

# Village plan not far away

The Aptos Village design review committee has just two more meetings to go before it winds up its task of preparing a development plan for the village.

And in its final stages, the meetings will be conducted with Supervisor Dale Dawson at the helm instead of Ralph Sanson. Dawson told the committee last week he wanted to "chair" the meetings so he could become familiar with the plan because he would be the one to present it to the board of supervisors.

The group will meet next on Feb. 2 and the third "working paper" developed by consultant Richard Peterson will be presented. This will be the rough draft of the final report which will be considered again by the committee at another meeting on Feb. 12. After that meeting the plan will be put in its final form and sent on to the county planning commission and supervisors for adoption to become a part of the Aptos area general plan.

The meetings are tentatively scheduled to be held in room 514 at Cabrillo College beginning at 7:30 p.m. on both nights.

The third working paper was to have been presented at last week's meeting, but Peterson said he hadn't had time to put it together yet. Instead, he reviewed with the committee sets of drawings he had made which represent various aspects of the plan.

Upon opening the meeting, Dawson lauded the committee saying he was "truly impressed" with its work. He then directed a review of the second working paper.

Peterson said that the Forest of Nisene Marks State Park was "a sleeping giant" as far as the

Village was concerned, and that he was going to recommend that the state lengthen its access to the park across the Southern Pacific tracks to connect with Soquel Drive.

Mrs. Lucile Aldrich said that SP has its right-of-way posted and that access to it by the public can be shut off at any time.

"SP would have a difficult time shutting off the right-of-way after all these years of use," Dawson said.

Then Dwight Sharpe opened up the question of planned development (PD) review on all building in the village.

"I get the feeling all this property is going to be R-M (multiple family residential)," Sharpe said. "If so, the PD should be looked at before it is made a part of the zoning ordinance. It represents an extra cost for anyone who wants to build a single-family home."

Peterson's answer to Sharpe was, "That's not what's shaking out," meaning, presumably, there will be some provision in plan for single-family home builders.

Mrs. Susan Blair, the planning staff advisor to the committee, said the county planning department "is looking at" the PD requirement in single-family residential areas.

Sharpe contended that "someone at the counter in the planning department should be able to waive the PD for someone wanting to build a single-family home on an R-M lot."

Dawson defended the PD requirement. "As I understand it, you want to protect the village heritage (in the plan.) The PD comes up in relationship with the architectural quality, street layout, etc., The PD is a very

valuable tool."

Sharpe was given assurance the problem would be considered in the final version of the plan.

After a short presentation by Phil Newton, representing the California Association of Physically Handicapped, the committee directed that the plan contains a statement that all facilities in the village have easy access by the handicapped.

Tom Whaley expressed doubt as to the wisdom of spelling out in the plan that there be a two-lane road through the village.

Peterson countered that "there is strong consensus that wants a two-lane road in the village."

Whaley also had doubts about the suggestion that the railroad tracks be considered when developing public transportation in the future. "Is that a practical statement or a pipe dream?" he asked.

When Peterson said it was offered as "an option", Whaley said "I don't think it's a practical suggestion. Whaley was also mildly critical of the ambiguous language in portions of the plan.