

## Supervisors to hear report on Wingspread

By BUD O'BRIEN

The fate of the Wingspread Beach project being proposed for the Porter Sesnon property in Aptos could be decided by the Board of Supervisors Tuesday.

The board will have before it a report by the county planning director that sets out three options the board has in dealing with the controversial project that has been in the works for nearly five years.

Currently, the Wingspread proposal actually consists of two alternate possibilities: (1) a complex which would include a conference center, 200 vacation rental units and commercial facilities, and (2) a complex that would include 295 condominium visitor-serving units, commercial facilities, plus a performing arts center and baseball and soccer fields for the public.

It's the latter proposal that most people are talking about when they speak of Wingspread. And it is the latter proposal that the developer, Hare, Brewer and Kelley of Palo Alto, wants to erect on the prime 66-acre beachfront parcel near

New Brighton State Beach in Aptos.

That proposal, labeled Project B — the smaller proposal is Project A — is currently hung up on a ruling that before it can proceed through the planning process, another environmental impact report will be necessary.

The developers have insisted that an EIR which was done three years ago for another proposed project — since dropped — was sufficient. But the planning department says that while that EIR is sufficient for Project A, it isn't for Project B.

Ryland Kelley, head of the development firm, has said that if he is required to do another EIR without assurances from at least a majority of the supervisors that they look favorably on the Wingspread idea, it wouldn't be worth the time and money.

In effect, Kelley was threatening to dump the Wingspread project if he didn't get a signal of support from the board. Two supervisors, E. Wayne Moore Jr. and Dan Forbus, have long supported the Wingspread concept, and two others, Gary Patton and Joe Cucchiara, have opposed it. The fifth supervisor, Robley Levy, in whose district the property lies, has taken no position and has steadfastly refused to do so until the entire package comes to the Board of Supervisors after completing its journey through the regular planning process.

But Levy has urged the board to set up a task force to expe-

dite the Wingspread project through that process. It is to that request, and an earlier one that a "public benefits" assessment of Wingspread be prepared, that Planning Director Kris Schenk will be responding Tuesday.

Schenk will present the board with a lengthy summary of the history of the Wingspread proposal and the difficulties between his department and the developers in shepherding the applications through the process.

The options the supervisors now have, Schenk will tell them, include: (1) sticking with the original preference of the board that the Porter Sesnon property become a park and prod the developer to reach an agreement to sell his lease on the property to the state; (2) allowing only a project that is fully consistent with the existing General Plan and Local Coastal Program, which would allow something like Project A, but nothing like Project B, or (3) indicating they would review other proposals for development of the property (which could include Project B) if "there are clear and compelling public benefits that

outweigh any adverse development impacts."

The wording of that option contains no commitments by the board to any particular project. Indeed, Schenk takes pains to point out in his summary that there is no provision in county law for the board to make "conceptual" approvals of such projects.

Schenk will recommend, if the board adopts Option 3, that a priority schedule be adopted, as urged by Levy, that would require a new EIR, but would also ensure that it is hurried through the process.

Kelley said this morning that he didn't want to comment on the newest proposals until he'd had time to review them.

The Wingspread issue is scheduled to be heard sometime during the morning of the board's Tuesday meeting, although it could be delayed until the afternoon because of a relatively crowded agenda.

The supervisors will also be considering whether to extend the hours of card rooms in the unincorporated areas of the county to 24-hours-a-day. Currently, such establishments must close between the hours of 2 and 6 a.m.