Not delivered.

[MS-0087.007.019.002]

Statement by CURE to City Council on December 3, 1970.

Citizens United for Racial Equality opposes acceptance of the Final Map for Bay Terraces, Unit 6, or any other maps, at this time. We urge that the subject of conditions upon the Final Maps 6 - 18 be referred to a Council Conference. We also request that the Board of Education be invited to participate in this conference.

The Council and the Board of Education have both a moral and a legal responsibility to exercise their powers in such a way as to require where appropriate, and encourage where they cannot require, policies and plans that will favor the development of a stable and balanced community. Last spring the School Board found itself in the position of being asked to approve plans of this project already given final approval by the city. This gave the Board no opportunity to present their needs in a positive and constructive way during the planning phase. Once again it appears they will be put in the same awkward position of not having been consulted before plans are approved.

Further, this resolution has been brought forward so quickly that interested citizens, such as ourselves, who are very much concerned with this project, who have been following it closely, and who have been preparing specific recommendations, are not being afforded the opportunity to present these recommendations. I think our sincerity and interest are demonstrated by the fact that we have noted this sudden request of the developer and are here to oppose it.

There are still too many unanswered questions. Will there be houses and apartments of varying costs? What will be the cost range? Will there be subsidized housing? Will houses and apartments with similar costs be clustered together, thus tending to cluster people of the same economic means? Will there be a distribution of houses and apartments of differing costs throughout the total project in order to promote a stable and

balanced community? What elementary school district will serve Area 6? Where are schools to be located? How are school boundaries to be drawn? Will school boundaries be drawn to encompass all housing of one type? Or will schools be located on the boundaries between housing areas of differing costs and types that will appeal to people of differing economic means? Where will parks be located? Will they be located on the boundaries between areas? Will the private parks in Map 6 area, counted as public parks, be available to residents of other areas? Will the private parks, counted as public parks, be required to meet the public park development and maintenance levels? How will the 20 acres of private parks, counted as public parks, be divided between the single and multiple family areas? Specifically what has the developer done to comply with the Council Resolution No. 195865? The developer reports having met with the City Planning Director, the League of Women Voters, and other groups, but does not appear to have been responsive to the counself of any of these groups, which was the intent of the Council Resolution No. 195865. Why not?

The developer graded the land using $16 million loan insured under the Title 10 Land Development Program. A requirement of this program is that the "development must meet with the approval of the appropriate local ... agencies. ... Evidence should be submitted that the proposed land development does not violate the land uses contemplated by the comprehensive plan for the area or community in question."

The City has responsibly placed certain requirements upon the developer in their Resolution No. 195865. The developer now argues that because he is governed by Federal regulations which over-lay City requirements the City should not hold him to its requirements. This seems contradictory since the protection afforded to the City by the Federal regulations is that the developer must be responsive to the requirements established by the local community to meet its needs. In this case the protection to San Diego is that the developer must by Federal regulation comply with Council

Resolution No. 195865.

In order that these many questions may be answered and the situation clarified concerning this project that will eventually house 33,000 people in 835 acres we urge that this matter be referred to a Council Conference.

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY 1897