



**LaRette Reese**

---

**From:** Corrine Haskins <corrinehaskins1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 30, 2021 9:56 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Questions for Plan Commission

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

Hello,

I received your letter in reference to the virtual public hearing. Although the letter is letting me know of a hearing it is not providing much information about the hearing. I have questions that I hope you can answer for me:

- Are all homeowners required to accept an offer in order for this plan to happen?
- What is the expected time frame that construction is to begin and end?
- In case a person does not want to move what provisions are available?

Corrine Haskins  
1133 N. McKnight Road  
University City, MO 63132

C: 314-708-9972



**From:** Corrine Haskins <corrinehaskins1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 30, 2021 10:07 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Questions for Plan Commission

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

Hello,

I received your letter in reference to the virtual public hearing. Although the letter is letting me know of a hearing it is not providing much information about the hearing. I have questions that I hope you can answer for me:

- Are all homeowners required to accept an offer in order for this plan to happen?
- What is the expected time frame that construction is to begin and end?
- In case a person does not want to move what provisions are available?
- My home is paid off. How can you ensure that funds to purchase another home are enough for me to buy another home at equal or more value, is sentimental value involved in your analysis?
- Is there a monthly severance pay provided to homeowners on top of the money provided to buy the property, again my property is paid for and I may not want to move.

Corrine Haskins  
1133 N. McKnight Road  
University City, MO 63132  
C: 314-708-9972

**From:** jinnett anderson <sunraven24@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 4, 2021 3:23 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Jinnett Anderson, 8632 Orchard Court, University City, MO 63132

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

Jinnett Anderson  
8632 Orchard Court  
University City, MO 63132

On June 9, 2020, I signed a Real Estate Option Agreement with U. City, LLC, granting it an option to buy my property at 8632 Orchard Court. This option lasted until September 30, 2020, the purchaser let the option expire without making me, or my attorney, any offer to extend it. Thereafter, before the purchaser sent any communication to me or my attorney about extending the option, Novus sent an email to the City Manager on October 15, 2020 requesting that the City Manager meet with me about Novus's need to purchase my home. We obtained this email through a freedom of information request. Since then, Novus has made a couple of half-hearted requests that I enter into a new Real Estate Option Agreement, but they continue to insist that I accept worse terms than the prior option- less money, less time for me to vacate the property, etc. I do not necessarily oppose this proposed re-zoning, but the City Council should understand that I have been continuously harassed by Novus about what they consider their absolute right to buy my property, on their terms, not mutually agreeable terms, and when my attorney responds to Novus, in what we consider to be a reasonable manner, Novus waits weeks before responding. Unless Novus is going to start conducting themselves in a professional manner that demonstrates that they are actually interested in acquiring my property and are capable of pulling off this development, the City Council should not allow Novus to continue this charade to the detriment of our community and a waste of your time.

Thank you,  
Jinnett Anderson

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

A

1 of 2

**From:** R&R Lacy <rrmmln18@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 5, 2021 3:28 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** comments for proposed redevelopment area public hearing PC 20-11

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

Richard Lacy  
 1109 N. McKnight Rd.  
 St. Louis, MO 63132

Regarding Proposed Redevelopment Project Area #1, Case Number PC 20-11.

As a voting constituent in the proposed rezoning area I am writing to inform you we are vehemently opposed to the proposed rezoning and redevelopment project. The City has completely failed to address any of the affected residents' concerns, let alone satisfactorily, with regards to lack of competing bids for the proposed project, finances for the project, addressing the projected increase of crime the project will bring and resulting need for increased police force, the increase of traffic especially along the residential McKnight Road and finally the how laws on your own books prohibiting this project until buildings are vacant.

The stated intent of this proposed project is to raise property values. A simple examination of recent area home sale prices indicates the property values have increased greatly in the past several years. While that rate of increase will not continue given the current administration's flurry of writing executive orders all willy nilly with no regard to the Constitution, people's wellbeing or market stability, the fact remains property values have gone up. The City must put an end to the redevelopment project as it has not satisfactorily addressed the concerns of its affected constituents.

Elaboration:

After the previous hearing on the proposed redevelopment project the City (one councilman anyway) stated they were just shopping to see what the values were. That is a very inappropriate conduct for an elected official and clearly shows they do not look out for their constituents' wellbeing. The lack of competing bids, especially for such a massive proposed project, is reckless and unacceptable.

Especially when the selected developer has a less than stellar record in the St. Louis area on other projects. Additionally, the use of eminent domain to remove people from their homes or remove existing business for commercial development is an abuse of City government's power. The Olivette development between 170 and Price Road took only one national retail business and seven homes. The other Olivette Olive Road developments are on vacant lots with the exception of one lot where the business were relocated a short distance away, no residential relocation. By contrast the proposed U. City redevelopment Phase One alone will displace not just one national retailer but over a dozen local businesses and restaurants and more than 10x the number of homes than the Olivette development.

U. City is and has been operating in the red. Yet the sales tax rate is higher than Olivette and property tax rate is in line with Olivette, Ladue and Clayton. Asking for deferred taxes from the businesses coming in from the proposed project is reckless. The existing residents and business cannot pay more taxes to make up for shortfalls, especially in this pandemic environment. The funding for this proposed project is simply not available.

The developer and City at a previous meeting dismissed the notion there would be increased crime from the proposed project. Lunacy. Big box stores experience much more theft than the current businesses do.

(5)

2 of 2

The big stores are also more frequent targets of carjackers (armed criminal action) than the current small businesses. And when more people are put into the same size area there will be more crime be it more theft or domestic disturbances.

This is now the third time I have brought up the McKnight traffic and I know neighbors are on record about it as well. The average speed on McKnight is close to 50% over the posted speed limit. When the radar sign showing "your speed" was put on the street it was set up near the stoplight at Olive and thus did not record any meaningful data.

Personal note: I was recently nearly rear ended after pulling onto the street when it was clear; a car came from behind at very high speed, went around into the oncoming traffic lane, and ended up sitting at the Olive stoplight three seconds later. I frequently observe 60 mph traffic on McKnight and occasionally see much higher.

There has also been a noticeable increase in heavy truck and of course [empty] Metro Bus traffic on McKnight in the past year. The proposed project will exacerbate this traffic issue. Even without the proposed project the City needs to work with the county on curbing the traffic and reckless driving on a residential road. I can think of several options, some are very easy and inexpensive to implement (hint: does not include speed bumps which are not allowed on public roads by Missouri law).

To reiterate: The City does not have the funding in place nor has it met its requirements for undertaking this redevelopment project and does not have its residents' and existing businesses best interests in mind with this proposed project. Voting against this proposed rezoning and redevelopment project is a necessity.

Respectfully,  
Richard Lacy

6

LaRette Reese

---

**From:** Roisin Halfar <roisin.halfar1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 7, 2021 8:48 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Concerns for Public Hearing Case Number: PC 20-11 Monday Feb 8, 2021 6:30 PM

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

Hi, thank you for the notice; My name is Mrs. Roisin Halfar. I live at 8516 Richard Ave within the 500 ft. courtesy notice area.

May I please have a link so that I can virtually attend the hearing tomorrow evening?

Please send to

[roisin.halfar1@gmail.com](mailto:roisin.halfar1@gmail.com)

I would like to go on record about potential parking, general neighborhood safety and traffic concerns on Richard Ave.

Will there be disruption to my immediate neighborhood with building vehicles on my street?

We already have people speeding through using Richard Ave as a short cut to Page Ave.

How does University City propose to

put traffic control in place both during and after the new project is completed?

I would like to see speed bumps put in the avenues -of Elmore, Richard and Orchard adjacent to Woodson Road, extending East to 81st Street-

Thanks again for your attention,

Sincerely,

Mrs. Roisin Halfar

Home owner since 2001

I

Roisin Halfar RN, LMT



**From:** greghal@earthlink.net  
**Sent:** Monday, February 8, 2021 10:11 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; Clifford Cross  
**Subject:** I need an invite to the virtual Public Hearing, Case Number PC 20-11, for Feb 8 at 6:30pm

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

Good morning,

I am a long time resident of 15 years at:

Gregory Halfar  
8516 Richard Ave  
University City, MO 63132

Please email me an invitation to the virtual public meeting  
Public Hearing, Case Number PC 20-11  
Scheduled for Monday, February 8 at 6:30pm

“Considering the application by U-City and Novus Companies  
For the Zoning Map Amendment to rezone 31.79 acres  
For the proposed Redevelopment Project Area #1”

I am interested in what is the impact on my residence, particularly what will be the traffic and noise and the property tax effects on me.

Thanking you in advance,

Greg Halfar  
[greghal@earthlink.net](mailto:greghal@earthlink.net)  
314-910-1824

**From:** Meg Mannion <Meg.Mannion@cblproperties.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 7, 2021 5:24 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared; bwaynesmotherson@gmail.com; Stacy Clay  
**Cc:** Julie Mannion; Meg Mannion  
**Subject:** NOVUS Development Comments for Meeting 2/8/2021

**Importance:** High

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

To the University City Council Members –

My name is Meg Mannion and I am a partner (along with other family members) in four properties on the southwest corner of Olive and 170 that Novus wants to acquire for their development. My husband, Mark, worked directly with Novus since the beginning of this project. After Mark’s passing from cancer in November, I am left with trying to figure out the status of our empty buildings in addition to the debt service on those properties.

- Novus has allowed the contract for the Mannion properties to lapse as of the end of 2018 (to the best of my knowledge) and Novus has not discussed or negotiated in good faith or on any kind of continuing basis a renewal of the contract since it lapsed.
- The properties have remained vacant since the end of 2018 with the burden of paying real estate taxes, insurance, utilities and maintenance falling on the property owner without the ability to lease the properties in order to offset those expenses.
- Novus has not been communicative and it is not fair or reasonable to expect the property owners to hold their property off the rental market for such an indefinite period of time without an agreement with Novus for fair compensation during the pre-development/pre-acquisition period. In other Novus projects, some where they partially proceeded and some where they didn’t - like Sunset Hills and Rock Hill, the commercial properties were either allowed to be leased with a kick-out/termination clause or Novus master leased the property.
- It is important to make sure the rezoning is not effective until such time as the property is sold. It is our understanding that this is a key issue. If the City rezones the property and Novus doesn’t perform, then the industrial properties have the potential to become a non-conforming use and we could have a very difficult, if not impossible, time leasing the property as occupancy permits will not be issued to users who are not a permitted use under the new zoning.

Thank you for your consideration.

Meg Mannion  
 314-420-0873

The information contained in this communication is strictly CONFIDENTIAL and may contain privileged attorney-client or work-product information. It is intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this communication in error, please contact the sender immediately at the telephone number or e-mail address set forth above and destroy all copies of this communication. In addition, you are notified that any distribution or use of this communication is strictly prohibited.



9

262

**LaRette Reese**

---

**From:** Meg Mannion <Meg.Mannion@cblproperties.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 8, 2021 11:14 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** RE: NOVUS Development Comments for Meeting 2/8/2021

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

8 Fox Run Lane  
63131

Thank you!

**Meg Boyce Mannion** | Business Development Manager  
Advertising & Strategic Partnerships  
Direct: 314-288-2032 | Cell: 314-420-0873

CBL & Associates Properties, Inc. | West County Center  
80 West County Center, Des Peres, MO 63131  
[meg.mannion@cblproperties.com](mailto:meg.mannion@cblproperties.com)

**From:** Council Comments Shared <councilcomments@ucitymo.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 08, 2021 11:08 AM  
**To:** Meg Mannion <Meg.Mannion@cblproperties.com>  
**Cc:** Council Comments Shared <councilcomments@ucitymo.org>  
**Subject:** RE: NOVUS Development Comments for Meeting 2/8/2021

Warning: This email originated outside of CBL. Verify the email address (not just the display name) before exchanging emails, clicking links or opening attachments.

Good morning,

May I please ask for your address? A name and address must be provided with all comments.

Thank you in advance.

LaRette



**LaRette Reese**  
City Clerk  
City of University City  
6801 Delmar Boulevard  
University City, MO 63130  
P: 314.505.8605 | [www.ucitymo.org](http://www.ucitymo.org)

10

LaRette Reese

---

**From:** Gabe Angieri <gabe.angieri@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 8, 2021 12:03 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Fwd: Case# PC 20-11 | Public Hearing Comments Submission

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

Submitted by:  
Gabe & Nichole Angieri  
University City Residents Residing at 8633 Mayflower, St. Louis, MO 63132

Dear University City Council Members:

My spouse, Nichole Angieri, and I have resided in University City for 15 non-consecutive years in total, and as homeowners on Mayflower Court where we are raising our two children for the past 13 years. We love UCity and have identified it as the only municipality in St. Louis County that we would want to live.

We were caught off-guard (to say the least) when we received notice of this hearing to consider rezoning our single-family residential neighborhood to Planned Development - Mixed Use for the Novus development to say the least. We can't comprehend how the city, which has repeatedly and unquestionably asserted that it will not exercise eminent domain on residential properties, can consider this issue before Novus has made an offer to purchase our home.

As you may know recall, both Nichole and I have made public statements in support of this project for the past 3 years, and some to this very body, because we truly believe that it will be of benefit to this community and its residents. However, after having come to mutually-agreeable terms with Novus in 2018 and being ready and willing to execute the sale of our home with the firm for over 18-months, Novus ultimately failed to exercise its rights to purchase our home and has not made any subsequent offer or serious effort to come to terms with us since then.

This move to consider rezoning by the city is as unconscionable as it is premature, given that there are many homeowners without contracts or any terms agreed upon with Novus, and by moving forward with this process you are fundamentally undermining your residents' rights to self-determination and our ability to negotiate with a profit-motivated development company in good faith.

Though we are certainly disappointed and discouraged by their inability to execute contracts our family had agreed upon, which at the time were both fair and equitable, we do not fault Novus in this process because, as stated, they are only looking out for their financial well-being and little else can be expected of them. It's just business!

But, isn't the City Council vested in the financial, emotional, and physical well-being of its residents? Especially during a global pandemic that is already causing massive economic uncertainty? There aren't enough to describe how disappointed we are that this is even an issue. The City Council should stand by its residents rather than a private developer, and ensure that the interests of this community come first in determining this matter.

In the strongest possible terms, we urge this body to suspend this process and reconvene only when Novus can substantiate their ownership or rights to purchase ALL residential properties within Redevelopment Project Area #1.

Sincerely,  
Gabe & Nichole Angieri

**LaRette Reese**

---

**From:** Adande Lane <aek.lane@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 8, 2021 11:45 AM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Questions for NOVOUS & UCity Council

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

**What does this potential expansion mean for the activation timeline?**

**Many of us have been waiting in limbo for almost 3 years now regarding the outcome of this endeavor.**

My family has been in favor of this development from the beginning, with the anticipation that it would help revitalize the area and keep UCity competitive (or help it to become competitive) with the surrounding areas; however, it now feels as though UCity & Novous are incapable of coming to an agreement that is in the best interest of the residents.

Two years in a row we were expected to close our contracts with Novous and prepare to relocate. First it was getting the City Council to vote in favor of the development, then getting the anchor store to sign on, then the issue of the McNair building and now an expansion.

For older adults, the inability to make plans for their future is stressful and unsettling. For those with special needs or health concerns who determine their living situation based on proximity to certain service providers, the unfamiliarity of circumstances is stressful and unsettling. For young parents who are trying to set roots and establish patterns for their family. The uncertainty of school access or home affordability is stressful and unsettling.

Housing is a basic need the affected homeowners have attained SO the potential to uproot- should be handled with greater grace. It should be settled keeping in mind those who will be most affected--the current residents. It should be decided upon more quickly than what is happening here.

**So, What is the hard line where this project is activated or ended for good?** Your constituents are stressed and unhappy.

Respectfully,  
A resident of Mayflower Court

--  
**Adande Lane**  
Founder | Director  
empowerSHE Network

**LaRette Reese**

---

**From:** Adande Lane <aek.lane@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 8, 2021 12:59 PM  
**To:** Council Comments Shared  
**Subject:** Re: Questions for NOVOUS & UCity Council

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

Thank you for your response. Please see my address below.

8609 Mayflower Court, 63132

--  
**Adande Lane**  
Founder | Director  
empowerSHE Network

On Mon, Feb 8, 2021 at 11:56 AM Council Comments Shared <[councilcomments@ucitymo.org](mailto:councilcomments@ucitymo.org)> wrote:

Good morning,

I am in receipt of your comments. May I please ask for your address? In order that your comments be made a part of the official record, a name and address must be provided.

Thank you in advance.

LaRette



**LaRette Reese**  
City Clerk  
City of University City  
6801 Delmar Boulevard  
University City, MO 63130

My Name Is Jeremiah Sullivan

I have lived at 8637 Richard Court  
for almost forty years. I've stayed there  
because it's a nice quiet court

I work nights and usually sleep until noon.  
Just a couple weeks ago, Diana from News

said "Most likely, your house won't be  
'Bought Out' until 6-18 months after those  
on the Cul-de-sac ← this had never been  
discussed; much less agreed upon.

I love to work in my yard and listen to the birds  
Nearby bulldozers would wreck that;

The Quality of my life severely impacted.

— Diesel fumes... dust... dirt, maybe even asbestos  
permeating my breathing air when houses  
just 35 yards from mine are demolished

— OR... what if they ran out of money  
and this development never goes beyond  
initial development?? Then I'm stuck looking

at a retaining wall for the rest of my life

on the ugly Chopped-off Street... And  
Get None of the Big Bucks Promised.

I partnered with Novus... yet they now  
won't return calls about Renewing Contract.  
which Expired December 17th

I eventually talked with Stacy Clay,  
who went to City Manager ← he apparently  
called Novus... they suddenly called me.  
yet were reluctant to Renew Contract,  
now mentioning they 'Needed Ducking'.

— We've all heard about what happened  
to them in Sunset Hills, and their  
Rock Hill Project ended up a 1/2 actually done.

— I would not hesitate to seek legal help  
but I hope & pray we can resolve this ourselves

314-991-2169