



MEMO

DATE: September 9, 2019

TO: Ron Munekawa, Chief of Planning
 Phillip Brennan, Associate Planner
 Sue-Ellen Atkinson, Parking Manager
 Karen Magallanes, Engineering
 Alex Mortazavi, 230 El Camino LLC(owner)
 Craig Almeleh, Arc Tec
 Evan Sockalosky, Arc Tec

FROM: Douglas Oliver

RE: 2 West 3rd Ave-Planning Review – Parking
 PA#2019-012

Arizona
 2960 E. Northern Avenue
 Building C
 Phoenix, AZ 85028
 602.953.2355 t
 602.953.2988 f

California
 1731 Technology Drive
 Suite 750
 San Jose, CA 95110
 408.496.0676 t
 408.496.1121 f

www.arctecinc.com

Ron,

Thank you for the time from you and your staff for the call yesterday to discuss the 2 West 3rd Ave. planning package. We understand the position that staff will not be able to support the project as designed with no proposed on-site parking. It is also noted that our application is deemed complete. Our project team has analyzed the site in developing the current design. Based upon that analysis, providing parking at this site is not viable for the following reasons:

- Site size
 - The small dimensions of the site prevent the use of conventional below grade parking.
 - The use of car stackers is cost prohibitive due to the reduction in rentable area and the system itself. In addition, the approximately 10 spaces that could be provided would be woefully shy of the City parking requirements. Needless to say, City public parking would still be required.
- Contaminated Soil
 - As staff knows, the site is the previous location of a gas station. Any below grade construction and excavation will require **significant** clean-up to meet County environmental standards. Costs associated with any below grade clean-up could range from \$1-2 million and may take up to 5 years. Both conditions render this project infeasible. The most cost-efficient manner of dealing with the contamination is to “cap” the site, and not build down into the ground.
- Land Use
 - Based upon the size and allowable density of the site, office use is the only viable use for the site. For a residential project to be viable on the site, the unit density would need to exceed 30-40 units. This exceeds both San Mateo and maximum achievable with the California State Density Bonus Law.

Based upon the above reasons, we request the opportunity to move forward with the process and present the project as designed with no on-site parking to the neighborhood meeting and the Planning Commission. It is our understanding that the neighborhood meeting is currently being coordinated. Again, we appreciate staff's time and careful consideration of the constraints of the site and project.

Douglas Oliver
Arc Tec, Inc.