

In response to “ High-Density Apartments Not Suited to the Area”:

While healthy skepticism is an important feature in the consideration of any new development, and I therefore appreciate the concerns you have raised, I believe that some of these concerns can be viewed through a different lens. First, density is a good thing. New residents obviously increase tax revenue but new residents living in dense areas increase revenue to a greater extent than lower density areas because of the greater efficiency with which services can be provided to them. It's a lot cheaper for the city to pick up one trash dumpster than it is to pick up an entire new subdivision's worth of bags. I also regard some of the concerns about traffic as slightly overblown. By far the largest contributor to traffic currently is from those driving to and from Meramec. While Meramec students, faculty, staff and their families might not make up a large portion of the development's target demographic, they will almost certainly occupy at least some of the units. The zoning exemption for fewer parking spaces would seemingly imply fewer residents that rely on cars to get around. Third, architectural diversity should be considered a positive. You mention the bungalow, craft, ranch and colonial style homes that currently dominate the area. These however, are each unique styles, each from their own individual era leading to what we now think of as a cohesive mixture. The proposed addition of modern architecture to this mixture, while perhaps not everyone's cup of tea, should be viewed no differently than diversity of styles that came before it. To write it off because it doesn't fit with what is already there doesn't make much sense, especially in light of the entire campus-worth of Mid-Century Modern structures that exist right across the street. Raising concerns is important, but so is encouraging walkability, maintaining diversity and accessibility in housing options and rejecting NIMBYistic, rent-seeking, behavior.