

**MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE  
Monday, October 12, 2020  
6:30 p.m.**

**A. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

At the Regular Session of the City Council of University City held via videoconference, on Monday, October 12, 2020, Mayor Terry Crow called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m.

**B. ROLL CALL**

In addition to the Mayor, the following members of Council were present:

Councilmember Stacy Clay  
Councilmember Aleta Klein  
Councilmember Steven McMahon  
Councilmember Jeffrey Hales  
Councilmember Tim Cusick  
Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson

Also, in attendance were City Manager, Gregory Rose; City Attorney, John F. Mulligan, Jr.; Director of Planning & Zoning, Clifford Cross, and Director of Parks & Recreation, Darren Dunkle.

**C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Rose asked that the Public Hearings, Items I (1) and (2), remain on the Agenda, but that Items L (2) and M (1) be removed from the Agenda.

Councilmember Hales moved to approve the Agenda as amended, it was seconded by Councilmember Cusick, and the motion carried unanimously.

**D. PROCLAMATIONS**

**E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. September 14, 2020, Study Session Minutes– Space Needs Study were moved by Councilmember Smotherson, it was seconded by Councilmember Cusick and the motion carried unanimously.

**F. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS**

1. Charles Gascon is nominated to the Plan Commission as a fill-in replacing Cirri Moran unexpired term by Councilmember Jeff Hales, it was seconded by Councilmember McMahon and the motion carried unanimously.
2. Lisa Greening is nominated for re-appointment to the Land Clearance Redevelopment Authority by Mayor Terry Crow, it was seconded by Councilmember Cusick and the motion carried unanimously.

**G. SWEARING IN TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS**

1. Cirri Moran was sworn into the Traffic Commission on October 5, 2020.
2. Susan Armstrong, Holly Ingraham, Mimi Taylor-Hendrix, and Andrew Wool were sworn into the Renaming Streets and Parks Task Force on October 5, 2020.
3. Don Fitz was sworn into the Renaming Streets and Parks Task Force on October 7, 2020.

4. Joseph Cavato was sworn into the Land, Clearance, and Redevelopment Authority on October 8, 2020.
5. Eric Whritenour was sworn into the Board of Trustees Retirement Fund (Pension) on October 9, 2020.

## H. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

### ***Procedures for submitting comments for Citizen Participation and Public Hearings:***

*ALL written comments must be received **no later than 12:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting.** Comments may be sent via email to: [councilcomments@ucitymo.org](mailto:councilcomments@ucitymo.org), or mailed to the City Hall – 6801 Delmar Blvd. – Attention City Clerk. Such comments will be provided to City Council prior to the meeting. Comments will be made a part of the official record and made accessible to the public online following the meeting.*

*Please note, when submitting your comments, a **name and address must be provided.** Please also note if your comment is on an agenda or non-agenda item. If a name and address are not provided, the provided comment will not be recorded in the official record*

Mayor Crow reminded residents of the City's Zoom protocols and thanked everyone who submitted written comments. All comments submitted within the required timeframe have been provided to members of Council and made a part of this record.

## I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Avenir Project (Charles Deutsch & Company) 353 Redevelopment Plan, Including Tax Abatement.

Mayor Crow opened the Public Hearing at 6:36 p.m.

The Mayor thanked citizens for their comments; a vast majority of which were extremely helpful and thought-provoking. However, to the handful of residents who in his opinion, made groundless assertions about there being a lack of transparency, he would note for the record that the process being followed by the developer, staff, and Council is the same process that has been in effect for the thirteen years he has been a member of this body. So, there is nothing nefarious or secret, and if the Ordinances this administration operates under need to be changed, they will be changed. The developer has nothing up his sleeve; the notices filed by staff were in accordance with the City's Ordinances, and Council has acted under that same guidance.

That said, these comments, as well as some of the concerns expressed by Council, have prompted a request to the City Manager and his staff to expand the circle of people that receive communications for not only these Public Hearings but those hearings that come before all of the City's Boards and Commissions. Mayor Crow stated staff and Council are always looking for ways to improve, but as they continue to develop, he would ask residents to keep in mind that the seven people they have elected to sit on this dais have always had the City's best interest at heart.

Mayor Crow asked for a motion to hold this Public Hearing open to allow for additional comments to be made before Council's next meeting on October 26th.

Councilmember Hales moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember McMahan, and the motion carried unanimously.

2. Map Amendment – Avenir Zoning Map Amendment/Preliminary Plan

Mayor Crow opened the Public Hearing at 6:40 p.m.

The Mayor acknowledged the comments submitted by interested parties and called for a motion to hold this Public Hearing open to allow for additional comments to be made before Council's next meeting on October 26th.

Councilmember McMahon moved to approve, seconded by Councilmember Hales, and the motion carried unanimously.

Councilmember Hales thanked the City Manager, Councilmember McMahon, and the citizens who emailed him in response to this item. He stated he appreciates when everyone gets involved, especially when there is the kind of mobilization that occurred in this instance that demonstrated a tremendous amount of concern.

Councilmember Clay stated the Mayor kind of touched on this issue, but he would like to hear more about the efforts that are being undertaken to expand the circle of people who receive communications for Public Hearings.

Mr. Rose stated initially, staff will look at expanding the radius of its radio communications to a minimum of 300 feet. This will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to determine if there is a need to expand this radius even greater. Secondly, they are deliberating on whether there is a need to hold additional Public Hearings for matters related to rezoning at the Plan Commission level, and whether this is the only venue where Public Hearings should be held. Mr. Rose stated both measures will be evaluated, and staff's recommendation will be brought before Council for consideration

Voice vote on Councilmember McMahon's motion carried unanimously.

3. Liquor License – Diego's Cantina, LLC – 626-630 North & South

Mayor Crow opened the Public Hearing at 6:43 p.m. and acknowledged receipt of several comments that have been made a part of this record. Mayor Crow closed the Public Hearing at 6:44 p.m.

#### **J. CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Emerald Ash Borer Tree Replacement Program
2. Tree Trimming Program
3. Demolition Funding
4. Liquor License - Diego's Cantina, LLC – 626-630 North & South

Councilmember Smotherson moved to approve Items 1 through 4 of the Consent Agenda, it was seconded by Councilmember Cusick.

Councilmember Smotherson thanked Mr. Rose for providing Council with the addresses associated with the Demolition Funding. He then asked if this information along with details describing the funding process and how these houses were identified could be provided to the public to help them better understand the impact this process will have on their neighborhoods.

Voice vote on Councilmember Smotherson's motion carried unanimously.

#### **K. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

1. Olive/170 Project Update

Mr. Rose reported that NOVUS is still in the acquisition stage which is to be completed in two phases. Currently, they are focused on the north end parcel that Costco has expressed the most interest in, and as a part of the Redevelopment Agreement, NOVUS has agreed to construct a concrete slab for the new store. Costco is still interested in being a part of the U City community and staff is working closely with its team to review all of the plans.

Staff anticipates that all parcels in the first phase will be acquired by the end of the first quarter of 2021.

Councilmember Clay stated barring any unforeseen calamities, when do you anticipate the next phase of this development will start unfolding? Mr. Rose stated NOVUS is committed to developing the north end parcel and he thinks there will be an accelerated pace for the construction of Costco. However, the completion of both the north and south parcels is difficult to gauge since it is contingent upon COVID's impact on the market.

So, at this point, he is hesitant to throw out any dates until staff has a better sense of when the construction of Phase 1 will be concluded. At that point, staff should be able to develop a calendar for Phase II.

Councilmember Smotherson asked whether additional staff would be needed to assist in handling the workload created by this development? Mr. Rose stated the area that will be largely impacted by the construction aspect of this project is the City's building inspectors. So, at some point, there will be a need to either hire additional inspectors or use contract laborers to fulfill this task; which may be the logical solution because once the construction phase is completed these new inspectors will no longer be needed. He stated staff is prepared to handle the various zoning processes and he is hopeful that NOVUS will work with them to achieve some of this prep work in the early stages of development to ensure a smooth process.

Councilmember Cusick asked Mr. Rose how soon after the end of the first quarter in 2021 does he think Costco's would be open for business? Mr. Rose stated his understanding is that the acquisition of Phase I will be completed by the first quarter of 2021. But if things go as planned, he thinks construction should be completed by the end of Fiscal Year 2021.

## 2. Special Events Policy

Mr. Rose stated he has asked Mr. Dunkle to provide Council with an updated proposal for the City's Special Events Policy.

Mr. Dunkle stated the Special Event Policy for use of the City's parks, Right-Of-Way, and Special Use Permits was last updated in 2009. And while most of the same policies and procedures utilized by Public Works will remain the same, staff is recommending the modification of one internal procedure concerning parks. Currently, a request and approval to utilize a City park are solely handled by the Parks and Recreation Director. The modification expands the review of these requests to include other department heads, with final approval to be granted by the City Manager.

Councilmember Klein moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Clay and the motion carried unanimously.

## L. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. **BILL 9411** – AN ORDINANCE FIXING THE COMPENSATION TO BE PAID TO CITY OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES AS ENUMERATED HEREIN FROM AND AFTER ITS PASSAGE, AND REPEALING ORDINANCE NO. 7129. Bill Number 9411 was read for the second and third time.

Councilmember Cusick moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Smotherson.

Roll Call Vote Was:

**Ayes:** Councilmember Klein, Councilmember McMahon, Councilmember Hales, Councilmember Cusick, Councilmember Smotherson, Councilmember Clay, and Mayor Crow.

**Nays:** None.

2. **BILL 9412** – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 400.070 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY, MISSOURI, RELATING TO THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP, BY AMENDING SAID MAP SO AS TO CHANGE THE CLASSIFICATIONS OF MULTIPLE PROPERTIES FROM GENERAL COMMERCIAL (“GC”), SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (“SR”), MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (“MR”) & HIGH-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (“HRO”) TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT – MIXED-USE (“PD-M”) DISTRICT; AND ESTABLISHING PERMITTED LAND USES AND DEVELOPMENTS THEREIN; CONTAINING A SAVINGS CLAUSE AND PROVIDING A PENALTY. **(REMOVED)**

**M. NEW BUSINESS  
RESOLUTIONS**

1. **Resolution 2020-15** – Avenir Preliminary Plan Approval; **(Removed)**

*BILLS*

*Introduced by Councilmember Cusick*

2. **BILL 9413** – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 400.070 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY, MISSOURI, RELATING TO THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP, BY AMENDING SAID MAP SO AS TO CHANGE THE CLASSIFICATION OF 7800 AND 7812 GROBY ROAD FROM SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (“SR”), TO LIMITED COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (“LC”); CONTAINING A SAVINGS CLAUSE AND PROVIDING A PENALTY. Bill Number 9413 was read for the first time.

*Introduced by Councilmember McMahon*

3. **BILL 9414** – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 120, ARTICLE I OF THE UNIVERSITY CITY MUNICIPAL CODE, RELATING TO COMMISSIONS, AUTHORITIES, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES, BY ENACTING THEREIN A NEW SECTION TO BE KNOWN AS SECTION 120.160. CERTAIN PERSONS RELATED TO CITY EMPLOYEES INELIGIBLE TO SERVE. Bill Number 9414 was read for the first time.

**N. COUNCIL REPORTS/BUSINESS**

1. Boards and Commission appointments needed
2. Council liaison reports on Boards and Commissions
3. Boards, Commissions, and Task Force minutes
4. Other Discussions/Business

**O. COUNCIL COMMENTS**

Councilmember Clay stated he would like to acknowledge the passing of Ms. Anna Rose Mims Bartley; reflect on her legacy and the diverse history of this community.

Mr. and Mrs. Charles Bartley were one of the first African American families to move into U City back in 1965. And while it's hard to imagine today, the White widower who believed the Bartley's were the perfect family to purchase her home, received a lot of pressure from neighbors for the thought of even selling her house to an African American family. As a result, both families should be recognized as true pioneers in the course of this City's history.

Both Anna and Charles became pillars of the music neighborhood within U City. They had four children all of whom graduated from U City High School. And in addition to their work within U City, Mrs. Bartley performed remarkable work outside of the community, as an entrepreneur, Special Educator in the St. Louis Public School District, and as a woman of faith who mentored countless young people.

Councilmember Clay stated while U City may not always get things right, he sincerely believes it has been successful in ways that other communities are still struggling to achieve.

That began with the legacy of these pioneers, whose reliance and compassion helped to make U City the vibrant place that it is today.

- P.** Motion to go into a Closed Session according to Missouri Revised Statutes 610.021 (1) Legal actions, causes of action or litigation involving a public governmental body and any confidential or privileged communications between a public governmental body or its representatives or attorneys

Councilmember Hales moved to adjourn the Regular Session and go into a Closed Session, it was seconded by Councilmember Cusick.

Roll Call Vote Was:

**Ayes:** Councilmember Klein, Councilmember McMahon, Councilmember Hales, Councilmember Cusick, Councilmember Smotherson, Councilmember Clay, and Mayor Crow.

**Nays:** None

**Q. ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Crow thanked everyone for their attendance and reminded anyone interested in submitting additional comments on the two open Public Hearings to provide them to Ms. Reese before the October 26th Council meeting.

Mayor Crow closed the Regular City Council meeting at 7:02 p.m. to go into a Closed Session on the second floor. The Closed Session reconvened in an open session at 7:53 p.m.

LaRette Reese  
City Clerk

**From:** Donna Nickum <dsn232@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 10:52 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** agenda item proposed Avenir project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Good Morning:

I live three houses off of Kingdel Ave. on Teasdale Ave. I was informed yesterday of the proposed Avenir project by a neighbor. This raises some concerns for me.

1. Why weren't adjacent property owners given notice of the zoning change and the proposed project so we could review the information and state our opinions?

This is a concerning lack of transparency in my opinion. Considering adjacent property owners weren't notified, I feel the proposal should not pass at this time.

2. I don't agree AT ALL with giving tax abatements to multi-millionaires. I have always paid my fair share of taxes and am happy to do so. I don't agree with letting

individuals or organizations out of paying their share. If a tax reduction is given in order to get a project done, reduce the tax somewhat. But a total tax abatement for 10 years and 50% abatement for 5 more years seems totally outlandish. I feel this is one of the main downfalls in our country...tax abatements and tax loopholes for the very wealthy and nothing for the average person.

Donna Nickum  
8717 Teasdale Ave., 63124

**From:** VAH <victorianika59@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 10, 2020 2:13 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Deutsch re zoning request

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I want to go on record to adamantly oppose the request to rezone the Delmar Blvd section just west of 170 to Kingdel for mixed (residential/commercial) use. In the short term the construction noise will disrupt those of us permanently working from home (I provide telehealth and will be unable to perform the essential duties of my job for the corporate, private and military-I am in the Army- sectors within which I am a mental health provider), it will increase both vehicle and foot traffic for our neighborhood (to include Washington, Teasdale, W. Kingsbury, and Kingdel), increase noise levels, invite more vandalism and increase exposure to vehicle exhaust. In the long term it reduces our property values, puts the current property owners at risk for additional commercial developers to blight our homes and displace the existing residents. Further, U City has not provided proper and timely notice for all interested parties to research their alternatives BEFORE Charlie Deutsch has yet another opportunity to bully us out of the lifestyles we have created for ourselves.

If, after all objections to this project are not honored and allowed to go on, it should not be able to happen without substantial concessions such as permanently gating our community, providing compensatory funds for being unable to work from home during the construction phase, providing a legally binding agreement that no further commercial development will occur, and forcing Charlie Deutsch to pay the property tax on ALL of the houses in our neighborhood during the 20 years he asking for a tax abatement. It is high time Mr. Deutsch experiences the personal impact of his insatiable greed. Thank you.

Victoria Anika Hannah  
8701 W Kingsbury Ave.



**From:** Linda Langer <lindalanger6@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 10, 2020 4:11 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Charlie Deutsch

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I want to go on record to adamantly oppose the request to rezone the Delmar Blvd section just west of 170 to Kingdel for mixed (residential/commercial) use. In the short term the construction noise will disrupt those of us permanently working from home, it will increase both vehicle and foot traffic for our neighborhood (to include Washington, Teasdale, W. Kingsbury, and Kingdel), increase noise levels, invite more vandalism and increase exposure to vehicle exhaust. In the long term it reduces our property values, puts the current property owners at risk for additional commercial developers to blight our homes and displace the existing residents. Further, U City has not provided proper and timely notice for all interested parties to research their alternatives BEFORE Charlie Deutsch has yet another opportunity to bully us out of the lifestyles we have created for ourselves.

If, after all objections to this project are not honored and allowed to go on, it should not be able to happen without substantial concessions such as permanently gating our community, providing compensatory funds for being unable to work from home during the construction phase, providing a legally binding agreement that no further commercial development will occur, and forcing Charlie Deutsch to pay the property tax on ALL of the houses in our neighborhood during the 20 years he asking for a tax abatement. It is high time Mr. Deutsch experiences the personal impact of his insatiable greed. Thank you.

Linda and Richard Langer  
509 Kingdel  
University City

Sent from my iPad

**From:** Jason Rudman <jrr42788@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 10, 2020 4:25 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Comment for Oct 12, 2020 PC 20-08 Meeting

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To the City Council of University City:

I would like to raise 2 concerns about the approval of this mixed-use development and its impact on our residential neighborhood.

Our house, 8681 W Kingsbury, is located directly south of the planned "Parcel 4" and in direct view of "Parcel 1." We currently enjoy a relatively private backyard. I expect that with the construction of an adjacent parking lot, as well the planned new apartment building in direct line of sight with the rear of our house (and that of my immediate neighbors), we can expect much of this privacy to be lost. Are any physical barriers (e.g. tall trees) planned along the southern border of the property (Parcel 1 and particularly Parcel 4) that may preserve some greenery and maintain our privacy from the tenants of this new multi-level apartment building and adjacent parking lot?

I would also be interested to know if construction would occur on weekends, given the level of noise expected.

Sincerely,

Jason Rudman  
8681 W Kingsbury Ave  
St Louis, MO 63124

**From:** Eric Harris <emharrier@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 10, 2020 4:44 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Avenir Project (Charles Deutsch & Company) 353 Redevelopment Plan

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Greeting,

My name is Eric Harris and I live at 8812 Washington Ave, University City, MO 63124. I live in the neighborhood adjacent to the West of the proposed development.

Having read through the proposal I believe that are some significant underestimates to the traffic impact in the area. There are two major points of concern for me.

1) The proposed coffee shop will add additional traffic to an area that is already suffering from poor design and traffic flow. With that, there will now be 3 entrance/exits to the complex within the 1000 ft between Kingdel and the on ramp for I-170 South. Adding the additional traffic (nearly 400 in the AM when combined with estimates of traffic from the apartment complex) to that already entering I-170 from Delmar will cause significant congestion due to how close the driveways are to on ramp (less than 200 ft from the proposed coffee shop drive to the on ramp).

2) The proposed design of the apartment complex calls for the courtyard to face into the abutting neighborhood in an almost voyeuristic manner disguised with flowery language such as, "The orientation of the exquisitely designed multi-family structure has been thoughtfully planned, so that it's expansive courtyard will face Kingdel Drive, thereby maximizing the open space view to the adjoining neighborhood." Despite the assertions in the proposal that two homes being "face" the proposed apartments, a simple walk through the area belies this statement. Additionally, no where in the proposal does it address that all of the apartments that face the neighborhood now have unobstructed views into a significant number of homes. It should also be pointed out that the language used on page 37 is intentionally deceptive about the visibility from and to the impacted homes. It speaks of properties "facing" rather than how many properties are in sight of the proposed complex. Additionally, it is arrogantly implied that since so few homes "face" the complex then their opinions do no matter.

In summary, this proposal will add a seriously underestimated amount of traffic to the area and is willfully negligent of the impact on the abutting neighborhood in terms of obtrusiveness and foot traffic.

Regards,

Eric Harris

**From:** Cindy <spacoach@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 11:13 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Kingdel Apartment project

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To The Committee Council,

I reside at 8743 Teasdale Ave in U City and enjoy the neighborhood due to the quiet family friendly area. There are residents out walking everyday of the week and the traffic will make an immense impact to the area. Before living here I resided at Quadplex on the corner of Kingdel and Delmar and the traffic on Delmar was heavy at that time and this will add to the traffic noise. Please consider the old neighborhood and the Jewish communities that walk to temples on Saturday many which push baby carriages. This project will affect the culture of this old neighborhood and the charm of the neighborhood.

Also consider the additional traffic jams and accidents that will occur at the NW corner of Delmar due to the removal of the lane with the bike path that was installed a few years back. This corner was poorly thought out at the time it was installed and will only cause more problems with this additional traffic from the complex.

Regards,

Cindy Angelly

Peak Packaging Inc.

## LaRette Reese

---

**From:** Ilene Murray <ilenemurray@att.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 11:48 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; Jeff Hales; Clifford Cross; Steve McMahon  
**Subject:** Proposed development for Delmar and Kingdel

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Council Members,

I am writing in regard to the agenda item concerning the Avenir Proposal to be presented at the council meeting on Monday, 12 October 2020.

I live just to the west of the proposed 256-unit apartment complex on Delmar, west of 170. As a longtime resident of this area, I am incredibly disappointed that we found out about this proposal via social media instead of in an honest, upfront manner by the city. I am even more disappointed that the project is now being ushered through with little to no regard as to what is best for the neighborhood.

We truly do NOT need 256 apartments jammed into what has been a quiet, residential area that already has two apartment complexes just to the north (Trilogy and the District) and a huge, imposing structure (Mansions on Delmar) just to the east. As much as I am a fan of Starbucks, we already have two within a few miles (North and South at Delmar and Olive and Price), plus a coffee bar at the Barnes and Noble, less than a mile away.

This is a neighborhood where people walk all the time; it is currently as safe and secure as is possible in this day and age, and the thought of adding hundreds more people, cars, and a four/five-story building that stretches for several blocks is just appalling. Over the years, as the apartments to the north have changed ownership, we have had many times when it was worrisome to have so many rental units nearby. Yes, I understand that these are to be high-end rentals, but it doesn't change the fact that people living in rental units are usually not heavily invested in the well being of home owners living nearby.

Property values in this vital corner of University City have been consistently solid. A massive development of this nature filled with transients is NOT stabilizing for the neighborhood. The rental units currently on Delmar are NOT blighted and the people living there are NOT undesirable. It makes absolutely no sense to remove the low density buildings that exist with such a high density development that will overwhelm the surrounding streets and the neighborhood.

If there is still time to prevent such a large, unnecessary project from occurring in our small pocket of the city, I hope you will take into consideration how the neighbors in this area feel.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Ilene Murray  
8724 Teasdale Avenue  
St. Louis, MO 63124-1926  
314-991-3593  
[ilenemurray@att.net](mailto:ilenemurray@att.net)

**LaRette Reese**

---

**From:** Jim Zaitz <jimzaitz@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 12:03 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon  
**Subject:** AGENDA ITEM FOR MONDAY'S (10/12/2020) CITY COUNCIL MEETING

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To Whom It May Concern:

Please let it be known that object to the Avenir Project proposal.

**NO NOTICE:**

I, nor my neighbors, were not given timely notice to fully comment on this proposed plan.

**NOT A NECESSARY DEVELOPMENT:**

This area is already getting an extra large mixed use development just to the north by less than half a mile, at 170 & Olive (both sides of the street).

High vacancy rates at the Mansions on Delmar and the Vanguard (higher end complexes) and The District and Trinity indicate that U City does not need another mass development.

**SAFETY:**

I believe it will be less safe to walk through my neighborhood. Our neighborhood has a wonderful combination of families, including small children, elderly and pets. Increased traffic puts all these at risk and raises a serious concern over increase in crime rates.

**PROPERTY VALUES:**

This will drastically decrease residential property values in my area, which is a harm to not only to me, but to U City as a whole. As one of the nicer areas of U City, as my council representative(s), I need to do our part to maintain home values for the sake of myself, my neighbors, and ALL residents of U City and for U City businesses.

I implore you to PLEASE do the right thing and vote against this.

Jim Zaitz  
8735 Teasdale Avenue  
University City, MO 63124

**From:** Katie O'Brien <obrienkatie123@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 12:16 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Avenir Project 353 Development Plan

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello city council,

I am writing as a resident of 8706 Teasdale Avenue in **STRONG** opposition to the proposed re-zoning of the Delmar, Kingdel, and Barby lane for an apartment complex. My driveway backs up directly to the proposed site.

This development will **DESTROY** our precious neighborhood by inviting increased traffic, noise, and activity to a quiet residential neighborhood. We do **NOT** want a multi use commercial space this close to our home.

Rather, we feel Charles Deutch of the Gatesworth should purchase the vacant and unappealing lot between the streets of Delmar, Delcrest, and the alley beside the centennial greenway for construction of the proposed property. While just across 170, this lot is already zoned for commercial use and currently does not house many businesses. Rather than destroy a lovely neighborhood and kick people out of their homes, Mr. Duetch should revitalize an already existing commercial zone and enhance the area.

In conclusion, the residents of 8706 Teasdale are **STRONGLY OPPOSED** to the destruction of our community.

Regards,

Upset Residents

**From:** Susan Devereux <susandevs48@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 1:46 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; Steve McMahon; ccross@ucity.org; halesforcity@gmail.com  
**Subject:** AGENDA ITEMS FOR MONDAY'S (10/12/2020)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To the Councilmen and Director of Planning and Development

I have been a member of this community for 6 years. I chose to move to this community to be closer to my children who live in Ucity and the CWE. I had always lived in west county and moving closer "in" was a change for me. But it has been a wonderful experience. I am so very comfortable here. My neighbors are lovely. I walk my dog in the neighborhood, ride my bike, and enjoy the quiet atmosphere Kingdel affords us all. This neighborhood is a mixture of the young and the old. I always say, "People are out with dogs, or kids day and night in my neighborhood. During this Covid crisis some of us have had cocktails (socially distanced) on our patios! This is a lovely neighborhood, don't destroy it.

A large apartment complex would change everything. We would have cars driving thru because it is an easy "cut thru" to Price Road. The traffic thru our neighborhood would be constant. Maybe U City would put up gates with code access, so we could keep our privacy??

Imagine if this were your neighborhood. Would you vote to put an apartment complex in your backyard? Think about it!

Thank you for your consideration.

Susan Devereux  
8739 West Kingsbury Ave  
St. Louis Mo. 63124



**From:** Chris Norber <jcnorber@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 2:02 PM  
**To:** Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon; Clifford Cross; Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** AGENDA ITEM for Monday's (10/12/20) meeting.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I am writing regarding an AGENDA ITEM for Monday's (10/12/2020) meeting. - My name is Jeanne C. Norber. I live at 8732 Washington Avenue, University City, MO 63124. I have lived here for 37 years as of October 1, of this year.

I believe the first "Gatesworth" was rail-roaded through 35 years ago in much the same manner as this project. No one seems to be concerned about the neighborhoods or neighbors.

I only found out about this "project" on the website "NEXTDOOR" - today (10/11/2020). When exactly were we going to be asked or "told"? I consider this to be very unscrupulous of our city officials. I suppose my "registered letter" will arrive tomorrow afternoon with my 4:00 p.m. or later mail delivery - just in time for the city meeting.

This is a terrible idea for this area. The Gatesworth has become a monopoly. I can only hope enough of my fellow citizens get wind of this before it is shoved down our throats.

Sincerely,

Jeanne C. Norber  
8732 Washington Avenue  
University City, MO 63124

**From:** Alyson Domoto <alysondomoto@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 2:11 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Cc:** Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon; Clifford Cross  
**Subject:** Comments to Monday, 10/12/2020 Agenda

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Deal Councilmen and Director of Planning and Development.

I am writing in regard to an **Agenda Item for the meeting on Monday, October 12, 2020.**

I am writing to express my grave concerns over the proposed Avenir Project, as well as my extreme frustration. I am a local University City homeowner as well as a local business owner in the immediate area. Even knowing that additional residents could potentially help my business, it is *not* worth it at the expense of the neighborhood. Preserving the neighborhood community is far more important in the long run. For the sake of brevity, I will try to keep my comments as succinct as possible:

1) **NO NOTICE WAS GIVEN:** Residents were NOT given proper notice of this proposal and therefore many concerned citizens will not have an appropriate opportunity to respond. This is patently unfair. I only found out because a diligent neighbor happened to see me outside yesterday. Giving the appearance of hiding an important agenda item will not serve the U City Council well, nor the Community as a whole. It is important to be transparent and give everyone a fair opportunity to respond.

2) **SAFETY:** My biggest concern over this proposed development is how it will affect the safety and crime rate in the area. We live in a lovely, diverse neighborhood, filled with both young children and elderly individuals, as well as many pets and wildlife. The increased traffic flow from transient dwellers and customers sailing through the neighborhood at all hours, and at all speeds will put residents in unnecessary danger. Furthermore, the vast increase in the population will inevitably lead to a higher crime rate. As it is, we currently deal with petty car ransackers, but for the most part that is the extent of the crime. The increased population would put our currently quiet, safe neighborhood at a considerable risk for far more serious and violent crimes. This is not a risk that University City can afford to take.

3) **NOT A NECESSARY OR VALUE-ADD ADDITION TO THE AREA:** The general area is already getting a large mixed use development down the street at 170 & Olive (both sides of the street). Furthermore, high vacancy rates at the Mansions on Delmar and the Vanguard, and The District and Trinity indicate that U City does not need another mass development. We need to **PROTECT** what we have and the *value* of what we have. Building more units when the ones we have aren't even full drives down the value of housing all around.

4) **PROPERTY VALUES:** Our neighborhood is partially responsible for some of the highest property values in University City, and therefore helps the entire community. Building such a complex would drastically decrease property values in the entire area, which is not only bad for homeowners, but it is not good for University City as a whole – we need to be increasing our values, not decreasing them.

5) **PARKING:** I believe your plan does not include sufficient parking for the vast increase in residents and consumers that you are proposing.

6) **TRAFFIC CONCERNS:** The intersection at Delmar and 170 is already a high accident zone. I see accidents there all the time. Increasing traffic exponentially is only going to make that worse.

In summary, this is NOT a necessary or even a good addition to the area. There are too many other similar, competing projects already going up within a few blocks of here. Vastly increasing the population will lead to additional crime, safety and traffic issues that far outweighs any monetary value it would bring to the area.

2062

Kind regards,

Alyson H. Domoto, Homeowner at 8753 Washington Ave., St, Louis, MO 63124 as well as business owner at 608 N. McKnight Road.

**From:** Jaci Benson <jmbenson85@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 2:24 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon; Clifford Cross  
**Cc:** Keenan McRoberts  
**Subject:** Avenir Project Proposal

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

**To:** University City Councilmen and Director of Planning and Development  
**From:** Jacqueline M. Benson McRoberts and Keenan C. McRoberts  
 Homeowners and residents, 8768 W Kingsbury Ave., St. Louis, MO 63124  
**Re:** Avenir Project Proposal  
**Date:** Sunday, October 11, 2020

Dear Councilmen and Director of Planning and Development,

I am writing in regard to an **agenda item for the meeting on Monday, October 12, 2020.**

We are writing to express our grave concern about the proposed rezoning and 258-unit apartment complex plus potential commercial entities that have been proposed in the Kingdel neighborhood. The best part about leaving work is knowing that we will be returning to the calm of our neighborhood, graced with lovely mid-century homes, old-growth trees, familiar neighbors, and families walking down the street. When we turn into the neighborhood, it's as if you've driven 20 miles out of the city. One of our favorite activities is strolling on the low-traffic, sidewalk-free streets with our one-year old daughter. This may feel unsafe to others not familiar with our neighborhood, but neighbors take great caution in driving around corners because of the frequency with which the residents of the neighborhood exercise, walk, bike, stroll and play in the safe streets, including in the evening and at night. One of the things we really love about our neighborhood is the bimodal age distribution, meaning that we have significant populations of both retired and young families. This neighborhood is significant because it provides both the comforts of suburban living with the experience of the city, and is economically accessible to burgeoning career professionals, families and those on fixed incomes.

Our primary concerns with this development are the following:

- 1) Safety.
  - a. We believe it will be less safe to walk around the neighborhood both due to incoming traffic and exposure to people who do not care about the neighborhood. Transient dwellers and customers that the proposed development would bring would damage this amazing, safe environment and culture that defines the neighborhood.
  - b. While we've had limited petty theft occurrences (two car break-ins to be precise in our six-year tenure), we have grave concerns that crime will increase multi-fold in the neighborhood. We would expect an increase in both crime frequency and severity (beyond petty theft to home break-ins and other potentially worse nefarious activity).
- 2) Natural setting with abundant wildlife
  - a. Increased traffic would negatively impact the biodiversity and urban ecological paradise experienced in the neighborhood. In our yard alone we frequently enjoy sightings of the following: wild turkey, coyotes, foxes, racoons, possums, rabbits, woodchucks, and more than 50 species of birds (including great horned owls that nest annually in our backyard, immature red tailed hawks, hummingbirds, numerous woodpecker species, numerous songbird species, goldfinches, and many more).
- 3) Property values

262

- a. The aforementioned points and others will significantly decrease residential property values in the neighborhood.
- b. Kingdel neighbors the attractive Olivette, Ladue, Clayton and Creve Coeur municipalities, which have schools with higher ratings, and frequently larger homes and bigger yards. We considered these options when we first moved to St. Louis, but our drive to be in University City, close to action with higher diversity, prevailed over these appealing features in other neighborhoods. We both work in Chesterfield and could have chosen a home anywhere. We chose our home to be here. With an apartment complex and commercial activity in the heart of this neighborhood, we would not have made this choice and we do not believe that other young professionals like us would make it either.

In summary we've dreamed about watching our daughter grow up in this neighborhood and know that this will be a reason to leave it and find a home elsewhere. What type of communities are you trying to create in University City? We believe that peaceful, intellectual foundations are a defining factor of University City that make it an attractive place to call home. This type of development would undermine the very reason we chose to live in this neighborhood in the first place. Thank you for your consideration – we support action taken to prevent the rezoning and building of an apartment complex and associated commercial entities in this serene Kingdel neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Residents and Homeowners at 8768 W Kingsbury Ave., St, Louis, MO 63124

Jacqueline Benson McRoberts, Ph.D., Crop Efficiency Platform Lead, Bayer Crop Science

Keenan McRoberts, Ph.D., Vice President Science and Program Strategy, United Soybean Board

**LaRette Reese**

---

**From:** Linda Langer <lindalanger6@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 3:02 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Cc:** rich.langer@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Agenda item for 10/12/2020

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I am writing to express my concern regarding the Avenir Project 353 Development Plan, headed by Charles Deutsch. This plan is an attempt to rezone the area bounded by Delmar, Kingdel and Barby Lane to build and receive a tax abatement for, a 258 unit apartment building, a coffee store and parking surfaces. As a resident of Kingdel since 2003, I oppose this project as unnecessary, disruptive and dangerous. High vacancy rates at The Mansions on Delmar, The Vanguard, the District and Trinity indicate the area has no need for yet another residential development. Nor is there a use for an additional drive-through coffee shop. This project would disrupt this serene neighborhood with noise, traffic, and lower property values. It would pose a danger to pedestrians, dog walkers, and children, with increased car traffic, and possible increased crime. Although we were given little to no official notice of this development, my home would be immensely impacted by it. I want to add my voice to those of many of my neighbors in opposition to this development.

Linda M. Langer  
509 Kingdel  
University City  
Sent from my iPad

**From:** Reggie Victor <victor.reggie@me.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 3:16 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Cc:** ccross@ucity.org  
**Subject:** Agenda Item for Oct. 12, 2020 Meeting- Avenir Project 353

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Mr. Cross,

I am writing today as a Very Concerned home owner that lives in the neighborhood of the proposed Avenir Project 353. Why were we not given any notice of this proposal? I had to have a neighbor inform me. Is this how U City likes to treat a 34 year resident?

There are already several apartments in this area; The District, Trinity Plus, the Mansions on Delmar and The vanguard. We do not need another apartment complex!

I DO NOT want this area rezoned for the Avenir. I think it will likely increase the crime rate and also Definitely increase traffic which Will make it less safe to walk through our neighborhood. My wife and I walk every day through the neighborhood and love the fact that it is quiet and safe. Please do not take that away from us.

This new development will decrease our property values. How is that a positive thing for me? Of course it will be a fruitful for Charles Deutch as he will get his tax abatement and make lots of money. What about the folks who live in this neighborhood? What do we get.....the raw end of of good deal for Mr. Deutch!

Please reconsider And DO NOT rezone this Lovely neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Reggie Victor  
8739 Washington Ave.  
U City, MO. 63124  
314-223-2659

**From:** Hasmukh Patel <vanmala@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 3:42 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Avenir Project (Charles Deutsch & Company) 353 Redevelopment Plan, Including Tax Abatement

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

**Re: Avenir Project (Charles Deutsch & Company) 353 Redevelopment Plan, Including Tax Abatement**

**To : City Council, University City**

We are the home owners residing just a block away from the proposed Redevelopment Plan. We are shocked to know about The Avenir Project, only a day before the public hearing for approval. We need more time to review the project before making any final decision for such a major project in the history of U. City. We have the following concerns:

1. Postpone the final decision regarding approval of this Project.
2. Designating this project area blighted seems unusual. If this area qualifies as blighted then most of the U. city will fall under blighted area!
3. Approving PUD rezoning for this project alone is short sighted. Intersection at 170 and Delmar is the most prominent real estate in U. City. This intersection and vicinity could be rezoned as commercial/PUD for long term unified mixed use growth. This may require a City Planning study.
4. There should be more set back line on Delmar and Kingdel.
5. It may be tempting to provide tax abatement benefit for this large project. However, this successful developer is capable of completing the entire project without help of a tax abatement. We think U. City should impose normal property taxes for this project and use future revenue to improve parks, schools and other amenities in poor areas.

We request U. City to consider the concerns of all residents. We hope that we will have another chance to review before the approval of the rezoning and Redevelopment Plan.

Sincerely

Hasmukh and Adrienne Patel  
8684 W. Kingsbury Ave  
U City MO 63124



## LaRette Reese

---

**From:** Rebecca Hrustic <rlmunsen@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 4:15 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Cc:** Haris Hrustic; Steve McMahon; Jeff Hales; Terry Crow; Rebecca Hrustic  
**Subject:** In regards to Public Hearing Case Number PC20-08 Charles Deutsch and Company

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

In regards to Public Hearing Case Number:PC 20-08.

On October 5th at 4:08 pm a certified letter from the City of University City was left in my mailbox. It notified us of a public hearing regard Charles Deutsch and Company. The letter provided minimal information and stated that public comments are due by noon on October 12. That gave us only 4 business days to call University City and gather more information. I called the point of contact on the letter and left messages only to find out that they were out of the office until Monday the 12th and no one else was available to speak on the matter. Out of frustration I contacted one of our first ward council persons and he was able to provide more information and a link to the current plan. That plan was posted on Friday October 9th. Allowing us no time a adequately review and consider the impact to our neighborhood. Also note that NO signs of the pending public meeting were posted in our neighborhood and only those 185 feet from the construction received the certified letter.

We have lived through Mr. Deutsch's construction projects in the past and have major concerns. Specifically regarding the latest builds to the Gatesworth. Mr. Deutsch acquired house by house on West Kingsbury and Barby. Often going back and forth with residents on whether he intended to buy their properties. Leaving many of us unsure when considering making major renovations to our homes. This latest endeavor amplifies that concern. Is the long term goal blighting and rezoning everything west of the Gatesworth to Price?

Living next to such an enormous project was horrible. Construction went deep into bedrock, causing shaking and damage to our home. Construction lasted from sunrise to sunset on some days and there were no restrictions on Saturdays. The noise and vibrations on some days was unbearable and the project lasted for years. Calls to University City and to the Gatesworth point of contact gave no improvement. Where was the oversight? The build is complete but there is still ever present environmental noise from their building exhaust and the perpetual building lights in our backyard.

Mr. Deutsch talks about being a good neighbor. Why did he leave Barby Lane in disarray? Dead ending the street and allowing overgrowth that makes it appear abandoned. Mr. Deutsch installed two cul de sacs. One on Barby and one on West Kingsbury. Both have been neglected by Mr. Deutsch and when neighbors ask the Gatesworth to care for it, they deflect and place the blame on University City. Again, where is the oversight?

Tax abatement is also a concern. While Mr. Deutsch is one of the biggest tax payers in University City, the Gatesworth community also uses a large amount of the resources. Ambulance service being one of them. Have long term studies been done to see the overall tax growth this project may or may not have?

Additional traffic studies should be considered. Over 250 family units and a drive through coffee shop will create additional traffic and potentially bottleneck Delmar during peak traffic times.

We are asking for accountability and transparency.

Rebecca and Haris Hrustic  
8685 W. Kingsbury Ave  
University City, MO 63124

**From:** Donna Wilensky <mmwtwins@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 5:09 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon; Clifford Cross  
**Subject:** The Avenir Project Proposal

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I am writing regarding an Agenda Item For Monday's (10/12/2020) meeting. My name is Donna Wilensky and my address is 8801 Washington Ave. U. City, Mo 63124.

I am vehemently opposed to this project proposal for several very important reasons:

1. It is very unfair that we did not receive timely notice of this proposal which was probably done on purpose!
2. There is no need for another mass development in this neighborhood which can only bring **NEGATIVE RESULTS!**
3. The safety of our neighborhood would be put in jeopardy! We have many young children, the elderly, not to mention many, many dogs and dog walkers! Increased traffic puts ALL these at risk, adding to a serious concern over the increase in crime! To add to that, speaking for myself as well as everyone else, since the Pandemic and the limitations that has put on us, we are finding that for recreation purposes we ALL are taking lots more walks and having lots more Outside activities than ever before. More disruption in our lives is certainly **NOT** something that we need more of!!!!
4. The safety and preservation of our wildlife is also in jeopardy. So many of our animals are being driven from their homes and trees that are hundreds of years old are constantly being bulldozed down which affects the landscapes and beauty of our environment, just for the sake of yet another unnecessary building and people profiting, **ALL** for the almighty buck!!!!
5. We **ALL** value our homes and work very hard to keep them well maintained. This project will certainly impact our property values which would be harmful to us as homeowners as well as U. City as a whole.
6. Lastly, the noise from all the construction and devastation would be unnerving not to mention the additional noise of extra traffic and more police and ambulances!!!

I hope these factors among others, are taken into consideration as to why this project **NEVER** should go forward!!!

Donna

**From:** John G <jgerardi@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 7:15 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Comments for Public Hearing on Case Number PC 20-08, on 10/12/2020

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

**In regard to the request to rezone 8630 Delmar Avenue (Gatesworth Community):**

There are many concerns with the proposed change of zoning and commercial expansion to this area.

1. The intersection at Delmar Blvd and McKnight were recently optimized for the Greenway project. That MINOR change has already caused a noticeable increase in traffic congestion at the intersection, and the junction with Hwy 170. That modification was made based on existing traffic patterns, and there was still an impact to traffic. Adding additional traffic through the Delmar and 170 interchanges would exacerbate the already restrictive traffic flow.
2. While the specifics of the intended commercial expansion in that area are difficult to find, I'd point out the number of vacant retail spaces available in University City, already.
3. Residential space in this area is already extensive, and has been seen to have vacancies, and it's likely that rental turn-over will remain high for the coming future. With a "luxury residential community" to the east, which has never achieved full occupancy. Extensive additional residential space is likely to result in an abundance of vacancies.
4. The infrastructure for the area would require extensive improvement to support even a medium-sized residential development at that location. The current infrastructure for water, sewer, sidewalks, traffic control, parking management, and utilities would need to be addressed.
5. The extensive tax abatement and duration associated with this effort is extreme. It calls into serious question the value to University City for this effort, as by the time taxes would be received for these changes, the revenues would be reduced to the point that they wouldn't offset the costs required by University City to provide the proposed project with University City resources for the intervening period.

Between the adverse impacts to the existing residents of the area, the impact of the extra traffic through an already constricted area, and the fact that University City, itself will not even generate revenue for this effort for a considerable time, I fail to see that this proposal is an overall benefit to University City and its residents.

John M. Gerardi  
8700a Delmar Blvd  
University City, MO 63124

**LaRette Reese**

---

**From:** Renee M. Bauer <reenebauer1516@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 7:26 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon; Clifford Cross  
**Subject:** Expanding Gatesworth

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I am writing in regards to an agenda item for the Monday, Oct 12, 2020 meeting. I am outraged and shocked to have recently learned that the Gatesworth is planning an expansion which will take away land, homes and value from our neighborhood.

I live on Washington Avenue. My husband and I moved from Kingdel to this home across the street in July 2020 because we didn't to leave this wonderful neighborhood! We have made friends in this close-knit community and love how safe it is for walking our dog and the general quality of life. We are retired, moving into our home on Washington Ave was our dream - a place to happily live out our years with a place for our kids and grandchildren to visit.

On Saturday - only a day ago - we were made aware of the Avenir project proposal. We also are shocked to know that the neighborhood has only until Monday at noon to issue any concerns about this expansion. It looks that this proposal is trying to be quietly slipped past us. It is also the next of more planned expansions which will further erode our neighborhood and force good people from their homes.

This community does not need the building of the Avenir project. There are several unrented apartments already in place and building more seems unnecessary. There are also more stores and office areas currently under construction in the University City area.

This project is unnecessary and will ruin a happy and thriving established neighborhood. This will create a less safe environment and decrease our homes values.

**I DO NOT SUPPORT THE EXPANSION OF THE GATESWORTH INTO OUR NEIGHBORHOOD. I WILL VOTE AGAINST ANY COUNCIL MEMBERS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PROPOSED AVENIR DEVELOPMENT.**

Sincerely,  
Renee M. Bauer  
7808 Washington Ave.  
University City, MO 63124  
314-780-2626

**From:** Heidi Pohlman <sthlp@me.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 8:00 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Cc:** Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon; Clifford Cross  
**Subject:** Agenda item for Monday's Meeting - public hearing (case number PC 20-08)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear Council:

I am writing regarding an agenda item for Monday's meeting, to provide comments for the public hearing on Monday October 12, 2020 re: Charles Deutsch and Company and the rezoning of our neighborhood. We would like to speak out against the development and the negative impacts it will bring.

We are disappointed that we were not provided timely notice to gather information and fully comment on the proposed plan. This is *not* the first time the city has been less than transparent about Charles Deutsch and Company's proposed plans and projects. Nor is this the first time you've provided little to no notice of proposed changes by said developer. Further the notice sent from the city includes jargon and acronyms that require a real estate developer to understand, and the map provided is unclear.

The mixed use development is not needed, we have ample large developments at 170 & Olive including a new area currently under construction. We also have plenty of mixed use south of us, at Ladue Road and Brentwood.

Our neighborhood is a wonderful, quiet area that is pedestrian and dog friendly. We've enjoyed living here for 20 years. There is a variety of wildlife, including falcons, hawks, songbirds, raccoon, and opossums. The creation of a this new development will drastically change the nature of the neighborhood, driving out wildlife, increasing traffic, and making it less safe. It also has the potential to drive down property values – hurting not only the residents but the city itself.

Please consider our comments as you evaluate the preliminary plan and rezoning.

Sincerely,

Heidi and Timothy Pohlman  
512 Kingdel Drive  
University City, MO 63124

**From:** Sarah Myers <shmyers4@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 8:06 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Avenir Project Proposal & Monday's meeting

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello,

Please accept these comments regarding an agenda item for Monday's meeting (10.12.2020) on the proposed Avenir project. My name and address are as follows:

Sarah H. Myers  
8716 W. Kingsbury Ave.  
St. Louis, MO 63124

First and foremost, please do not rezone the area in question and do not allow the proposed Avenir project to proceed. Avenir would ruin what I love most about my neighborhood and my home. It would devastate my home's value as well -- and my neighbors' home values, too. And it will not give University City what it needs -- good and safe neighborhoods with strong property values, and with residents of all ages, races, and backgrounds, many of whom have lived here for decades.

I'm very surprised and concerned that we were not informed earlier of the proposed project. We did not receive timely notice of the meeting or of plans to consider this development.

Avenir is not necessary, so please say just say no to the rezoning and the proposal. UCity is already getting a large mixed use development just down the road at 170 and Olive. And we have plenty of apartment buildings and complexes already -- with many vacant units. It is not because the apartment buildings are obsolete or not nice enough -- look at the Mansions for example.

If the proposed mixed-use, high density project proceeds, it will forever change the character of our wonderful neighborhood. We don't have sidewalks, but even if we did it wouldn't be the same. Young families, older families, singles of all ages, children, bicycles, scooters, and pets on leashes -- you'll see all of these outside on any given day, walking and pedaling on our safe and quiet streets. Those not walking are often sitting out front or working in their yards -- me included -- because the views are pretty and peaceful, and it's very social with the pedestrian passersby. All of that would go away with the increased traffic. I would miss it terribly and I know my neighbors feel the same. I also would not feel as safe in terms of crime -- and that matters to me a great deal.

Would you want your children biking, walking, etc. on streets that provide egress for five story parking structures and lots, a huge apartment complex, and a coffee shop designed to divert 170 and Delmar traffic into our neighborhood? Would you want to do walk on those streets yourself? Would you want to live there? And it's not just people on Kingdel who will be affected. The cut-through traffic will no doubt be intense throughout the neighborhood.

The views, the sites, the sounds -- like the owls I hear every evening -- all that would change. The five story parking structure and apartments looming over me and ruining my view from every single window in the front of my home and the yard is awful to even think about. As is a significant lowering of my property value.

I am not one of those people who are against "progress". But this doesn't sound like progress. It just sounds like a bad idea.

Thank you for your time.

Sarah

Sarah Herstand Myers

282

## LaRette Reese

---

**From:** CHARLIE SCHIPPERS <gpkai@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 8:08 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Cc:** Paul Schippers  
**Subject:** FW: ATTENTION: City Clerk

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

RE : Public Hearing (Case Number: PC 20-08)

As the owners of one of the residences to be impacted by the planned development, I believe we should have a say in the outcome of the decision the council makes.

We live in the houses that back up to the property to be developed.

We were here during the construction of the Gatesworth Community and dealt with the construction and the cul-de-sac. The said cul-de-sac does come with its problems. Garbage, Recycle, Delivery vehicles, and heaven forbid Fire apparatus definitely experience a few inconveniences turning around.

The greenery has slowly begun to look less cared for.

We have to deal with the 24/7/365 lights on at the Gatesworth that shine into our house. Forget trying to stargaze.

The noise from the exhaust fan is another constant assault.

We are also subjected to frequent extremely loud big band music. (Admittedly most are in the afternoons) but for folks with children who either nap or doing on line schoolwork this can be a little difficult. As neighbors one would expect a courtesy notice.

New construction in our back yards will mean constant noise, dust, and traffic. Out pets will now have even more restrictions than before.

I believe there is talk of a tax abatement. The Gatesworth charges over \$3,000.00 for a one bedroom apartment. I can't imagine they are loosing money on that.

The plan is to build apartments and retail. Both will be revenue makers.

Why should we provide socialism for the rich? They should instead be paying us for the inconvenience we will have to deal with. We get no benefits from this development.

When I think forward, my backyard view will now be windows. People watching everything that happens in my yard. No more sun bathing with or without a swim suit. In other words the privacy my neighbors and I have paid for GONE. And if the tax abatement is approved We will pay for that privilege.

We already pay obscene amounts of property taxes. Clayton which has a better school system pays less than we do, and has more shopping and dining opportunities.

We have the Loop Trolley (that managed to close down many of the independent stores in the Loop) and Washington University. Neither of which benefits us. Metro Link goes the same places as the Trolley and runs not only more frequently, but cheaper and is more reliable.

How much of these funds, if any, go to UCity Police, Fire, Ambulance and Schools? This needs answered.

Imagine how you would feel if this were to happen in your back yard.

Respectfully.

Valda 'Charlie' Schippers, Paul Schippers  
8689 W Kingsbury Ave  
University City, MO. 63124



**From:** Shirley Seele <seele.a.shirley@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 9:21 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Gatesworth Project

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

For 26.5 years I have lived at 8716 Washington Avenue and watched the growth of the Gatesworth Senior Living Center and assumed senior living and senior services were the goal of the enterprise.

I do not support this proposal of 258 luxury apartments with special amenities, but do support extra parking for the employees, guests and family of the clients, etc. Likewise, the enhancing of the McKnight Place street and providing a coffee shop are good in and of themselves.

Luxury Apartments Nowhere in the 98 pages of this proposal, did I find, or read a reference to the Feasibility Study outlining the demand for such. Two luxury apartment complexes less than one mile from this property are Vanguard Crossing and Mansions on the Plaza. Vanguard built in 2014 with 202 units has a 14% vacancy factor or 28 open units. Mansions on the Plaza completed their second addition in 2017, have 208 units with 19 open or 19% vacancy. These figures were obtained from the internet and not verified by their management. Other apartment complexes The District and Trilogy on the opposite side of Delmar also have vacancies but may not be a similar product to compare.

Many solo apartment buildings on Delmar from I-170 to Price Road also have for rent signs, as well as the duplexes on McKnight, north of Delmar. Some of these are owned by the Gatesworth.

#### Blight and Dilapidation Concerns

The 8 buildings or 32 apartments on the south side of Delmar and 554 Kingdel Drive apartment building are all owned by the Gatesworth. Yes, the buildings have not been updated, but are owned by the Gatesworth. With the exception of 8656 Delmar, bought in May of 2018, all other 8 were purchased beginning in 2006 (2 buildings), 2009 (1 building), 2014 (1 building), 2015 (2 buildings), and 2016 (1 building). There has been adequate time to refurbish. Likewise, dilapidation status was achieved when a new 4 bedroom, 2-story was built on 544 Kingdel, double lot, and the owner sold to the Gatesworth in 2007. The new house was bulldozed and hauled away in 2 days. Clearly that endeavor is in line for the entire area to be blighted or dilapidated.

Kingdel Drive Proposed Changes Kingdel is a major egress for the residents of these 3 streets: Teasdale, Washington, and West Kingsbury. We simply cannot have the street narrowed, or needed for additional parking for the guests, or other congestion. Our neighborhood is relatively quiet, without much traffic, and the residents all enjoy this way of life.

From what I have read, single family homes are more in demand in this surrounding area.

#### Future Comments on Proposals

If we could get information more than 2 days prior to a comment period on proposals that affect us, I would greatly appreciate it.

Thank you,  
Shirley Seele  
8716 Washington Avenue.

**From:** valmik thakore <valmikt@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 10:01 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Citizen Participation and Public Hearings Comments: ON AGENDA FOR CITY COUNCIL MEETING on October 12, 2020  
**Attachments:** VTs public comment on Board Agenda Item I.doc

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

**This is a public comment on City Council Agenda Item I, sub-items 1 & 2 (“Avenir Project 353 Redevelopment Plan, Including Tax Abatement” & “Avenir Zoning Map Amendment/Preliminary Plan”, respectively) for the University City Council Meeting on October 12, 2020.**

My wife and I own the property at 8727 W Kingsbury Ave, University City, MO, 63124. Our house is in the neighborhood impacted by the proposed Avenir development.

As an urban designer, planner, and architect with considerable experience in urban design guidelines, large-scale (1 million sq ft+) projects, and over 46 years of experience in the field, I have major concerns about both sub-items on the agenda. My concerns are not limited to those listed here, but because of the irregular and rushed timeframe imposed upon citizens by the Board/ City for such a major project, I am choosing to highlight the following after a limited and rushed review:

1. Character

a) First and foremost, this project would change the character of University City and the Delmar corridor, especially west of I-170. Currently, the Delmar corridor consists of residential properties from the Lions in the Loop through to Price Road. While a variety of architectural styles are featured, all of the buildings are built at appropriate scale. West of I-170 to Price, University City boasts appropriately scaled and appropriately dense residential neighborhoods. This creates a peaceful, walkable city that is the envy of many in the region. An overly dense, big-box apartment complex would tear that fabric and make the surrounding areas less attractive, leading to a lower quality of life for citizens and less overall tax revenue for the city due to a decline in property values.

2. Density, Traffic, Parking, Noise and Nuisance

a) The proposed project increases the density from 40 residential units and one low-density office building to 258 units with inadequate parking and a high-traffic drive-through retail space. This is a dramatic increase in density that will create much more traffic and put a strain on the community.

b) Building density and scale will increase from 2 stories to 5 stories (more than doubling the height), and to 4 stories at Kingdel and Delmar (doubling the height). This will create an imposing streetscape that looms over the neighborhood and stifles daily life.

c) The area will experience increased traffic from trip generations of approximately 5 times the current level generated by the site’s current uses. This additional traffic will create left-turn issues during both rush hours and present a hazard for vehicular traffic and pedestrians due to increased accidents.

d) The 10% waiver granted for reduced parking will cause parking spillover into our neighborhood, especially on Kingdel because of the courtyard entrances to the proposed development. Visitor parking is very limited (19 spots for 258 units), especially considering that 65% are 1 bedroom units, which will skew younger. Employee parking is non-existent, and there is no identifiable delivery zone. Visitors, employees, Amazon, USPS, FedEx, Uber, Grubhub, etc., will all use our neighborhood and the courtyard for entrance/parking. This will cause

crowding, double-parking, and late-night traffic and lower property values of our peaceful neighborhood, as well as increasing risk of vehicular injury and property damage/crime. 296

A courtyard entry from Kingdel or Barby should not be allowed should the development go forward.

Adequate employee and visitor parking as well as a delivery zone should be provided on site.

### 3. Zoning/Site Plan

a) The proposed Zoning Map Amendment to Planned Development-Mixed (PD-M) would require a 50 foot setback under PD-M regulations. However, the developer has requested a setback waiver to 24 feet, thereby going against the PD-M regulations and the spirit/intent of the regulation. This will have a negative impact on our property values, quality of life, and neighborhood fabric. The waiver should not be granted in order to protect the citizens of University City.

b) Furthermore, the developer is requesting an additional setback waiver along Kingdel from the requested 24 feet to even less distance ("Kingdel Encroachment", per the developer). This would exacerbate the issues I listed in the point directly above. This waiver should not be granted.

c) The boundary adjustments requested under Vacation A (page 29 of Avenir document) should not be allowed. Rather, the City should retain the property for the probable future need of lane adjustments/widening of Delmar that will arise from this project. Retaining the property mentioned in Vacation A will also help the visual scale along Delmar and lessen the negative impact of the drastic increase in vertical scale.

d) Vacation B (page 29, Avenir) on Barby Ln should only be allowed if the developer is willing to pay fair value to the city based on the proposed density of Lot 1, appraised as High Density Residential (HD) or Commercial, whichever is higher. This land should not be given away for free.

e) The Floor to Area Ratio (FAR) Waiver requested on page 27 of Avenir's document is unspecified, and thus, troubling. This waiver should not be allowed. Once the City grants a Planned Development, the developer should abide by the rules. Incessant granting of waivers make laws and development plans pointless.

f) The Site Coverage calculations shown on page 25-26 of the Avenir document CONFLICTS with the landscape plan on Avenir's page 35 [also in Appendix M1-75 as "Outdoor Courtyard Map"]: page 35's Landscape Plan shows paved areas and a pool in the courtyard while page 25 shows the same area as open green space. Paving and a pool will increase the Site Coverage dramatically and lead to greatly increased stormwater runoff and will violate PD-M regulations on ground coverage. This will have a strong negative impact on our neighborhood and property values.

g) The City and Board should verify that the Development meets Site Coverage code and act to protect the interests of University City citizens.

### 4. Chapter 353 Usage Tax Abatement/Blighting

a) The developer has requested a 100% Tax Abatement for 10 years and a further 50% for 10 years under Chapter 353. The developer claims a positive economic impact for University City, but unless we are expecting an exponential increase in University City's population, this will simply have a negative impact on existing properties in historic U City neighborhoods. We are simply shifting renters around.

b) The developer's Chapter 353 Tax Abatement is based on a blight study commissioned by the developer (page 33, Avenir document). Avenir is the long-time owner (see page 100 of the PDF package /page M1-10-

3026

“assembled over the last 17 years”) and CAUSE of blight in the properties mentioned. Avenir let their property decline into what they call a state of “Physical Deterioration”, which led to a reduction in what they call “Reasonable Taxes”, created “Conditions Conducive to Ill Health, Transmission of Disease, and Crime”.

Now, Avenir wants to profit from their willful neglect AND reduce the taxes paid for the next 20 years. This is adding insult to the injury caused to our neighborhood over the last 17 years.

c) A tax abatement simply means that OUR taxes will remain high or be increased to provide police, fire, EMS, school, library, etc. services to 258 new units. We will be subsidizing the developer’s profits while having our property values decline and quality of life destroyed.

**There should be no tax abatement. I say this as a citizen and an urban designer.**

If Avenir wants to pursue a reasonable development at human scale that actually benefits University City and its existing citizens, they should be welcomed to do so with a modified plan that meets all code requirements and zoning regulations. A plan that incorporates neighborhood consultation by providing adequate time for review and public comment should be submitted after the COVID-19 crisis has been resolved.

Sincerely,

Valmik Thakore, Master of Architecture & Urban Design, Washington University in St Louis  
Retired Architect  
8727 W Kingsbury Ave, University City, MO

This is a public comment on City Council Agenda Item I, sub-items 1 & 2 (“Avenir Project 353 Redevelopment Plan, Including Tax Abatement” & “Avenir Zoning Map Amendment/Preliminary Plan”, respectively) for the University City Council Meeting on October 12, 2020.

My wife and I own the property at 8727 W Kingsbury Ave, University City, MO, 63124. Our house is in the neighborhood impacted by the proposed Avenir development.

As an urban designer, planner, and architect with considerable experience in urban design guidelines, large-scale (1 million sq ft+) projects, and over 46 years of experience in the field, I have major concerns about both sub-items on the agenda. My concerns are not limited to those listed here, but because of the irregular and rushed timeframe imposed upon citizens by the Board/ City for such a major project, I am choosing to highlight the following after a limited and rushed review:

**1. Character**

a) First and foremost, this project would change the character of University City and the Delmar corridor, especially west of I-170. Currently, the Delmar corridor consists of residential properties from the Lions in the Loop through to Price Road. While a variety of architectural styles are featured, all of the buildings are built at appropriate scale. West of I-170 to Price, University City boasts appropriately scaled and appropriately dense residential neighborhoods. This creates a peaceful, walkable city that is the envy of many in the region. An overly dense, big-box apartment complex would tear that fabric and make the surrounding areas less attractive, leading to a lower quality of life for citizens and less overall tax revenue for the city due to a decline in property values.

**2. Density, Traffic, Parking, Noise and Nuisance**

a) The proposed project increases the density from 40 residential units and one low-density office building to 258 units with inadequate parking and a high-traffic drive-through retail space. This is a dramatic increase in density that will create much more traffic and put a strain on the community.

b) Building density and scale will increase from 2 stories to 5 stories (more than doubling the height), and to 4 stories at Kingdel and Delmar (doubling the height). This will create an imposing streetscape that looms over the neighborhood and stifles daily life.

c) The area will experience **increased traffic** from trip generations of approximately **5 times** the current level generated by the site’s current uses. This additional traffic will create left-turn issues during both rush hours and present a hazard for vehicular traffic and pedestrians due to increased accidents.

d) The 10% waiver granted for reduced parking will cause parking spillover into our neighborhood, especially on Kingdel because of the courtyard entrances to the proposed development. Visitor parking is very limited (19 spots for 258 units), especially considering that 65% are 1 bedroom units, which will skew younger. Employee parking is non-existent, and there is no identifiable delivery zone. Visitors, employees, Amazon, USPS, FedEx, Uber, Grubhub, etc., will all use our neighborhood and the courtyard for entrance/parking. This will cause crowding, double-parking, and late-night traffic and lower property values of our peaceful neighborhood, as well as increasing risk of vehicular injury and property damage/crime.

A courtyard entry from Kingdel or Barby should not be allowed should the development go forward.

Adequate employee and visitor parking as well as a delivery zone should be provided on site.

### 3. Zoning/Site Plan

a) The proposed Zoning Map Amendment to Planned Development-Mixed (PD-M) would **require a 50 foot setback under PD-M regulations**. However, the developer has requested a setback waiver to 24 feet, thereby going against the PD-M regulations and the spirit/intent of the regulation. This will have a negative impact on our property values, quality of life, and neighborhood fabric. **The waiver should not be granted** in order to protect the citizens of University City.

b) Furthermore, the developer is requesting an **additional** setback waiver along Kingdel from the requested 24 feet to even less distance (“Kingdel Encroachment”, per the developer). This would exacerbate the issues I listed in the point directly above. **This waiver should not be granted.**

c) The boundary adjustments requested under **Vacation A (page 29 of Avenir document)** should not be allowed. Rather, the City should retain the property for the probable future need of lane adjustments/widening of Delmar that will arise from this project. Retaining the property mentioned in **Vacation A** will also help the visual scale along Delmar and lessen the negative impact of the drastic increase in vertical scale.

d) **Vacation B (page 29, Avenir)** on Barby Ln should only be allowed if the developer is willing to **pay fair value** to the city based on the proposed density of Lot 1, appraised as High Density Residential (HD) or Commercial, whichever is higher. **This land should not be given away for free.**

e) The Floor to Area Ratio (FAR) Waiver requested on page 27 of Avenir’s document is unspecified, and thus, troubling. **This waiver should not be allowed.** Once the City grants a Planned Development, the developer should abide by the rules. Incessant granting of waivers make laws and development plans pointless.

f) The Site Coverage calculations shown on **page 25-26** of the Avenir document **CONFLICTS with the landscape plan on Avenir’s page 35 [also in Appendix M1-75 as “Outdoor Courtyard Map”]**: page 35’s Landscape Plan shows paved areas and a pool in the courtyard while page 25 shows the same area as open green space. Paving and a pool will increase the Site Coverage dramatically and lead to **greatly increased stormwater runoff and will violate PD-M regulations on ground coverage.** This will have a strong negative impact on our neighborhood and property values.

g) The City and Board should verify that the Development meets Site Coverage code and act to protect the interests of University City citizens.

### 4. Chapter 353 Usage Tax Abatement/Blighting

a) The developer has requested a 100% Tax Abatement for 10 years and a further 50% for 10 years under Chapter 353. The developer claims a positive economic impact for University City, but unless we are expecting an exponential increase in University City’s population, this will simply have a negative impact on existing properties in historic U City neighborhoods. We are simply shifting renters around.

b) The developer's Chapter 353 Tax Abatement is based on a blight study commissioned by the developer (**page 33, Avenir document**). Avenir is the long-time owner (**see page 100 of the PDF package /page M1-10- "assembled over the last 17 years"**) and **CAUSE** of blight in the properties mentioned. Avenir let their property decline into what they call a state of "Physical Deterioration", which led to a reduction in what they call "Reasonable Taxes", created "Conditions Conducive to Ill Health, Transmission of Disease, and Crime".

Now, Avenir wants to profit from their willful neglect AND reduce the taxes paid for the next 20 years. This is adding insult to the injury caused to our neighborhood over the last 17 years.

c) A tax abatement simply means that OUR taxes will remain high or be increased to provide police, fire, EMS, school, library, etc. services to 258 new units. We will be subsidizing the developer's profits while having our property values decline and quality of life destroyed.

There should be no tax abatement. I say this as a citizen and an urban designer.

If Avenir wants to pursue a reasonable development at human scale that actually benefits University City and its existing citizens, they should be welcomed to do so with a modified plan that meets all code requirements and zoning regulations. A plan that incorporates neighborhood consultation by providing adequate time for review and public comment should be submitted **after the COVID-19 crisis has been resolved.**

Sincerely,

Valmik Thakore, Master of Architecture & Urban Design, Washington University in St Louis  
Retired Architect  
8727 W Kingsbury Ave, University City, MO

**From:** William Ash (wmash47) <wmash47@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 11:09 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Comments on Agenda items 1 and 2

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

My name is William Ash. I live at 8690 West Kingsbury, 63124, on the south side of the street.

My Comments on Agenda items 1 and 2

I have a number of concerns about the proposed Avenir project and proposed re-zoning.

a) For one thing, I only found out about this re-zoning proposal this week, third hand from my neighbors. This approval process has obviously been going on a long time. I have never received any notifications or seen any sign postings. Even though I live just outside the 185 foot perimeter, the scope of this project obviously will have impact on me. I feel I should have been notified as well in acknowledgement of the wide impact of this project, both on me personally and for all U-City residents. This could easily have been put in ROARS, the University City newsletter to ask for public input. Why was it not?

b) What assurances—either covert or formally approved by the planning commission --were given Mr. Deutsch or his company that such a process would be approved? We can only assume he would not have been buying up properties in our area beginning 17 years ago without at least some tacit approval that his redevelopment application would be approved.

Our area—the one last desirable convertible multi-use site in U-City--could have received multiple development proposals within such period, presumed some not requiring tax abatements, if these properties were no longer in the possession of Mr. Deutsch's company.

c) I assume an independent audit of the financial projections submitted by Mr. Deutsch was solicited by the Planning Commission to assess whether this project indeed requires such a substantial tax abatement to become financially successful. We as University City residents should have access to this document. Without it there is no justification for depriving all of us residents from the taxes this project would generate, as our safety, our schools, and services are compromised by failure to grow our tax base. And if no financials were submitted nor independent assessment done, I strongly object to giving any tax abatement whatsoever. The rights of all U-City residents are being dismissed should we allow Mr. Deutsch to profit from a community development that has no corresponding benefit to our community.

Given the above concerns, I object to any quick approval given to this project until a full public vetting process has been allowed to happen. An open forum where we can express our concerns—even if we have to do so on Zoom—needs to allow for U-City residents to ask questions, and time for answers to be generated. Which I cannot imagine being done fairly and adequately in less than three such future meetings.

If no acknowledgement is given to our concerns, you can expect letters to appear in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. And they will not be favorable.

William Ash



**From:** Asim Thakore <asim.thakore@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 1:41 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Cc:** valmik thakore  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Oct 12th Meeting

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

This is a public comment on Board Agenda Item I, sub-items 1 & 2 ("Avenir Project 353 Redevelopment Plan, Including Tax Abatement" & "Avenir Zoning Map Amendment/Preliminary Plan", respectively) and Board Agenda Item L (Zoning Bill) for the October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2020, University City City Council Meeting.

I live at 8727 W Kingsbury Ave, University City, MO, 63124. Our house is in the neighborhood impacted by the proposed Avenir development. I am very concerned about the new apartment complex and urge the Council to not allow it.

My reasons for opposition are myriad, but chief among them is the complete joke of a public consultation process. After some news in local development media in May, there hasn't been any information. All of a sudden, our neighborhood found out about the project this week when a letter was delivered to a select few. Most of us learned about it secondhand.

The public consultation process has been so rushed and inadequate that it makes a mockery of the term. The rushed and poorly communicated process could be misconstrued as something more sinister. I am not suggesting impropriety, but even the appearance of impropriety should be unacceptable to the Council. After the Costco debacle, I thought you would try to do better, but here we are.

How do you expect people to have faith in local government when they aren't even consulted on life-changing decisions until it's too late to actually have a say in the outcome? How do you expect us to have faith in the Council when we never hear from you, even on big things like this? Under no circumstances should the faith of the people in their government be crushed by the actions of that government. **No project should be valued above preserving faith in government. For this reason alone, the process should begin anew.**

That said, I am not laboring under the illusion that we are living under enlightened rule. I am not naive enough to believe that the Council will accept the fundamental American truth that they derive their powers from the consent of the governed. Therefore, I turn to more quotidian and commercial objections:

**1) This project will be a disaster for pedestrians and motorists. The south side of Delmar from Kingdel to 170 will be unusable due to having to navigate multiple curbcuts/parking lots/cars zooming off the highway into the drive-thru. Delmar is already perilous to cross at the best of times. There are only two crosswalks, one at 170 and one at Price Rd. The scarcity of crosswalks forces people to jaywalk; thus are the citizens made criminals by their government. Adding greater physical hazard to the extant moral hazard of law-breaking would make it seem that the Council is abrogating its duty of care for citizens. **Will the developer commit to a lighted, raised, signaled crosswalk at Kingdel and Delmar? Will the developer commit to safe, lighted, raised crossings on the south side of Delmar at his curbcuts? If not, the project/bill should not go forward.****

**2) There is no tangible benefit to the City or neighborhood. Has the Council asked for a signed Community Benefits Agreement in exchange for a giveaway of both land (Vacations A + B in the Avenir document) and money (100% tax abatement for 10 years, 50% for a further 10 years)? Vacancies at similar buildings in the area are high. This project makes little financial sense for the City right now. I am sure the Council is aware of the current macroeconomic climate, but for posterity, the economy is built on hope and cheap money from the Fed right now. The long-term outlook is far**

from certain, and the Council should act in the best interests of the City and secure a hedge against failure. The developer should be made to pay a penalty for blighting the buildings in the first place, and should pay again if the project flops. You're really gambling on increased sales taxes, but what are you going to do if the economy collapses but there is mortgage forbearance so you have a bunch of residents still in units requiring services but no money to spend? Sound familiar? 203

**If there is no penalty clause and no Community Benefits Agreement for both the neighborhood (agreed upon by the neighborhood) and to ensure use of local and minority contractors, the project/bill should not go forward.**

**3) This project will not only cause massive environmental disruption during construction and the destruction of many mature trees, but the increase in traffic will cause a permanent increase in CO2 and NO2 emissions in the area, which have been conclusively proven to cause a higher risk of heart disease, lung cancer, Alzheimer's, and stroke (look it up, published in the Lancet, NEJM). And that's not even getting into climate change. With California on fire, will the developer commit to a carbon-neutral construction plan and a carbon neutral development? Will the developer commit to planting double the trees destroyed? If not, the project/bill should not go forward.**

**4) The parking ratios cited are inadequate. 1.5 parking spots per unit is the proposed ratio, with an illogical 10% deduction because of proximity to transit. The developer then says that the building will attract "Clayton professionals". Let's live in the real world: do we expect any of these businesspeople except an enlightened few to get up an hour early to take the bus to work? Do we expect that if a young professional couple is living together that they won't have 2 cars?**

Who are we kidding? Residents, visitors (who only have 19 spots), employees (who have no spots) will simply park in our neighborhood. There is no dedicated delivery zone, either. Amazon, Uber, FedEx, will all be idling in our neighborhood, belching fumes and blocking the road (by the way, we have no sidewalks, so I guess we're just trapped in our houses). The pedestrian access to the courtyard from Kingdel means greatly increased foot traffic from strangers and a potential for more crime.

**Will the developer commit to a logical parking ratio, whether through increased, hidden garage space for residents, visitors, and employees or a less dense development? Will the developer commit to dedicated drop off and delivery zones and no access to Barby or Kingdel? Will the City and the developer commit to neighborhood improvements for security given the increased comings-and-goings? If not, the project/bill should not go forward.**

**5) Can the Council reconcile the fact that the developer claims a green space in one part of his plan and a paved area in another? Is the Council aware of attendant stormwater runoff issues? Can the Council reconcile the fact that another part of the plan violates code? If the plan cannot be made legal, it is very obvious that the development MUST not go forward.**

**6) What guarantee do we have that this won't become Airbnbs with a transient population? If there is no such guarantee, the project/bill should not go forward.**

**7) What guarantee do we have that eminent domain will not be used on our homes? What guarantee do we have that our neighborhood will not be re-zoned in the dead of night? If the Council cannot commit to citizens that we will be allowed to have a say in how we are ruled, the project should not go forward.**

**8) The massing and setback variances detailed in the plan will cause the apartments to loom over our houses and yards, creating an unfriendly environment for pedestrians, ruining property values, and creating a risk of voyeurism. Will the Council and the developer commit to a mechanism to make the property owners whole? Will the developer commit to a more appropriately scaled project within the existing setbacks (no variance)? Will the developer commit to ensuring the privacy and safety of residents?**

In short, this project will jeopardize our safety, destroy our health, ruin our quality of life, wreck our property values, completely erode any faith in the local democratic process, and cost University City money.

This project should not go forward until a robust, in-person public debate can be had that allows the Council to hear our concerns. This should happen after the COVID crisis is over.

I know the above sounds like the NIMBY-ism, but it's really just a list of valid concerns: we live in University City because we like that it is green, walkable, diverse, and safe. If we wanted to live next to excessively tall, cardboard box architecture that creates an expressway by our houses, there are plenty of places we could do that. Increased density---especially next to transit---is good when done properly; this project doesn't just pay it lip service, it uses it as a cudgel to advance goals antithetical to transit oriented development.

The developer should have the opportunity to improve the land and contribute to University City. If he and the Council wish to begin the process anew and actually take the neighborhood into account, I invite them to do so. I also invite the Council to begin treating us like citizens and constituents and not an afterthought.

Thank you,

Asim Thakore

**From:** Mary Blair <mgblair56@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 5:36 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Agenda item for 10/12 meeting

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I am writing to comment on an **agenda item for Monday's meeting, Charles Deutsch's Avenir project.**

I am very much opposed to this development because I am a resident of the subdivision it will negatively affect and a resident of the city that does not need any more apartment buildings. There are two developments on the north side of Delmar between Price and 1-70 already. Additionally, there are two (VanGuard and Mansions on the Plaza) east of 1-70 that have high vacancy rates. We don't need another in this area.

I'm confused as to why we were given two days notice on a project that has been at least a month in the making. I walk my dog early in the morning when it is still dark. I enjoy the sounds of the wildlife that will surely disappear along with their habitat. I'm concerned that there will be an increase in the number of cars that will cut through the subdivision to get to Price Road to avoid the traffic caused by a new apartment building on Delmar.

Thank you for your consideration,

**Mary Blair**  
**8756 W Kingsbury**  
**University City, MO 63124**

**From:** Sarah Marshall <smarshallspeech@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 7:36 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Cc:** Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon; Clifford Cross  
**Subject:** Kingdel 10-12-2020 meeting agenda

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To whom it may concern regarding tonight's Avenir Project Proposal,

After receiving notice yesterday afternoon from neighbors, (I'm disheartened to say that UCity did not take a more active approach to inform us themselves) I wanted to share some information regarding the Avenir Project 353 Development Plan.

I chose this area of University City to reside for safety, peaceful location, and privacy. The crime surrounding the Kingdel neighborhood comes mainly from apartments across Delmar at Trilogy. I am very worried that this will only increase as more apartment housing is developed. The crime statistics lead me to this belief. Don't be fooled by 'luxury apartment claims'. Every developer is calling new builds 'luxury.' In reality 'luxury builds' really means 'luxury location'. Our community and neighbors are already aware that this location is luxury. What makes it so desired is the peaceful single home residential community which escapes, while keeping close, to an urban feel and Delmar Blvd. What makes a location a luxury location? Scarcity. It's when relatively few people can actually live there, in comparison to the number of people who would like to live there. When I googled apartments in Ucity over 400 results arose. Why would more apartments be needed when so many businesses are struggling to support already developed housing in need of tenants. Over 10 places to get a cup of coffee also arose within 2 miles of my home. When will UCity stop building larger apartment buildings in safe, quiet, single home residential areas and invest instead in struggling areas? Expansion on the suburban fringe is fiscally ruinous for our community. Building more homes on the same amount of land can only be stopped by zoning codes who say it cannot happen. Who is to say that if this zoning passes more will not also pass until the entire land to Price Rd is developed? Imagine your own home once looking out to grassy areas and old brick buildings now being proposed to view parking lots/garages, bright lights, and highrise buildings. Would you not be writing this same letter?

I love this neighborhood. I love this location. I love that family and friends who visit and have a skewed view of UCity, are instantly swayed to love it too. Rezoning will change the character of my neighborhood and lead to more people, traffic, safety issues, and noise as well as cause property values to decrease.

I thank you for listening to some of my many concerns.

-Sarah Marshall  
8774 West Kingsbury Ave

**LaRette Reese**

---

**From:** Kathy Victor <KathyVictor@STLDA.COM>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 8:16 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Cc:** ccross@ucity.org; Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon  
**Subject:** Agenda Item for Oct. 12, 2020 Meeting- Avenir Project 353

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Gentlemen,

I am a long time resident of U City and want to communicate my **strong disapproval** of rezoning the west area of U City for the proposed Avenir Project.

This project would drastically change our quiet and safe neighborhood. There are plenty of apartments close by without creating another 258 unit apartment building.

I am an avid walker and this will create a lot of traffic and likely increase the crime as well.

I am also concerned that this project will decrease my property value.

I hope you will reconsider the negative effects this project will have on our lovely neighborhood.

Please **do not** rezone this area for mixed use.

Respectfully,

Kathy Victor

8739 Washington Ave.

St. Louis, MO 63124

314-223-2658

**From:** Katy Blair <kblair5511@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 8:24 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; Jeff Hales; stevemcmahon@att.net; Clifford Cross  
**Subject:** AGENDA ITEM-Monday, 10/12/20 Avenir Project proposal hearing

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

**My major concern is resident safety as a result of increased traffic caused by the proposed Avenir project.**

1. My house at 8834 Washington, is close to the Price entrance. Over the past 17 years I have observed an increasing number of rush hour drivers cutting through the subdivision to avoid the Price/Delmar stop sign. These drivers are in a hurry and drive extremely fast.
2. Since there are no sidewalks and cars are often parked on both sides of the street, resident dog walkers and school children end up having to walk in the middle of the street and can be in danger of being hit by drivers, not familiar with the neighborhood.
3. In addition, there are no signs directing drivers to yield or stop at the crossroads of Washington, West Kingsbury and Teasdale. Current residents know to slow down and check for oncoming cars, but delivery trucks and those cutting through do not slow down. I have seen or experienced near collisions with these drivers.

As a result, the increased traffic caused by the additional 250 plus residents, McKnight staff and Starbucks customers will significantly escalate our residents' safety risks.

KATHRYN C BLAIR  
8834 WASHINGTON AVE.  
UNIVERSITY CITY, MO 63124

**LaRette Reese**

---

**From:** Victoria McMullen <mcmullen@webster.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 8:31 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon; Clifford Cross  
**Subject:** Avenir Project 353

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I am writing to oppose the Avenir Project 353 Development plan for a number of reasons, the first being that it is an unnecessary development. With high vacancy rates at the Mansions on Delmar, the Vanguard, the District and Trinity and with another large mixed used area being constructed near Olive and 170, this development is not needed. Secondly, this development result in unnecessary traffic in what is a quiet subdivision with families walking dogs, children riding bikes, etc... Lastly, and most important a tax abatement would detract further funding from the University City Schools that have already suffered a loss of income due to Washington University's purchase of multiple properties in the Loop. Please vote no on this proposal.

Dr. Victoria McMullen  
8730 West Kingsbury Avenue  
University City, MO 63124



**From:** Daryl Hall <darylkhall@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 9:51 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon; Clifford Cross  
**Cc:** Mary Beth Hall  
**Subject:** Kingdel Proposal

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

We are writing to express our extreme opposition to this 258 unit development in our residential neighborhood. Our opposition is based in part on the following:

1. The complete change in traffic and access to streets it would present. Representing a danger to our pedestrian residents and children and pets being walked in our neighborhood.
2. The area already has many mixed use options and we believe there is little need for such development.
3. The negative impact to our property value! When we moved to U-City six years ago we sought out this quiet, but convenient neighborhood.
4. Totally appose this project and any tax abatement and will do all possible to voice our opposition!
5. The little time and explanation of this project makes it difficult to respond and inform those directly impacted.

Please advise us that this information has been received and confirm your position on this development.

Mary and Daryl Hall  
8730 Teasdale Ave.  
Saint Louis, Mo. 63124

314-801-7132  
618-806-5067 (Mary's Cell)  
618-806-8056 (Daryl's Cell)

---

**From:** Phil Klasskin <philklasskin@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 9:54 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Comments on Avenir Proposal  
**Attachments:** Avenir comments.doc

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Attached please find my comments related to tonight's hearing at the council meeting.  
Please confirm receipt of this email.

Thank you,

Phillipo Klasskin  
8736 Teasdale Ave

Comments for October 12 meeting on the proposed Avenir project south of Delmar:

Phillip Klasskin

8736 Teasdale Ave (one of the single family homes west of the project)

I would like to make a couple comments regarding this development—

But first I must say I believe Avenir and The Gatesworth have been good neighbors and beneficial to U City.

However, I have some concerns about their proposal

First and foremost, I strongly disagree with the need for their requested tax abatement. One of the main rationales for seeking tax relief is that the project will combat blight. While the existing buildings are not the most modern, calling the area blighted is an unwarranted stretch. By the analysis of the blight study, I would guess that more than half of U City would be called “blighted”. And is the cost to “ameliorating blight” somehow a lot greater than simply tearing the buildings down?

If these are to be “luxury apartments” surely some added property tax can be covered by the rent paid by the high end residents.

As an alternative to holding the tax to current levels for 10 years, I would suggest that it be increased by 10% per year until fair market value has been reached.

A second, though less serious concern, is traffic flow.

While the traffic study indicates it is manageable, when I come out of Kingdel and go east, I can foresee issues. Will the exits from the development have major stops while Delmar is free to flow? (We certainly do not need yet another electric signal along that stretch of Delmar.)

Construction traffic will, of course, be an issue on Delmar as well as on Kingdel.

Finally, just from a purely parochial point of view, I would be interested in whether there have been any estimates made on the appraised value (up or down) of our homes between Kingdel and Price.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

**LaRette Reese**

---

**From:** Daryl Hall <darylkhall@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 9:55 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon; Clifford Cross  
**Cc:** alysondomoto@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Re: Kingdel Proposal

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Please see attached copy of our e-mail sent this a.m. We were out of town this weekend and just returned to this info. please add Mary Hall to the Facebook neighborhood or she is mbhgreens on Instagram. Thanks.

> On Oct 12, 2020, at 9:50 AM, Daryl Hall <darylkhall@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> We are writing to express our extreme opposition to this 258 unit development in our residential neighborhood. Our opposition is based in part on the following:

>

> 1. The complete change in traffic and access to streets it would present. Representing a danger to our pedestrian residents and children and pets being walked in our neighborhood.

>

> 2. The area already has many mixed use options and we believe there is little need for such development.

>

> 3. The negative impact to our property value! When we moved to U-City six years ago we sought out this quiet, but convenient neighborhood.

>

> 4. Totally appose this project and any tax abatement and will do all possible to voice our opposition!

>

> 5. The little time and explanation of this project makes it difficult to respond and inform those directly impacted.

>

> Please advise us that this information has been received and confirm your position on this development.

>

> Mary and Daryl Hall

> 8730 Teasdale Ave.

> Saint Louis, Mo. 63124

>

> 314-801-7132

> 618-806-5067 (Mary's Cell)

> 618-806-8056 (Daryl's Cell)

**From:** mlaz279293@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 10:15 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Comments to be read at Council meeting at 10-12-20 at 6:30 PM regarding Avenir project effects of neighborhood

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

## To the City Council

I am a 40 plus year resident of the neighborhood that has been described in real estate listings for years as "the much sought after Del Crest neighborhood."

I am opposed to the the plan being proposed as the Charles Deutsch, Gatesworth, Avenir project that will effect our neighborhood bounded by Washington Ave, West Kingsbury, Teasdale, Kingdel and Delmar & Price.

This will drastically cause more traffic on my street. Cars are already cutting and speeding down our street to get to Delmar from Price to avoid the stop sign at Delmar & Price. It will always have an effect on the other streets.

We are a very dog and pedestrian and bike friendly street with no sidewalks, so have to walk in the street. When cars are parked, it forces us to walk in the middle of the street. On the 8808 block of Washington, there are 10 dogs living on our block alone. We have already had a lot of problems with the new house being built and the traffic and parking with several near misses. So are the other streets surrounding.

Our property values have been rising nicely in the last few years, causing us to pay more in property taxes to help U City and the schools. We don't want our property values to go down with more apartments, we already have enough at the west end of U City.

With 258 apartments replacing 36-40 apartments, that will increase the possibility of more crime in our area, which has been relatively safe with more people coming in and out of our neighborhood from this proposal.

And with a tax abatement, that will also decrease tax revenue for the city. We are already giving TIFs to the Costco area, and that should be enough.

And with a drive through coffee shop, again there will be more traffic and look at the problems with congestion at the Starbuck drive through at North & South and Delmar and the one on Price & Olive.

This seems to also be a potential problem with getting on and off the innerbelt and driving down Delmar that we all do.

And if parking lots are accessed off Kingdel, it will encourage more people coming into this area. And if the parking lots are allowed, then what will happen next, will they start buying other houses to tear them down for other potential projects.

202

And next time, please notify the entire neighborhood in a timely manner. In the past, there were notices posted and letters were sent out to only a few of the neighbors living close to the area. This effects us all.

Again, please vote no and not allow this to go forward while it can be stopped.

Let's keep our "much sought after Delcrest Neighborhood" as it is, peaceful, quiet, and safe.

Thank you.

Margie Lazarus  
8808 Washington Ave  
St Louis, Mo 63124

**From:** Brent Bunn <brentbunn@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 10:23 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Gatesworth Proposal Comments

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I am not writing to oppose progress. I am writing to prompt the Council to consider a larger plan for University City and the KingDel subdivision. I have three primary concerns:

- 1 - Security
- 2 - Property Values
- 3 - Education

I have lived in the KingDel subdivision (on Kingsbury) for over 10 years. In this time, I have witnessed a substantial increase in crime. Our subdivision has been mismanaged as evidenced by frequent drug activity, gun-related violence and theft. I repeatedly see individuals trying to break into our vehicles witnessed on our home security video of which I have consistently reported to the U City Police Department. I witness repeated drug activity in the middle of the day. Some street lights are broken making it dark and unsafe to be out at night. We see increased gun violence as evidenced by the shooting two weeks ago at Delmar and Kingdel. U City residents on the Ring network I am a part of consistently post about nightly gunfire and violence. It seems more than fair to assume that with increased traffic from this proposed development we can anticipate an increase in crime.

With this, it is also of great concern to the residents in this far southwest corner of U City that our property values will decrease with approval of this development. Yet, U City residents pay higher property taxes than most municipalities.

The council should ask themselves, "What's the ROI for OUR constituents?" when considering the approval of this development. Crime is NOT being controlled and education enrollment is down per stats reported by the Post-Dispatch (pre-COVID). I am 100% supportive of my tax dollars supporting public education BUT when I read in the Post-Dispatch there is a significant decrease in enrollment in U City Public Schools, then it seems there are much larger challenges the Council should be addressing.

I would ask the Council to reconsider the direction of the KingDel Subdivision, if this development is to be approved. Families living to the north, west and south of KingDel benefit from lower crime, lower taxes and a stable school environment. It would make sense for our subdivision to join a new municipality, if this proposed development is approved. Our decrease in property values would be offset with an annex into a different municipality. I have had conversations with other residents of the area who are also in agreement of this.

I ask that the City and County Council to consider a holistic plan that benefits ALL rather than a transactional approach. If the Council wants to approve this development that will ultimately impact the livelihood of those living in KingDel, then county residents should be allowed to vote on the direction of this subdivision!

Regards,

Brent Bunn  
8738 West Kingsbury Ave

**From:** Roger <rocketpolymers@att.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 10:51 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 1 Sub Items 1 & 2 Avenir Project 353 Redevelopment plan & tax abatement on Oct 12, 2020

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To Whom it may Concern,

October 12, 2020

This is a public comment on the city council Agenda Item 1 Sub-items 1&2 (avenir project 353 Redevelopment Plan for the University City Council Mtg. on 10/12, 2020.

I own both 500 and 506 Kingdel properties. I have just spent the last several months (and thousands of dollars) with architects designing a midcentury modern house for my wife and I to move from Creve Couer to 500 Kingdel that compliments the midcentury house I currently own at 506 Kingdel. This house was approximately 2700sqft and over \$1,000,000.00. I certainly won't be investing that kind of money for a residential property in a neighborhood with a drive-thru "anything" in it. Furthermore, I wouldn't do it in a city that disregards its working class, long term stable, residents with wealthy oblivious developers.

Given this developers (historic) bait and switch and bully tactics, as well as the limited time frame and limited information we as property owners were given to evaluate this project, I strongly oppose the issuance of variances to proceed with this development without impact studies of the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Considering we are in the midst of a deadly pandemic with reduced access to information, I find it unconscionable the city would even consider this proposal during this time. I as a multiple property owner in the affected area have significant concerns the city council will be transferring property values from small individual property owners in an appreciating quaint little oasis in university city, to a developer with no regard for his neighbors or the neighborhoods he impacts. I currently hear a Kitchen exhaust hood that runs continuously on his current property. A 258 unit property in the midst of all single family homes in our neighborhood (Kingdel off Delmar) is completely inconsistent with the current population density standards that have been in place since my grandmother designed and built the house at Washington and Kingdel in the early 1950's.

The notification I received last week alerting me to the zoning change hearing had no specific information and very little time to get it. I would think a developer interested in the neighborhood and the impact of their project would at least hold an informal meeting (virtual if need be) and enlighten those attending in an effort to reduce resistance and encourage cooperation. Again, I own two properties in the affected neighborhood and haven't heard a thing from the developer as to how he's going to protect our peaceful, quiet, tight knit community from the hundreds of new residents and employees that are going to cut through and overtake the area. Have there been Density Studies, Traffic Studies, ambient noise and proposed noise studies done? I've heard there's only going to be 19 visitor parking spots available for 258 mostly one bedroom units. That's ridiculous. Less than 10 percent of the residents can have guests at any one time with sufficient parking. The overflow is going to clog our neighborhood with people coming and going to their parked cars. Not to mention what the retail component will add. Or he will force his employees to park in front of our houses so his tenants' guests can find parking. Is the city trying to maintain the integrity of the current area? Our property values will most certainly decline if our area isn't protected. Does this mean anyone can now get a variance to build multifamily residential/mixed use buildings? How can the city even consider a project like this without a greater effort to solicit neighborhood input.

I would further ask are these all market rate apartments? I heard them described as "luxury" apartments. I'd like to know what that definition of luxury apartments is? "New" is not Luxury. This developer has bought up the properties in the area and let them fall apart so he could later offer the city a shiny new project. If these are "luxury" apartments, why on earth would the city grant tax abatement to a wealthy developer? Shouldn't abatement dollars go to small projects that preserve neighborhoods and communities? So in essence his proposal is to increase traffic, increase noise, increase



crime, increase nuisance individuals(true with any big development) reduce neighborhood parking, and flood a currently residential area with commercial volume and problems. Without even a neighborhood mtg, they want to reduce the tax base for 20 years and ask the community the development will devalue, to provide free parking and subsidize all the increased services they will surely utilize. Has the developer explored gating our adjoining community? Tax abatement on a luxury apartment complex with insufficient parking that encourages transients through a peaceful residential area? Look at the current crime statistics, there are next to none in the Kingdel, Kingsbury, Washington area. This will change with the rough increase of 5 times the current density. I speak for many neighbors when I say we are vehemently opposed to a development of this scale in this area, especially without the developer being required to educate the impacted residents on exactly what he plans. Do property owners get no say on what gets built next to their houses? Would you all want your peaceful area, your home, your largest investment next to a "drive-thru" anything? Please consider the precedents that have been in place for years and the precedent this will be setting for all the neighborhoods with small impeccably maintained homes near busier thoroughfares. Are the U city urban planners trying to force out the working class people that built the community to enrichen wealthy developers? Please count me as 2 properties opposed to this scope and scale of development in this diverse and vibrant, one and two story single family neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and your concern for the safety and security of your Ucity neighbors and communities.  
Sincerely,

Roger Cohen  
President  
KPB Properties  
500 & 506 Kingdel  
Ucity, MO 63124

[RocketPolymers@att.net](mailto:RocketPolymers@att.net)  
314-533-9200

## LaRette Reese

---

**From:** coberlee9444@charter.net  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 10:59 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon; Clifford Cross  
**Subject:** RE: Agenda item "Avenir" on 10-12-20 meeting

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

10-12-20

Colleen Oberlee  
8749 Teasdale Ave.  
St. Louis, MO 63124

City of U. City Council,

I am writing in regards to a Monday 12 October 2020 agenda item on rezoning an area adjacent to my neighborhood bounded by Delmar Blvd., Kingdel Drive, and Barby Lane.

As a resident living on Teasdale Ave since 2006, I have strenuous objections to the proposed development.

Since I have been a resident, despite the seeming seclusion of the neighborhood we have experienced our share of crime and I feel that the increase in traffic through the neighborhood would cause this to increase. I personally have had a lawn mower stolen, had someone break into my house, had someone steal items out of my car, and caught someone late at night leaving a stolen bicycle at the tree at the end of my driveway scared away when I came out to throw out the trash. While no one was caught in any of the incidents I feel that they were acts of local opportunity for thieves and that a development such as is proposed will open our neighborhood up to a huge increase in "opportunity".

I am also extremely concerned about what such a development will do to the property values of a community that was once quiet and peaceful. When I chose to purchase my house I was looking for easy access to I-170 and close proximity to both work and school, I also picked it for the quiet, peaceful, and secluded atmosphere. I actually drove to the house at rush hour and sat and listened to make sure that the noise pollution from the nearby interstate wasn't too loud. This development will destroy that quiet, peace and seclusion. It will take and open up a tucked away neighborhood to a high volume of traffic (pedestrian and automotive), it would also destroy the privacy that came with the seclusion. Right now it is bad enough having the 4 unit apartments on Delmar Blvd and the trespassing that has generated (people cutting through the back of my property to get from Delmar to Teasdale), this would be to a whole new level. It would also create a potential overflow street parking issue which could cause problems when I have visitors as well as being a nuisance. It will also bring light pollution along with the increase in noise pollution. Being able to go outside at night and see the stars will be a distant memory.

Finally, there are plenty of other large mixed use developments fairly close by, including a new one just up the street at Olive and I-170. Of the ones close by, they have high vacancy rates at the Mansions on Delmar and Vanguard. The demand across I-170 wasn't enough to sustain Mai Lee or the other restaurants that were in that location and it wasn't enough for the Chinese restaurant that was in the Gatesworth building so I believe any retail, coffee, or restaurant option would struggle with limited foot or car traffic to sustain them. Kaldi's coffee, which in my estimation is a good coffee, didn't make it at the nearby Schnucks so I don't believe one closer would fare any better.

Thank you for your time and attention. Please don't let this happen to our neighborhood! Vote no to this development.

Sincerely,

192

**LaRette Reese**

---

**From:** Gigi Werner <gigiwerner01@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 11:10 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Avenir

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

My name and address was eliminated from my email opposing the project. Please add Gigi Werner at 8762 West Kingsbury avenue to make this included in the record

**From:** Gigi Werner <gigiwerner01@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 10, 2020 9:23 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** aventir project 353

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

We are opposed to the proposed rezoning the Delmar, Kingdel, Barby Lane area to a mixed use designation. The traffic coming in and out of Kingdel has, for years, been a dangerous situation with entering and exiting Delmar. In addition, the very nature of a mature residential, **SAFE** area with children on bikes and walkers in the street (there are no sidewalks) would become a serious problem with increased traffic. We strongly urge the Council to take under earnest consideration the quality of life of this area, as well as the property values of the current and future residents.

**LaRette Reese**

---

**From:** stacey hutchens <staceyhutchens406@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 11:25 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon; ccross@ucity.org  
**Subject:** Comments on Avenir Complex Proposal

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.**

Hello, my name is Stacey Hutchens and I own the home at 8700 W Kingsbury Ave, St Louis, MO 63124.

I love my quiet neighborhood - and would like to keep it that way.

To that end I would suggest a decrease in the overall scale of the project, which is out of proportion with the surrounding neighborhood.

I would also suggest that by any design or enhanced landscaping methods, the view of this building from Kingdel be minimized, and no pedestrian traffic paths/walkways from the new complex to Kingdel.

I would suggest installation of a gate on Kingdel at Delmar - so that there is no thru or cut-through traffic, and any complex resident or guest parking would be minimized on Kingdel or Teasdale.

The only access for cars, deliveries and pedestrians entering the complex must be restricted to Delmar or McKnight Place.

*Stacey Hutchens*

**636-346-1217 (c)**

**From:** valmik thakore <valmikt@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 11:44 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Re: Citizen Participation and Public Hearings Comments: ON AGENDA FOR CITY COUNCIL MEETING on October 12, 2020

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

**I am providing additional comment on the City Council Agenda Item I, sub-items 1 & 2 (“Avenir Project 353 Redevelopment Plan, Including Tax Abatement” & “Avenir Zoning Map Amendment/Preliminary Plan”, respectively) for the University City Council Meeting on October 12, 2020.**

The traffic study summary included on page 22 of the Avenir document recommends adding left turn lane on Delmar for the West Bound traffic by incorporating the existing on-street parking lane on the south side of Delmar. This is the same space that Avenir is requesting for Vacation A (page 29 of Avenir document). This requested Vacation A should not be allowed.

Please provide full Traffic Study for Public Review, including the underlying assumptions/ calculations and recommended changes plans as drawings.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Valmik Thakore, Master of Architecture & Urban Design, Washington University in St Louis  
Retired Architect  
8727 W Kingsbury Ave, University City, MO

---

**From:** valmik thakore  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 11, 2020 10:00 PM  
**To:** councilcomments@ucitymo.org <councilcomments@ucitymo.org>  
**Subject:** Citizen Participation and Public Hearings Comments: ON AGENDA FOR CITY COUNCIL MEETING on October 12, 2020

**This is a public comment on City Council Agenda Item I, sub-items 1 & 2 (“Avenir Project 353 Redevelopment Plan, Including Tax Abatement” & “Avenir Zoning Map Amendment/Preliminary Plan”, respectively) for the University City Council Meeting on October 12, 2020.**

My wife and I own the property at 8727 W Kingsbury Ave, University City, MO, 63124. Our house is in the neighborhood impacted by the proposed Avenir development.

As an urban designer, planner, and architect with considerable experience in urban design guidelines, large-scale (1 million sq ft+) projects, and over 46 years of experience in the field, I have major concerns about both sub-items on the agenda. My concerns are not limited to those listed here, but because of the irregular and rushed timeframe imposed upon citizens by the Board/ City for such a major project, I am choosing to highlight the following after a limited and rushed review:

203

### 1. Character

a) First and foremost, this project would change the character of University City and the Delmar corridor, especially west of I-170. Currently, the Delmar corridor consists of residential properties from the Lions in the Loop through to Price Road. While a variety of architectural styles are featured, all of the buildings are built at appropriate scale. West of I-170 to Price, University City boasts appropriately scaled and appropriately dense residential neighborhoods. This creates a peaceful, walkable city that is the envy of many in the region. An overly dense, big-box apartment complex would tear that fabric and make the surrounding areas less attractive, leading to a lower quality of life for citizens and less overall tax revenue for the city due to a decline in property values.

### 2. Density, Traffic, Parking, Noise and Nuisance

- a) The proposed project increases the density from 40 residential units and one low-density office building to 258 units with inadequate parking and a high-traffic drive-through retail space. This is a dramatic increase in density that will create much more traffic and put a strain on the community.
- b) Building density and scale will increase from 2 stories to 5 stories (more than doubling the height), and to 4 stories at Kingdel and Delmar (doubling the height). This will create an imposing streetscape that looms over the neighborhood and stifles daily life.
- c) The area will experience increased traffic from trip generations of approximately 5 times the current level generated by the site's current uses. This additional traffic will create left-turn issues during both rush hours and present a hazard for vehicular traffic and pedestrians due to increased accidents.
- d) The 10% waiver granted for reduced parking will cause parking spillover into our neighborhood, especially on Kingdel because of the courtyard entrances to the proposed development. Visitor parking is very limited (19 spots for 258 units), especially considering that 65% are 1 bedroom units, which will skew younger. Employee parking is non-existent, and there is no identifiable delivery zone. Visitors, employees, Amazon, USPS, FedEx, Uber, Grubhub, etc., will all use our neighborhood and the courtyard for entrance/parking. This will cause crowding, double-parking, and late-night traffic and lower property values of our peaceful neighborhood, as well as increasing risk of vehicular injury and property damage/crime.

A courtyard entry from Kingdel or Barby should not be allowed should the development go forward.

Adequate employee and visitor parking as well as a delivery zone should be provided on site.

### 3. Zoning/Site Plan

- a) The proposed Zoning Map Amendment to Planned Development-Mixed (PD-M) would require a 50 foot setback under PD-M regulations. However, the developer has requested a setback waiver to 24 feet, thereby going against the PD-M regulations and the spirit/intent of the regulation. This will have a negative impact on our property values, quality of life, and neighborhood fabric. The waiver should not be granted in order to protect the citizens of University City.
- b) Furthermore, the developer is requesting an additional setback waiver along Kingdel from the requested 24 feet to even less distance ("Kingdel Encroachment", per the developer). This would exacerbate the issues I listed in the point directly above. This waiver should not be granted.
- c) The boundary adjustments requested under Vacation A (page 29 of Avenir document) should not be allowed. Rather, the City should retain the property for the probable future need of lane adjustments/widening of Delmar that will arise from this project. Retaining the property mentioned in Vacation A will also help the visual scale along Delmar and lessen the negative impact of the drastic increase in vertical scale.

393

d) Vacation B (page 29, Avenir) on Barby Ln should only be allowed if the developer is willing to pay fair value to the city based on the proposed density of Lot 1, appraised as High Density Residential (HD) or Commercial, whichever is higher. This land should not be given away for free.

e) The Floor to Area Ratio (FAR) Waiver requested on page 27 of Avenir's document is unspecified, and thus, troubling. This waiver should not be allowed. Once the City grants a Planned Development, the developer should abide by the rules. Incessant granting of waivers make laws and development plans pointless.

f) The Site Coverage calculations shown on page 25-26 of the Avenir document CONFLICTS with the landscape plan on Avenir's page 35 [also in Appendix M1-75 as "Outdoor Courtyard Map"]: page 35's Landscape Plan shows paved areas and a pool in the courtyard while page 25 shows the same area as open green space. Paving and a pool will increase the Site Coverage dramatically and lead to greatly increased stormwater runoff and will violate PD-M regulations on ground coverage. This will have a strong negative impact on our neighborhood and property values.

g) The City and Board should verify that the Development meets Site Coverage code and act to protect the interests of University City citizens.

#### 4. Chapter 353 Usage Tax Abatement/Blighting

a) The developer has requested a 100% Tax Abatement for 10 years and a further 50% for 10 years under Chapter 353. The developer claims a positive economic impact for University City, but unless we are expecting an exponential increase in University City's population, this will simply have a negative impact on existing properties in historic U City neighborhoods. We are simply shifting renters around.

b) The developer's Chapter 353 Tax Abatement is based on a blight study commissioned by the developer (page 33, Avenir document). Avenir is the long-time owner (see page 100 of the PDF package /page M1-10- "assembled over the last 17 years") and CAUSE of blight in the properties mentioned. Avenir let their property decline into what they call a state of "Physical Deterioration", which led to a reduction in what they call "Reasonable Taxes", created "Conditions Conducive to Ill Health, Transmission of Disease, and Crime".

Now, Avenir wants to profit from their willful neglect AND reduce the taxes paid for the next 20 years. This is adding insult to the injury caused to our neighborhood over the last 17 years.

c) A tax abatement simply means that OUR taxes will remain high or be increased to provide police, fire, EMS, school, library, etc. services to 258 new units. We will be subsidizing the developer's profits while having our property values decline and quality of life destroyed.

**There should be no tax abatement. I say this as a citizen and an urban designer.**

If Avenir wants to pursue a reasonable development at human scale that actually benefits University City and its existing citizens, they should be welcomed to do so with a modified plan that meets all code requirements and zoning regulations. A plan that incorporates neighborhood consultation by providing adequate time for review and public comment should be submitted after the COVID-19 crisis has been resolved.

Sincerely,

Valmik Thakore, Master of Architecture & Urban Design, Washington University in St Louis  
Retired Architect  
8727 W Kingsbury Ave, University City, MO



**From:** Larry James <ljames3505@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 11:51 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; Jeff Hales; Steve McMahon; Clifford Cross  
**Subject:** Today's meeting regarding expanding Gatesworth

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

The proposed development site is currently a mix of affordable multifamily apartments, single family homes and open space. It is home to a vibrant collection of ethnically and economically diverse people, awesome wildlife and mature trees. It is a true neighborhood where adults, children and dogs walk and mingle throughout the day. It is a quiet, wonderful place to live.

The current traffic situation is already a problem. Turning onto Delmar from Kingdel in either direction can be very difficult during both morning and afternoon rush hours. The poorly designed intersection at Delmar and I-170 is confusing, dangerous and busy at all hours. The addition of an additional 222 families worth of traffic onto Delmar from the proposed development would only compound the problem. The proposed coffee shop would create a traffic nightmare. While the proposed development has minimally adequate parking for the residents, the 16 spaces for guests are far too few. If only 10% of the residents had a guest at one time, 26 spaces would be required. This overflow would end up parked along Kingdel and Barby. There is also the issue of traffic and parking for the moving and delivery trucks necessary for 258 apartments. The residents and guests would quickly learn that cutting through the homes on the west via Washington or Teasdale is a way to avoid the traffic and congestion that is already on Delmar.

The large, tall, monolithic building that is proposed is completely out of character with the existing neighborhood on the west side of I-170. Currently the amount of light and noise at night in the development footprint is minimal, with the addition of another 222 families it would create light and noise pollution at all hours of the day and night. My wife and I recently purchased a house on Washington after renting for two years on Kingdel because of the quiet, relaxed nature of the neighborhood. We think the value of our property would be very negatively impacted by proposed development. Having lived here for some time, I have seen no evidence of blight. It is interesting to note that some people are reluctant to make substantial improvements to their property because they are concerned that the Gatesworth complex will eventually just use eminent domain to seize their property.

In summary, the proposed development would totally alter the character of the neighborhood from quiet residential to a noisy, traffic clogged urban environment. Not a place I would want to live.

Thank you,  
Lawrence James  
8708 Washington Avenue

**From:** Shirley Seele <seele.a.shirley@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 11:51 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Gatesworth Proposal

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

This is an addendum to my email sent last evening. Given the fact that the census bureau reported that by 2034 (14 years down the road) older people are projected to outnumber children for the first time in history by 77 million.

With interest rates so low, younger Clayton professionals would be encouraged to purchase housing rather than pay \$2000/month rental. Thus the demand may not be here in this area.

I have not had the time to research the newest 2 or 3 luxury complexes in Clayton to determine their vacancy factor but that also, would be a factor in approving this proposal.

Thank you,  
Shirley Seele, BSN, MHA  
8716 Washington Avenue

## LaRette Reese

---

**From:** VAH <victorianika59@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 11:52 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Monday's Agenda Item re: Deutsch re zoning request

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I want to introduce myself to the UCity council members. I grew up in University Heights and left to go to college and explore many decades of adventures in other cities. Throughout my travels I proudly proclaimed where my life began: in a diverse, progressive culture of brilliant residents (poet laureates, internationally recognized artists, physicians and educators) comparable to nothing I have seen in my global travels. I therefore returned to UCity nearly 7 years ago to again experience the lifestyle and values the UCity of my upbringing once held.

I am also a Licensed Clinical Social Worker who has devoted my career to mental health support and advocacy. Now, in the middle of a global pandemic, I cannot keep up with the demands of my profession. We are all aware that every human being that walks this planet is currently functioning with some degree of compromised mental health due to the profound adjustments forced upon us by the presence of CoVID-19. In light of the fact that none of us have the bandwidth to take on an entirely preventable threat our mental health, I want to go on record to adamantly oppose the request to rezone the Delmar Blvd section just west of 170 to Kingdel for mixed (residential/commercial) use.

In the short term the construction noise will disrupt those of us permanently working from home (for me, it means that I cannot continue to support my fellow soldiers as an Army Behavioral Health Officer, as well as the clients I support in both the private and corporate sectors), it will increase both vehicle and foot traffic for our neighborhood (to include Washington, Teasdale, W. Kingsbury, and Kingdel), increase noise levels, invite more vandalism and increase exposure to vehicle exhaust. In the long term it reduces our property values, and puts the current property owners at risk for additional projects of Mr. Deutsch's to intentionally blight our homes and displace the remaining residents. (this is eerily similar to Munchausen Syndrome: imposing a fictitious disorder, in this case causing the blight, on another resulting in unnecessary and costly diagnostic and corrective processes).

I am profoundly disappointed in U City for not providing proper and timely notice for all interested parties to research their alternatives BEFORE Mr. Deutsch has yet another opportunity to bully us out of the lifestyles we have created for ourselves.

If, after all objections to this project are not honored and allowed to go on, it should not be able to happen without substantial concessions such as permanently gating our community, providing compensatory funds for being unable to work from home during the construction phase, providing a legally binding agreement that no further commercial development will occur without offering to buy our homes at percentages above market value and forcing Mr. Deutsch to pay the property tax on ALL of the houses in the neighborhood during the 20 years he asking for a tax abatement. It is high time Mr. Deutsch experiences the personal impact of his insatiable greed.

I am counting on all of you to do the right thing for this entire community and stop this new development from encroaching upon our peaceful neighborhood.

Thank you.

V A Hannah

8701 W Kingsbury Ave

**From:** Richard Laney <rich.laney29@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 11:59 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Cc:** Steve McMahon; Hayley Bohnert; Jeff Hales  
**Subject:** 10/12/2020 Council Meeting - Map Amendment - Avenir Zoning Map  
**Attachments:** 20201012120106571.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Good Morning,

Attached please find comments expressing our concern regarding the Avenir Project and the Map Amendment/Rezoning, which is an agenda item for tonight's Council Meeting and the lack of input from the neighborhood next to the proposed development.

Thank you,

Richard Laney and Hayley Bohnert  
8704 West Kingsbury Ave., University City, MO 63124

282

OCTOBER 12, 2020

**VIA EMAIL:**

University City Council Members  
councilcomments@ucitymo.org  
Steve\_mcmahon@att.net  
halesforucity@gmail.com

**RE: Agenda Item for 10/12/2020 Council Meeting: Map Amendment – Avenir Zoning Map Amendment and Preliminary Plan Approval**

Dear Council Members:

We are writing to express our concern with the proposed rezoning and preliminary plans for the development called “Avenir” consisting of roughly 6.465 acres bounded by Delmar Blvd. to the North, Kindgdel Ave. to the West, McKnight Place to the East, and Barby Lane to the South. As homeowners and residents of the neighborhood immediately abutting the proposed development, we are concerned with the effect a massive 258-unit apartment complex will have on our property and neighborhood.

Charles Deutsch and Company (the “Developer”) state in the “Enhancing Current Kingdel Environs” section contained in their proposal submitted to University City and dated August 2020 that the “Redevelopment of this incomplete area with luxury apartments, which are stylishly designed to appeal to affluent market segments, such as Clayton professionals, will dynamically enhance the overall environment. Consequently, this plan will also support increases in surrounding housing values...” The Developer provides no support that this development will increase our property value and this is the only mention of the development’s impact on our neighborhood. In fact, placing a large apartment complex in the open space view of the entrance point to our neighborhood will likely decrease our property value and will surely impact our neighborhood.

Additionally, the Developer, to the best of our knowledge, has had no discussions with the neighborhood or property owners that will be gravely affected by the development. To our knowledge, the Developer has not attempted to inform the surrounding property owners of the development, nor have they engaged in discussion regarding the development and its impact on the neighborhood. If the development is going to increase our property values and enhance the overall environment (as the Developer claims), why has the Developer neglected to engage in discussion with the neighborhood or inform the neighborhood of the development?

This development will not only affect our property value but the traffic and increased density from the development (and construction) will negatively alter the fabric of a fantastic and peaceful University City neighborhood. A place that is home to a diverse array of University City citizens will be changed for an apartment complex development partially funded by 20 years of full and partial tax abatement. What happens if this complex has high vacancy rates and doesn’t attract the “affluent market segments” the Developer is counting on? Our neighborhood is a great place to live, play and raise a family and this development will drastically change that and the Developer has taken no input from our neighborhood.

Undertaking such a massive development without input from the citizens it will affect most is a mistake. We respectfully urge the Council to take the time to consider input from the neighborhood prior to considering the rezoning and preliminary plan.

Respectfully,

Hayley Bohnert and Richard Laney, 8704 W. Kingsbury Ave., University City, MO 63124

**From:** Grace Collins <taylorcollins@att.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 12:12 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Fwd: Avenir Project Hearing @ 6:30 pm on 10-12-2020 ~ Agenda Item

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Grace Collins <taylorcollins@att.net>  
**Subject:** Avenir Project Hearing @ 6:30 pm on 10-12-2020 ~ Agenda Item  
**Date:** October 12, 2020 at 12:06:24 PM CDT  
**To:** [halesforucity@gmail.com](mailto:halesforucity@gmail.com)

Good morning,

My name is Grace Collins. For 21 years, I have been a resident at 8841 Washington Avenue, 63124.

I am disappointed with the transparency of this project that has appears to have been in the planning for several months.

And while my residence is not within 185', why have there not been signs/ notices of these huge, structures in the planning to take place where there is a desire to change the current zoning to "MIXED USE"

Who governs when it is desired to receive a tax abatement for ? many years?  
And how does a tax abatement serve the nearby residents, nearby residents that reside in a beautiful neighborhood?

I am able to comprehend how tax abatements are granted when one and or ones are going into a poor run-down area, however not is that of my neighborhood. So why is a tax abatement even on the planning table?

I have grave concerns of the effect on the info-structure of this project.  
WATER ~ SEWER LINES~ ELECTRIC  
Help me understand how this will not have an unnatural hasardous ripple effect.

I'm with out a doubt, or please correct me if I am inaccurate in my thinking that there will be an enormous amount of startling ground movement, an increase in the already plethora amount of traffic, life altering changes made that I have always thought University City was opposed to.

I have a lot more concerns, however I am aware of the 4 letter word TIME

So I thank you for your time reading my concerns.

2062

Sincerely,

Grace Collins  
8841 Washington Avenue  
Sant Louis, Missouri  
63124