



FOREST PARK SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION EXERCISE RESPONSES

June 2022 | Conducted in-person and online

SUPPORT (12)

I support this project because if it is built as it is presented and meets the form-based code it will be an asset to the neighborhood. -44XX Arco

I support this project because TOD, Density, Safety, Environment, Increased Housing Supply → Moderated Price Pressure - 44XX Arco

I support this project because density, replace the eyesore/dangerous current situation, support local businesses -45XX Oakland

I support this project because it is a relatively fitting design for the neighborhood and Lux has addressed the issues brought up. With all the development in FPSE we need to monitor projects after they are completed. -45XX Chouteau

I support this project because it densifies the neighborhood which will make the neighborhood safer -44XX Manchester

I support this project because I have yet to see a better site proposal. Site has been empty for 10+ years. -45XX Wichita

I support this project because it's time to move forward with improving the entrance to the neighborhood. It appears that they want to make this work for the neighborhood. At any given time managers can be lousy. -42XX Gibson

I support this project because as a resident of Arco neighborhood, it is a huge safety issue related to those buildings on Kingshighway. Constant car looting and loitering are concerning for a woman like me to feel safe. -45XX Arco

I support this project because the buildings look terrible and need to be taken down. -45XX Arco

I support this project because the developers made the requested changes to the appearance of the building and moved traffic flow to Kingshighway. Having an apartment building in this space is 1) much better than having empty buildings for aesthetics, crime, local economy, etc and 2) is really our best option -- we're not going to get single family/single owner homes in these spaces, so let's get something productive in these spaces. -45XX Wichita

I support this project because the development as proposed uses high-quality exterior materials and would be a much more attractive and longer-lasting benefit to the neighborhood compared to the cheaper residential-grade



FOREST PARK SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

EXERCISE RESPONSES

materials in projects like the Gills'; buildings at 4400 and 4440 Manchester. I appreciate the modifications made to shift access to Kingshighway and think that the project is an ideal use for the land, in accordance with the form-based code. -44XX Oakland

I support this project because greater resident density is good for the neighborhood however they will need MUCH more parking than 1 per unit. Couples/roommates/guests will all have to park in the neighborhood.

SUPPORT WITH CONDITIONS (2)

I support w/conditions this project because I like the density + form-based code compliance and the site accommodations that have been made. I have concerns about the developers, and would want the alderman to step in to take steps to ensure Lux's compliance with the commitments they make. -45XX Gibson

I support this project because I believe we should have spent more time discussing what conditions we'd want to add rather than focusing on approval or denial. My sense is that Lux does not have to do a single thing to appease us and can proceed accordingly with or without our approval. It's unclear to me what value we are providing by voting this down? Lux did make some positive changes after attending prior meetings with us. For those of us on Arco and Gibson the previous entry way would have been an absolute disaster. Lux changed that proposal with our feedback and had to actually jump through additional hoops to accomplish this. To me that was a big sign of good faith. I do not at all disagree that there are much better property managers out there but unfortunately those are not the companies that own this land. I think it's in all of our best interests to work with Lux and try to attach some additional conditions (good neighbor clause, etc.) rather than poke the bear and end up in a worse place than we are today. I don't see a scenario where this building doesn't move forward and feel strongly that we need to find a way to be a partner and have a seat at the table as this moves forward. -45XX Arco

NO STANCE (1)

1) I like the new LUX dev plan. They catered to all the aesthetic demands it seems. Their new architecture plan was really more than I expected as a change for us. (even the color choice of black was surprising to me instead of some 1 or 2 selected color wouldn't have been bad, but understand and appreciate the choice of black as congenial outcome and likely less expensive solution than a color on top).



FOREST PARK SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

EXERCISE RESPONSES

2) I acknowledge the terribleness of LUX as management in all situations and possibility of faulted construction as per the previous project. But despite their lack of ability to properly manage, I can only imagine that it would have been mostly better had they not had the complexity of covid stabbing the whole process in the back either. I suffer the same thing as a home owner these past couple years (and still today) when it comes to repair projects.

3) I sent a question to acknowledge the demolition process for this project (as there was a question about that in the meeting), as I also know the company in charge of the demolition. The answer is:

"No demo permit yet. No deal yet."

"Getting things torn down is the biggest hurdle for the large development."

"Until the city issues a demo permit everything else is noise."

"Drury was well connected. He gave up on his hotel after 15 years on that [site]."

"The city will hold the demo permit over the developers head [un]til the neighborhood association along with the city get exactly what they want."

"In other words, if the neighbors [accept] the proposal. They'll get thier demo permit."

4) I fear that not allowing them to develop something could be cause for LUX sitting on the land like Drury for many years, and that would be bad. They would likely do just as little to sustain the current lots as Drury did. I acknowledge and have faith that there are other likely better developers out there than LUX that would buy this land and do better, but at what price? It was muttered that LUX was merely the highest bidder? I am not sure the process, but logic tells me if they paid top dollar for this then who else would and would LUX actually sell? No one can force them to sell? Would it be a loss to them?

5) I want to reiterate as I have told many people in the last Drury meeting and first LUX meeting that I used to know and visit the residents that used to live at the corner of Oakland and Kingshighway when it was still subsidized living, when it was open turn and then later blocked. I witnessed 16 or so years ago that the buildings there were decent and housing low income people like my friends. I am very sad that even though I personally feel these 4 flats are not of significant historical architecture even though they are relatively old they were constructed as utilitarian architecture at best as I say, with a hard swallow as a pretty staunch preservationist that these 6 can go.

I note a while back I contacted my/a/the primary friend that used to live there (who currently owns a home on the Kinloch border inside Ferguson -and his mother happens to be a city realtor for decades) about this all and his thumb sucking finger waving reply was "tear it down"

(I disclose that I personally in a round about way benefit from the demolition in that I intend to buy a bunch of the bricks to use in my Chouteau yard



FOREST PARK SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

EXERCISE RESPONSES

effectively keeping them in the neighborhood at least and that I am not bias when I say tear them down -this was an after benefit to me.)

6) The ideas of making LUX pay for some sort of checks and balances outside or whatever form of regulation that the city doesn't have in order to ensure better management I think is too complex and unlikely a demand and would love to hear from our group actualable solutions so I can say yes demand that too. I believe the counter communications point was to advocate just say no to LUX completely we'll do better, and this was exactly explained as why. I agree this seems like the best choice, but what about the consequences I question above? I'd rather take chances on a yes than wait more than a mere year or two better.

7) I can't account for who was online, but I note that there was only one black person which accounts for barely any diversity represented in our neighborhood at our meeting. (I acknowledge that one of the hudson residents that voiced thier complaint was a black woman and also that of course Sweet-T, despite covid sickness, was tuned in and commentary). Is our list of practical and sociable demands inclusive to the poverty sector and balance of the neighborhood? (Rhonda of 4368 Chouteau and her network of elder black neighborhood residents said she would give feedback also FYI, and I'm sure Dan Scot has words to give.)

8) My note was specifically what needs to be demanded upon LUX. LUX said very specifically that we should be happy to have 100s of units added to the area due to our problem of rent control and that "by them building more they are essentially" "hurting themselves" and "helping lower rent in the area" This is actually jaw dropping and I was surprised nobody picked up on this as I find it an extremely important note. Because it is wrong! And it is the mentality of a millionaire CEO who is of course a giant capitalist, but one can be so and not put money before people. And isnt that the whole entire point of our entire process here? It is proven that cities can not build thier way out of rent control any more then that giving tax breaks trickle money down to the poor that slave to make those same people thier money in the first place. This is very cart before the horse mentality. At best the building gets abandoned and turned into a subsidy building (see below).

I believe any large apartment development and certainly a variance for "fixing" the currently awkward Oakland/Kingshighway interchange would be awesome at this location.

I believe we need to get together for not just our FPSE, but the entire city and pass ordinance and demand upon ALL new developments over a certain number of residential units must have a requirement that a percentage of their



FOREST PARK SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

EXERCISE RESPONSES

building be only rented to low income rated people at a rate set forth by the surrounding poverty equivalent.

This might require the city to allocate money to house the regulation of this I have little idea, but I do know that this method has worked in other cities to control rent and there is no reason we can not implement whatever carbon copy here for our entire city and we should have done it years ago we are many buildings behind as it is, but maybe if we start with LUX here we can set a new president. LUX wants it so bad they can suffer this demand and they should be happy to be made an example of for historical sake.

There are something like 160 units proposed, so then I demand 15 percent (about 24 units) should not be rented for more than 500 to 800 per month rent. This is a reasonable percent for "[LUX] to bare thier fair share of the cities poor" and that also makes up for the cities loss of about the same amount of subsidized units i the 6 buildings that are being torn down. (this quote comes from the documentary about housing and development called "Spanish Lake" which is about the second generation of white flight in USA but exampling our local SpanishLake as the nations example, film is available on netflix)

If we do not coexistence with poor we run away from them and perpetuate concentrated poverty, such that the former alderperson of the neighborhood sided with developers citing that there were sufficient amounts of subsidized living within the ie. CWE for another high rise for wealthy there. This might have been true in numbers, however the subsidized are all in the same apartment building(s) making these apartment building(s) into like modern "Pruitt Igoes"! I have had friends living in them and been inside to experience thier workings and despite if they have maintenance and acceptable management, I see the ill results of concentrated poverty within the building today. it doesn't work and is not acceptable. ("Pruitt Igoe Myth'' documentary everyone in STL should know also).

In demanding this I believe it will only naturally force LUX management to cater to diversity, they are already bad, but then they will have to learn efficacy, empathy, and coexistence since thier other units will be classy and likely classist.

I know second hand how this works in NYC because I know a local born and raised STL person previously living on the edge of the North City by Pine Lawn most of his life and he moved there, after thier subsidized placement program wait got into a brand new building in prime area of the city for a mere 1k/mo (other units being like over 5 or 6k same building) and had some struggles to assimilate, risking getting kicked out, but succeeded and enjoys his spacious unit! -43XX Chouteau

DO NOT SUPPORT (20)

I don't support this project because 1) Concerns of appropriate quality management capacity 2) concerns of inadequate parking for # of units + their



FOREST PARK SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

EXERCISE RESPONSES

guests 3) Lux Living DID apply for demolition + denied this 4) Concerns about traffic on Arco which empties on Gibson + on Oakland. Poor management practices continue to follow Lux Living. Why? There is a lot of talk about how it is up to the neighborhood to monitor and hold Lux Living accountable. My question is why would we agree to an owner that already raises red flags?
-45XX Gibson

I do not support this project because they lied about applying for demo permits. They applied for the demo permits in the fall of 2021. Don't know he felt he had to lie. - Lawn Place

I don't support this project because Mike's research about Lux Living's history of poor property management concerns me. 11XX S Kingshighway

I don't support this project by Lux Living because the property has high visibility for our neighborhood and so we need a good quality project in that space. Lux Living's track record raises significant questions about Lux Living's ability to carry out the project in a quality way and a long-lasting way. -45XX Gibson

I do not support this project because STL CityWide/Lux/Aspirent's history, local reputation, and habit -45XX Oakland

I don't support this project because I witnessed the building of the Hudson their newest development (I lived in the area at the time). Tenants moved in when the building looks very much under construction and construction blocked the road more than necessary. Also, don't think the way they treat tenants are fair. Concerned about the way they handle complaints. -Vista+Taylor

I don't support this project because Lux Living's past projects do not suggest that they can make positive impact in the long term. -42XX Vista Ave and Newstead

I don't support this project because the developers have had a previously poor record in all developments. This development would limit supply of good quality development if another better developer doesn't get this site. - Vista/Taylor

I don't support this project because I don't trust Lux Living to maintain the property. They are not trustworthy since they have been caught in lies several times already. *in the future, it would be helpful for non-neighborhood residents to identify themselves in meetings -10XX block South Taylor

I do not support this project because while I appreciate the changes that have been made and like the renderings, I don't trust that they would be able to deliver on the promised development or that tenants living there would be treated humanely. -44XX Oakland



FOREST PARK SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

EXERCISE RESPONSES

I do not support this project because I want to wait for a developer/management company that respects their tenants and keeps them safe. Lux sounds like a terrible neighbor. -45XX Arco

I do not support this project because too dense, too much traffic, terrible developer. Can we require max 3 story building, limit units?? -43XX Swan

I do not support this project not only because the developer has a long track record of mismanaging apartment buildings and building sub-standard buildings (mold within the first year of construction is a huge red flag), but the size and design of the building is out of step with its surrounding context. While I appreciate that they relocated the garage access to Kingshighway, this new design creates a blank wall along 90% of the perimeter of the building at the street level. It is well-documented and understood that this type of design creates an unsafe experience when walking next to these blank walls (and is also part of my criticism of a lot of the new construction at the BJC campus, where this effect is much more pronounced at the larger scales). I live on the other side of the neighborhood, but I often walk my dogs around the 4500 blocks, including along Kingshighway. I understand that having these homes vacant for so long, left to be demolished by neglect, also creates an unsafe experience and sometimes reality. But as an architect and urban planning curmudgeon who spends most of my time considering the built environment, the proposed 7 story building is totally out of place. We requested a sun study last fall, they only presented what it would look like on the summer solstice, when the sun is high in the sky and shadows are small. They dismissed this concern about shadows, which is wild, because it should be a huge part of design consideration. This 7 story monolith will certainly cast huge shadows, particularly affecting the areas east and north of the site. In the summer, the shadow will affect what plants will grow. But I am more concerned about the shadow effects in winter, where blocking out access to the sun will affect heating bills and how quickly snow and ice melt. Sure, 7 stories is nothing compared to Midtown Manhattan, but we do not have the street widths and setbacks of Midtown Manhattan (who also has graduated setbacks as buildings get taller AND requirements for creating and maintaining outdoor public spaces). Along with a lot of the big apartment buildings that are going up in the neighborhood and around the city, I have a strong suspicion that the Lux Living building will not age well. Ignoring aesthetics, they have shown that they building buildings that start to fail immediately after occupancy (partly because they rush occupancy, because they value profit over people), so it will not surprise me when whatever gets built will itself need to be demolished in a decade or two, with all of that material going to the landfill. Despite being neglected for the last decade or so, those vacant houses are still standing a century after they were built. What replaces them should be just as resilient. Also, to slow climate change, it is incredibly important to start building more efficient buildings and retrofit existing buildings. This is more on the city to require and enforce more stringent energy standards and for the state and federal government to subsidize (there



FOREST PARK SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION EXERCISE RESPONSES

are options out there already, but St. Louis and Missouri are always slow to adapt to changing building methods). Any development at any scale that does not prioritize energy efficiency and carbon neutrality is also a huge red flag for me. While it would certainly benefit the neighborhood and city to have these new housing units, ultimately these buildings are creating a big climate burden that will need to be addressed later and at a much higher cost than if they had been built efficiently from the ground up. Oh, another reason I do not support this project is that the apartments will be incredibly overpriced ("market rate") and will create zero affordable housing options. Our neighborhood and city does not need anymore overpriced studio-2 bedroom apartments. We need affordable housing for families. I understand that this project will most likely go forward, and I have mostly accepted that. I am not against development at this location, clearly something needs to be done with these properties. If this project does go forward, in addition to making sure construction crews respect the surrounding neighbors, I think it is important to ask Lux Living to contribute to public space updates like an improved bus stop (especially since they claim to be transit-centered), landscaping along Kingshighway, etc. That area is not just an eyesore because of the vacant houses - it has so much potential as a greenspace that can help mitigate stormwater runoff and provide a space for pollinators and urban wildlife. And/or we contribute what money they do set aside to a North City ward like we did with the money from The Foundry project. -42XX Gibson

I do not support this project because the builders that own the company have a history of building subpar structures and are known for poor mismanagement. With that said, this appears to be happening whether I like it or not. So I ask that the cities oversight is on the micro level to ensure they don't cut corners and that they are made to set aside money for neighborhood beautification like UIC had to do to build in the area and the City Foundry. If they are not held to the highest of standards this building will turn out like the ones currently there. -42XX Gibson

I do not support this project because my concerns for this project are twofold - first the developer's history and second the scale of the project. Lux Living is not known to be a good neighbor and this has been documented by numerous journalists via reports in the St. Louis Post Dispatch and Riverfront Times. The current plan vacates an existing alley, to enlarge the footprint of the project bringing it further into the neighborhood. This was not in the original proposal and I believe that it would be an unnecessary change to the street grid that is unwarranted. Our neighborhood has dealt with these blighted properties for over ten years. We can wait a bit longer to ensure that whatever project is proposed has an opportunity to be fully vetted. Any promises made by developers to the neighborhood need to be fully documented and legally binding. Granting approval based on preliminary information is premature. A project of this scale deserves greater scrutiny. -45XX Arco



FOREST PARK SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

EXERCISE RESPONSES

I do not support this project because Lux Living has a well documented record of poor business practices and show no interest in working with the community.
-42XX Gibson

I do not support this project because I do not support this project. Specifically, I am not opposed to the development itself, but rather am opposed to the developer due to its deplorable track record. Just a few reasons: (1) its unethical tactics, including suing rival developer Expo to block its development (and also suing the City of St. Louis, expending time, money, and resources); the CEO of LuxLiving, Vic Alston, defrauded investors in an SEC document while at his previous company (as reported by numerous media outlets), then lied about the SEC violations on an ethical disclosure while asking Kansas City for a 25-year tax abatement; Lux subpoenaing a tenant at the Hudson who spoke to the Post-Dispatch in an attempt to bully and intimidate him; existing residents of LuxLiving's apartment buildings asserting that Lux deleted their negative online complaints and reviews and/or tried to coerce them into providing positive reviews in exchange for money; Lux selling two of its tax-abated complexes for "windfalls" (per the Post-Dispatch's article), prompting the City to institute a new policy to claw back tax breaks; (2) Lux's reputation with tenants, including a wealth of issues while under the name Asprient, as detailed in the Riverfront Times; (3) Lux's inability to construct quality buildings, such as when one of Lux/Asprient's buildings in the CWE suffered a partial collapse just last year due to shoddy construction; (4) countless lawsuits against Lux and its affiliates alleging illegal practices around the handling of tenants' security deposits; and (5) Lux's model to incorporate short-term rentals (Airbnb and VRBO), which resulted in a shooting and a whole host of other problems at the Ely Walker building this year. There are countless other examples to cite in the relatively short time that Lux has been operational in the City of St. Louis, but these are all important reasons why the residents of FPSE do not want LuxLiving in the neighborhood. This is not a situation where we have to "take what we can get" in terms of development. We care about our neighborhood, its growth, its future, its safety and security, and most importantly, the residents who live here. With roughly 70 FPSE residents attending the FPSE Neighborhood Association meeting on June 21, 2022, when Lux presented its revised development, this was one of the largest turnouts yet. And, aside from one or two attendees who spoke in support of Lux who did not even live in the neighborhood (and who were suspected to be planted by Lux), it was clear that the overwhelming majority of the roughly 70 attendees support redevelopment of this site, but do NOT support Lux. In short, please consider the input of our residents when determining whether or not to proceed with this development. We do not want Lux and its unethical, dangerous practices in our neighborhood for years to come. 43XX Chouteau

I do not support this project due to the shoddy track record Lux Living has with their other buildings in the City of St. Louis. -45XX Gibson



FOREST PARK SOUTHEAST NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

EXERCISE RESPONSES

I am hesitant to support this project without some sort of tenants bill of rights attached to the variance. Very alarmed by the ways the developers are openly intimidating tenants and appears to be incentivizing others to come out in support, that behavior CANNOT be taken lightly. The Tenant Bill of Rights as passed by Kansas City, addresses these issues directly. We cannot allow a developer to intimidate tenants. See link to Bill of Rights (<https://nextcity.org/urbanist-news/kansas-city-adopts-a-tenants-bill-of-rights>) -44XX Oakland

I do not support this project. I am very on board with new development in the neighborhood and especially development on these parcels. If this was being proposed by anyone else, I would be a strong yes in support. But, I will not support Lux Living in our neighborhood as they will only cause decline. - 13xx S. Boyle