

# Which Way To Go For SC Freeway?

(Second of a series)

By Don Righetti

Sentinel Staff Writer

At a public hearing last year, the Santa Cruz Planning Commission endorsed Line 2 in the Mission Street corridor as its choice for a Highway 1 freeway route through Santa Cruz.

Line 2 is also the recommendation of the city's general plan. City Planning Director Neal Walton explained the plan provides for a freeway in the Mission Street corridor because of the need to provide adequate circulation to carry traffic to its major area destination point—the city itself.

Facilitation of that traffic flow, Walton said, is advantageous to the highway user and the city alike. Of the alternates presented by the state, he continued, the Line 2 location "most closely conforms with existing neighborhood boundaries, existing topographic and man-made physical features, and is the least disruptive to existing and future land use."

Walter said Line 2 would serve to delineate two distinctive and homogeneous residential neighborhoods to the north and south of the route.

"This alignment," he continued, "also serves the industrial area which is located near the west city limits and provides for the expansion of high-

density residential uses in close proximity to the central district. It provides good access to the central area of the city and is not disruptive of the local major street pattern."

The planning director concluded that Line 4 was least attractive because it acted as a bypass of the city and would separate UCSC from the rest of the city—physically, socially and economically.

Furthermore, he stated Line 4 would not contribute to the strengthening of the central area and would not assure downtown relief from truck traffic because of its sustained 6 per cent grades.

On the other hand, champions of the northerly route, a group called Citizens for Route 4, maintain that their choice is least disruptive of (1) stable neighborhoods, (2) the "intimacy" of Mission Plaza, (3) schools and (4) the economic resources of the community.

The group further contends that future planning needs suggest the desirability of Line 4 as part of a network because it would best distribute traffic, best accommodate UCSC and environs in terms of accessibility, and allow maximum opportunity for flexible, orderly growth.

Other persons have expressed strong opposition to all the lower lines because of the value to the community of the Mission Plaza and Holy Cross High School. Concern also has been ex-

pressed over the shortage of low cost housing in the city for use by the families which would be displaced by the lower routes.

Any of the lower lines will displace far more families than will the northerly Route 4.

The division of highways impact study notes that various analysts agree that the single most important contributor to the growth and prosperity of Santa Cruz and Santa Cruz County throughout the remainder of the century will be UCSC.

The study foresees most area building growth in the mid-county, west city limits and university environs area.

In addition to directing that growth along beneficial patterns, the study examines the freeway's prospective impact on four major community concerns:

**ECONOMIC EFFECTS**—including impact on local tax structure and commercial opportunities.

**DISRUPTION EFFECTS**—including impact on stable neighborhoods and future development.

**RELOCATION OF DISPLACED PERSONS**—including the availability of low-cost and low-rent housing.

**PUBLIC FACILITIES EFFECTS**—concentrating on the consequences to schools and the Mission Plaza.

(Tomorrow's article covers impact on economics)