9-8-83 -Foulup prevents Lighthouse vote

By MARK BERGSTROM Sentinel Staff Writer

SANTA CRUZ - A bureaucratic snafu was discovered early this afternoon which prevented the state Department of Parks and Recreation Commission from voting on a controversial development plan for Lighthouse Field.

The meeting notice required by law for such a public hearing was sent to a newspaper in Ventura County instead of one in Santa Cruz County, staff announced to the commission and public in the middle of a hearing at the Holiday Inn.

The commission said it would continue to take public testimony, but said it could not vote to adopt or reject the plan because of the foulup. The commission said it would correctly publicize a new hearing at which it can vote on the plan.

More than 150 local residents turned out this morning to speak to the plan. The plan under consideration has been approved by the Santa Cruz City Council, the county Board of Supervisors and the state Coastal Commission,

It is the result of a citizens' initiative in 1974 which blocked construction of the convention center at the field and a subsequent drive to protect the 36 acres through addition to the state parks system.

Supervisor Gary Patton, who authored that 1974 ballot initiative, urged the commission to approve the plan so the citizens of Santa Cruz could finally realize the benefits of their vote.

Robert Bell, chairman of the Lighthouse Field Advisory Committee, told the commission the proposed plan was the result of a three-year planning process which emphasized public participation at every step.

The park plan calls for maintaining 32 acres in their natural state, with only minimal picnic and recreational facilities, such as a restroom and picnic tables.

That pleases just about everybody.

The plan also calls for the relocation of 1,000 feet of West Cliff Drive some 200-300 feet inland from the

That upsets a lot of people.

The relocation of West Cliff Drive dominated the public hearing this morning. Persons who participated in the drafting of the plan, claimed a majority at the public planning hearings, wanted the road relocated to separate the field from the recreation area, which is proposed to be built on the cliffs.

Those opposed say the issue never really was settled at any of the public planning meetings. In fact, they said they were promised one more meeting on the road issue, but that meeting never was held.

They said they want the road right where it is so they can continue to drive by or park their cars and watch the

waves, surfers and sea lions. Santa Cruzan Wes Reed said the reasons given by supporters of moving the road are nothing more than excuses to shut the public out of the area.

In the middle of the debate, Asa Lake stood up and referred to the place which Santa Cruzans voted 2-1 to preserve forever as "that scraggly old field."

An eight-year resident of the city, Lake told com-missioners, "The state is being asked to preserve Santa Cruz' neurosis.'