

Summary of Analysis of the 1 vs 2 Building Scenarios

Saint Matthews – School Gymnasium Project
City of San Mateo – Pre-Application

In accordance with the June 2009 staff report under Alternative Actions Saint Matthews evaluated the use, expansion and demolition of the existing Auditorium building. This included consideration of a small addition to the existing auditorium building instead of a new building. The following is a summary of that analysis.

1. Parking – The potential parking requirements/needs of the “2 building scenario” would be less than the “1 building scenario”. Please see Attachment 6 which addresses this issue in more detail.
2. Adherence to Use Limitations – The adherence to Use Limitations would be easier/more straight forward with the “2 building scenario”. This is due to the fact that each of the buildings within “2 building scenario” are smaller than the one building within the “1 building scenario” enabling a more controlled segregation of uses.
3. FAR – The project site is approximately 310,400 square feet with an existing floor area of 85,841 for a current FAR of 28%. The two building scenario would create an approximate FAR of 32% with the FAR for the 1 building scenario being approximately 30%. In that the project is now going to be processed via a Master Plan/Overlay Zone it is pertinent to note that the FAR for Serra High’s Overlay Zone is 37%.
4. School & Church programs – The School Gymnasium is solely for the use of school athletics while the auditorium is used by both the school and church. The “1 building scenario” would not work because it cannot accommodate the range of programmatic needs of both the church and the school. The “2 building scenario” allows for the flexibility in scheduling that is required of the church and the school. While the School Gymnasium submittal is not proposing any intensification of use for neither the church nor the school, the “1 building scenario” would in part defeat the purpose of the project.
5. Historical – The Historical Analysis, Attachment 8, details the findings of Historical Architect, Mark Hulbert from Preservation Architecture.
6. Cost – The “2 building scenario” is significantly less costly than the “1 building scenario”. The additional cost of the “1 building scenario” would be in excess of \$2,275,000, not including site prep, soft, mechanical and other costs. The “1 building scenario” would be at least 6,500 square feet more new construction than the “2 building scenario” (Estimated \$350 per square foot for building construction x 6,500 =\$2,275,000).