

Wingspread developer appeals plan delay

5-18-85
By JAMIE MARKS

Sentinel Staff Writer

SANTA CRUZ — The developer of Wingspread Beach has appealed the county Planning Commission's deferral of Plan A, Ryland Kelley's proposal to build a 197-unit conference center on the Porter Sesnon property in Aptos.

In a letter to the board, Richard Allen, attorney for Kelley, asked the Board of Supervisors to set June 4 as a jurisdictional hearing on whether to consider the issue.

The board Tuesday approved the hearing without comment.

"There is no basis in county regulations for suspending processing an application by continuing a project due to issues outside the scope of the application and for an uncertain and unascertainable time period," wrote Allen.

April 24, the Planning Commission voted to postpone a decision on Plan A until the larger project, called Plan B, is brought to public hearing.

Plan B includes 295 "lockout" condominium units, which can be rented as separate rooms, a performing arts center and sports fields.

Kelley has garnered massive public support for the project by promising to keep the theaters and sports fields open to the public.

However, there has been an equal

amount of opposition to the proposals by neighbors who want the 72-acre parcel to be turned over to the state for a park, or left undeveloped.

The county's land-use policies allow for either a park or "visitor accommodating services," such as Kelley's hotel-condominium project.

The Planning Department is now reviewing the administrative draft of an environmental impact report for Plan B and expects to release the document within the next two weeks.

After the EIR is released, it must undergo public review before it is compiled into a final form.

Consequently, the first Planning Commission hearings on Plan B are not scheduled until the fall.

Kelley has stated emphatically that he does not want to delay Plan A while Plan B undergoes this review process.

However, the Planning Commission, upon the recommendation of Aptos District Commissioner Ree Burnap, voted to consider the two projects concurrently.

Allen's letter cited two reasons for appealing the commission's decision.

The Planning Commission erred by basing its decision, not on the project itself, but on reasons outside the scope of the application, said Allen. Secondly, the commission erred by continuing the hearing until the other project, called Plan B, can be heard.