

(Continued from Page 1)

ave a general feeling that commercial development shouldn't be strung out all over the place," Sanson said, adding, "commercial development contaminates residential districts." He used a similar phrase in placing his concern on how such conflict of interest possibilities arise by saying, "Politics has a way of contaminating the in-

dividual by being a participant. Maintaining my integrity is extremely important to me. That's why I have declared conflicts."

In the meantime, a petition is being circulated in the Aptos-Rio del Mar area, asking the board to reconsider the Sutter Hill proposal.

Directors of the Rio del Mar Improvement Assn. have called a

special, closed strategy session tonight to discuss the issue.

Four of the 10 Aptos supervisorial candidates who could be reached this morning generally expressed shock at the board's action Tuesday.

Don Kassler cited the earlier unanimous recommendation for denial by the planning commission and the advice of the planning staff against the project. "What appalls me as much as the outcome of the voting is the resultant distrust in local government," he said.

John Fitzgerald termed the vote as "absolutely beyond my comprehension." He said homeowners groups "from La Selva Beach to 41st avenue are on record as being opposed to the proposal." He said Supervisors Cress, Dan Forbus and Henry Mello should be asked reasons why they supported the shopping complex.

Dale Dawson commented that "Mid-County residents are frustrated because their voice was not heard, either through their supervisor or themselves. Many concerned district citizens attended planning commission hearings, protesting the proposed development. They believed the board of supervisors would uphold the planning commission's unanimous rejection of the project." He is behind a petition drive for the rehearing, and said interested persons should call 688-5887, 688-3687, 688-1581, or 688-6084.

Mrs. Joe Specht stated, "I cannot believe that any group of public officials would go against what the public so obviously intended. These gentlemen (supervisors) also are directors of the Aptos Sanitation District. They should realize that the sanitation district now is almost at capacity and cannot accommodate the 80-unit motel proposed by Sutter Hill."

Other candidates, Walt Jordan, Irby Bourriague, Martin Richard, Brad Macdonald, Jim Popin and Ray Liebenberg, could not be reached for comment.

Plans for six of the 22 acres involved were presented when the board approved the use permit Tuesday. Included in that sector was a supermarket, drug store, restaurant and bank. Sutter Hill said it contemplates a motel, professional offices and public facilities, such as a library and art gallery, in the second phase site—where apple orchards are now.

Santa Cruz Sentinel

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 23, 1972

32 Pages

Sutter-Hill Vote To Be Challenged

By BRUCE McPHERSON
Sentinel Staff writer

Aptos Supervisor Ralph Sanson this morning said he will ask county supervisors on Tuesday to reopen the public hearing on Sutter Hill Development Corporation's use permit for a 22½-acre commercial development at the Deer Park site in Rio del Mar.

Sanson, who didn't participate in Tuesday's discussion or vote on the matter because of a

possible conflict of interest, said today, "I have been advised by many people that they would have appeared if they had realized I wasn't going to participate."

Sanson said he would take part now if the public hearing is reopened.

Tuesday night, Sanson, an attorney, withdrew from the discussion because one of his clients, Dr. Shields Barr, owns a portion of the 22½ acres in-

involved in the proposed commercial development, which supervisors approved by a 3 to 1 vote.

Said Sanson this morning, "I have received a call from Dr. Barr, who told me that as far as he was concerned, he would expect me to participate in any future deliberations. He didn't realize there was a conflict of interest situation."

The Aptos representative said he doesn't solicit permission from a client before he acts, but said he eliminated himself from the matter on the basis of a "personal, ethical situation."

Sanson said he held the "greatest respect" for Dr. Barr for taking the initiative to call him on the subject.

It's unknown whether the board will reopen the hearings, although it did take such action on a proposed Boulder Creek development recently to the request of San Lorenzo Valley Supervisor George Cress.

Sanson said he has a "general inclination to oppose" the Sutter Hill proposal, "although I haven't heard the testimony. If it's reopened, I'll listen to the tape of Tuesday's meeting and participate in the remainder of the new hearing."

The Aptos supervisor said he leans against the proposal because "it is not in accordance with the General Plan. I also

(Continued on Page 2)