

Housing foes vow new battle

Glenwood plan could
face city voters — again

By **DAN WHITE**

SENTINEL STAFF WRITER

SCOTTS VALLEY — The past may soon repeat itself in Scotts Valley, where the same upscale housing project keeps crawling through city bureaucracy, only to later face judgment by voters.

On Thursday, foes of the Glenwood development plan already were considering their options after a 3-2 City Council majority approved the 49-home development late Wednesday night.

Opponents said if the project is not changed to their satisfaction, they will head in the same direction as in November 1998, when foes forced a public vote on the project after the council OK'd a 145-home version of the project on Glenwood Meadow, the city's last big piece of open land. The project was defeated at the polls in June 1999, and opponents claimed a victory over urban sprawl.

The defeat forced the developers to downsize the proposal several times, culminating in the current plan, which opponents say is still too much.

Roland Krevitt said it would be "an absolute crime" to put housing on the meadow and berated the developers for discussing the possibility of law-suits if they keep setting back the plan.

**'It is not perfect.
But it is the best
compromise. I
think it's as
good as it's
going to get.'**

MAYOR SHERYL

AINSWORTH,

VOTED FOR

GLENWOOD

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Glenwood

Continued from Page A1

Mayor Sheryl Ainsworth and councilmen Paul Marigonda and Randy Johnson on Wednesday voted for the project. Stephany Aguilar and Cliff Barrett voted no. Aguilar called the meadow project "poor planning." Barrett said the 6,000-square-foot lots were too small.

"It is not perfect," Ainsworth said before voting. "But it is the best compromise. I think it's as good as it's going to get."

Ainsworth called a zero-home proposal "illegal, and a great way to lose a lawsuit."

Jeff Ringold, consultant for the opposition, wasn't swayed, but said a referendum isn't set in stone: "We have had conversations with the city and with the applicant to try to avoid a referendum."

But he expressed concern that Keenan's setting aside 95 percent of the meadow as open space carries no guarantee. He said the city also could break a no-development arrangement for the land. He said the state must, at the very least, hold an open-space future easement.

Opponents also want less density. Ringold said the developers were not forthcoming about wanting homes in the 3,000-square-foot range on 6,000-square-foot lots, which he called "enormous monster homes."

Keenan Land Co.'s Williams said the developer and opponents agree about conservation easements. She said there is no guarantee the state or a land trust

The Glenwood project

WHERE: Located off Glenwood Drive across the street from Scotts Valley High School.

THE PLAN: The developers want to build 49 homes in the '\$750,000-plus' range on the 195-acre Glenwood Meadow, now used for horse grazing and off-limits — officially, at least — from public use. It is owned by Palo Alto-based Keenan Land Co. Lot sizes would be around 6,000 square feet, which opponents say is too small. The project would develop about 5 percent of the land, with 5 acres for ball fields, 1.6 acres for future development, and 184 acres left for open space.

HISTORY: The latest Glenwood plan is a revised version. Keenan originally wanted more than 200 homes. A plan for 145 homes was defeated at referendum two years ago. Before Keenan's proposal, a 276-home plan, with a golf course, was knocked down in the mid-1990s in part because it required building on land outside the city limits.

THE OPPOSITION: Friends of Glenwood says the reduced plan is too high-density for the meadow, ruins views and carries no firm guarantees the project's open space will stay undeveloped in the future.

'Larger lots mean more expensive homes. We're damned if we do, damned if we don't. They don't want more density, meaning more affordable housing.'

KERRY WILLIAMS, KEENAN LAND CO.

would take over the easement "but it is highly likely." She also insisted a deed restriction offers strict protections.

But preserving the entire meadow would require the purchase of the land at fair market value, Williams said.

Lot sizes are another sticking point. "Larger lots mean more expensive homes," Williams said. "We're damned if we do, damned if we don't. They don't want more density, meaning more

affordable housing."

She said houses would probably be in the 2,500- to 2,800-square-foot range, perhaps with some around 3,000. She said if the developers followed the opposition plan, "it works out to 27 houses on 8,000 square foot lots," a situation that "absolutely doesn't work for us."

Contact Dan White at
dwhite@santa-cruz.com.