an "oversight on everybody's part."

Russell said he will submit the permit application to the Coastal Commission by Monday or Tuesday of next week.

He added the latest requirement apparently won't jeopardize SCAT's ability to meet a grant deadline from the state Coastal Conservancy. That group has promised SCAT \$250,000 in a no-interest loan to build the first phase of the project — the RV park.

Developers hope to generate enough money from the RV and camping facility to later construct an Olympic-sized swimming pool, which would serve the county's swim team and the public.

According to Loomis and Russell, the property on 17th Avenue comes under state

jurisdiction because of a drainage that leads into Schwann Lake. The state has retained authority over all inland waterways and drainages. Russell said he had already applied for a local coastal permit, which was OK'd.

Loomis said he hopes to incorporate all the information from the county in his recommendation to the state Coastal Commission for approval. If all goes well, then the permit will be heard by commissioners at their July meeting in Eureka.

"I'm praying they did everything right," said Loomis of the county planning staff.

Apparently, the county planning staff and state Coastal Commission disagree over which agency failed in its duties. Each side claims the other had responsibility to determine who had jurisdiction over the property.

But Russell called it a "no-fault situation."