



**MINUTES BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
ONE ST. PETERS CENTRE BLVD., ST PETERS, MO 63376
MEETING OF JANUARY 21, 2015
6:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Dan Meyer called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Those in attendance were Mr. Bill Kendall; Mr. Tom Fann; Mr. John Shetterly; Mr. Dan Meyer; Mr. William Jaggi; Ms. Julie Powers, Director of Planning, Community & Economic Development; Ken Braunfeld, Planning Coordinator and Ms. Melissa Vollmer, Recording Secretary. Mr. Nick Trupiano was absent.

MINUTES

Mr. Meyer asked the Board for any comments or questions regarding the minutes of November 19, 2014. Mr. Jaggi made a motion and Mr. Shetterly seconded to approve the minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS OF OFFICERS

Mr. Meyer asked for any reports or communications from the Officers or Staff. Ms. Powers indicated there were none.

PETITION 15-A:

Mr. Meyer stated that the purpose of the meeting was to consider Petition 15-A. Shirley Seeba requests a variance to allow the sale of used merchandise in the S-D Special Old Town District. The property is located at 117-121 Main Street.

Mr. Meyer declared the public hearing open to consider Petition 15-A. The petitioner or their agent was requested to step forward to present their position. Ms. Shirley Seeba and Ms. Tiffany Dutsel, were sworn in as the petitioners. Ms. Dutsel explained that they are leasing a space at 117-121 Main Street in Old Town to open a consignment shop. They would be selling clothing, jewelry, house wares and other items.

Mr. Meyer asked if there were any questions of the petitioner. Being none, Mr. Ken Braunfeld was sworn in to present the City's position for Petition 15-A.

Mr. Braunfeld explained that Shirley Seeba, the applicant, leased retail space at 117-121 Main Street in Old Town St. Peters. A permit for a retail tenant finish was applied for and granted by the Building Department and work has been done to prepare the space for business. When the applicant applied for a business license it was discovered the use is for the sale of used merchandise, including clothing, antiques, jewelry, small furniture, and/or other such items.

Based on this information, staff advised the applicant that the City Code requires the sale of used merchandise in the C-3 General Commercial District with a Special Use Permit. The S-D Special Old Town Overlay District allows a combination of uses as permitted in the R-1 Single Family Residential District, R-2 Two-Family Residential District, C-1 Neighborhood Commercial District, and the C-2 Community Commercial District. It is noted that if a use appears to be incompatible with the zoning

district it is typically flagged prior to the issuance of a building permit. However, in this case it appears there was a miscommunication between the applicant and City that the proposed retail use was for used and not new merchandise.

Based on this, Shirley Seeba requests a variance to allow the sale of used merchandise in the S-D Special Old Town Overlay District for property located at 117-121 Main Street.

Mr. Braunfeld noted that the variance requested by the applicant is from the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations (Title IV Land Use Chapter 405 as amended), states the following:

Section 405.180 Special Old Town Overlay District.

- A. Purpose of The District. The purpose of this district is to preserve the integrity of Old Town as identified on the Official Zoning District Map and to provide for development consistent with preserving the Old Town image and environment. The regulations of this special district are intended to allow greater design flexibility in development than is permitted by the other district regulations with the exception of the Planned Urban Development District.
- B. Uses Permitted. A building or lot shall be used only for the following purposes:
 - 1. All uses permitted in the “R-1”, “R-2”, “C-1” and “C-2” Districts

Section 405.210: C-3 General Commercial District

- D. Special Use Permit Required
 - 2. Retail sales of any used goods, wares or merchandise, but excluding used motor vehicles

Mr. Braunfeld explained that when the applicant applied for a business license to lease space within 117-121 Main Street, it was discovered there was a miscommunication that the proposed retail use was for used and not new merchandise.

A review of the City Code currently permits the sale of used merchandise in the C-3 General Commercial District with a special use. However, staff is of the opinion that used merchandise can be appropriate within the S-D Old Town Overlay District.

As stated in the Special Old town Overlay District description its goal is to preserve the integrity of Old Town and to provide for development consistent with preserving the Old Town image and environment. A review of the proposed use finds that it is found in other downtown or historic type areas such as Main Street in St. Charles. Main Street in St. Charles contains a variety of stores selling used merchandise including antiques, furniture, jewelry, clothes, and arts & crafts. In addition, the regulations of this overlay district also states another goal is to allow greater design flexibility in development than is permitted by other district regulations. Therefore, staff will propose used merchandise as a Special Use in the S-D Old Town Overlay District when future code changes are considered.

Updates to the City Code are typically reviewed or implements annually after a joint work session with the Board of Aldermen, Planning and Zoning Commission, and the Board of Adjustment. This review by the Board of Adjustment – to include “used merchandise” to the S-D Special Old Town Overlay District for this property – will be consistent with the goals and objectives of the future special use requirements. This consistency in approach includes notification of nearby property owners, posting of the site, and publication in a newspaper. In addition, as part of the variance, the site can be reviewed for its

appropriateness based on the intensity of the use. Further, staff has proposed incorporating the same requirements that have been included in other used merchandise special use requirements.

The property at 117-121 Main Street contains a multi-tenant commercial building which was upgraded a number of years ago to enhance its old town character. This included new siding, trim, handicapped accessibility, and a new large functional and decorative porch. A review of the proposed use finds it can be successfully integrated into this commercial building. Also, this type of retail typically attracts similar numbers of shoppers as general new retail; therefore, the intensity of the use will be the same as other S-D Special Old Town Overlay District uses.

Noting the above, staff is of the opinion the proposed used merchandise expansion of the facility would be appropriate given it meets the spirit of the code, by providing for consistent and compatible development and re-use of vacant retail space.

Mr. Braunfeld stated the code considerations as follows:

1. If the petitioner complied with the provisions of this Zoning Code (does not obtain the variance they are requesting), will they not be able to get a reasonable return from, or make reasonable use of the property?

The applicant and owner would be subject to an unnecessary delay in the re-use of the property for a use that is consistent with, but is not contained in, the S-D Special Old Town Overlay District. Therefore, the variance will allow timely full and reasonable use of the property by the property owner (landlord) and applicant (lessee).

2. Does the hardship result from the strict application of these regulations?

To comply with the code, the applicant and owner would have to delay the lease and re-use of the property until such time as this code change is reviewed and approved, which could be over a year away. Such a delay would place a significant hardship on the applicant and owner.

3. Is the hardship suffered by the property in question?

The City Code references similar intensity uses such as general retail, variety stores, art/crafts, and home furnishings. However, the property suffers a hardship because the City Codes does not make provision for a use that is consistent with, but not contained in, the S-D Special Old Town Overlay District.

4. Is the hardship the result of the applicant's own actions?

The specific omission of used merchandise which is consistent with, but not contained in, the S-D Special Old Town Overlay District is not due to the applicant's own actions.

5. Is the requested variance in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations and does it preserve the spirit?

If the variance is approved the development will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations, since the use of the retail building for used merchandise sales, as proposed by the applicant and restricted by the recommended contingencies, will be indistinguishable.

6. If the variance is granted, will the public safety and welfare have been assured and will substantial justice have been done?

The public safety and welfare will have been assured and substantial justice will have been done because the applicant will be able to use their property to the fullest extent and will have no ill effects on surrounding properties or the City as a whole.

Based on this analysis staff recommends approval of a variance to allow the sale of used merchandise in the S-D Special Old Town Overlay District for property located at 117-121 Main Street with the following contingencies:

1. The Lessee, and any future owner or lessee of the premises, may use the premises for retail sales of any used goods, wares or merchandise, but excluding used motor vehicles, as permitted in the C-1 Neighborhood Commercial District and C-2 Community Commercial District.
2. The sales of used merchandise shall be permitted on the property, except for the following:
 - a. Firearms, weapons, guns, ammunition, and knives – unless otherwise approved by a Special Use Permit. Knives typically used for food consumption which are part of a silverware set shall be permitted.
 - b. Whips, chains, rusty farm implements, automotive parts, any items that are donated for the purpose of resale, and any item which would fall under the definition of junk yard in Section 405.100 of the St. Peters City Code.
3. No outside storage or display of items shall be permitted on the Property.
4. Any items dropped off at the premises for consignment shall be stored inside the premises.

Mr. Meyer asked if any of the board members had questions for Mr. Braunfeld. Mr. Meyer asked if there was anyone in the audience to speak in favor, opposition or in comment of Petition 15-A. Seeing no one present to comment, Mr. Meyer closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kendall made a motion and Mr. Jaggi seconded to approve Petition 15-A.

Mr. Meyer requested Ms. Vollmer call the roll, which resulted in the following votes:

Mr. Fann	Yes
Mr. Kendall	Yes
Mr. Jaggi	Yes
Mr. Meyer	Yes
Mr. Shetterly	Yes

There being 5 yes, and 0 no vote, Mr. Meyer declared that Petition 15-A was approved.

Mr. Fann presented the findings of fact as follows:

1. The subject property is located at the northwest corner of Main Street and North Church Street as recorded in Deed Book 5076 Page 2314 at the St. Charles County Recorder of Deeds Office, more commonly known as 117-121 Main Street.

2. The lot is presently zoned S-D Special Old Town Overlay District.
3. The adjacent zoning is S-D Special Old Town Overlay District.

Mr. Jaggi made a motion and Mr. Kendall seconded to approve the findings of fact. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Jaggi presented the Conclusions of Law for Petition 15-A as follows:

1. The variance will not impair the supply of light or air to the adjacent properties.
2. The variance will not increase congestion in the public streets.
3. The variance will not impact the safety of the community.
4. The variance will not impact on the general health and welfare of the community.

Mr. Shetterly made a motion and Mr. Fann seconded to enact the Conclusions of Law. The motion carried unanimously.

PETITION 15-B:

Mr. Meyer stated that the purpose of the meeting was to consider Petition 15-B. Duane Talbert requests a variance to permit a residential structure to encroach into the rear yard setback in the R-1 Single Family Residential District. The property is located at 20 Julie Lane.

Mr. Meyer further stated that the evidence and testimony received this evening would be the only record considered by the Board. Title IV Land Use of the Municipal Code, as amended, shall be Exhibit #1 for this petition.

Mr. Meyer declared the public hearing open to consider Petition 15-B. The petitioner or their agent was requested to step forward to present their position. Mr. Duane Talbert, homeowner, was sworn in as the petitioner. Mr. Talbert explained that he is looking to expand the living area of his home. When laying out the proposed addition, he found that it would encroach two feet into the fifteen foot rear setback and that is why he's requesting this variance tonight.

Mr. Meyer asked if there were any questions of the petitioner. Being none, Mr. Ken Braunfeld was sworn in to present the City's position for Petition 15-B.

Mr. Braunfeld explained that the applicant, Duane Talbert, is the owner of a home located on lot 285 of Brookmount Estates Plat Five, more commonly known as 20 Julie Lane. The home is located on a corner lot at the southeast corner of Julie Lane and Sherri Lane. The applicant desires to expand the living area of the home. When the applicant laid out the proposed addition he found it would encroach two feet into the fifteen foot rear setback. Due to the homes fixed location and interior layout, there are no practical alternatives to the proposed encroachment which would allow for the proposed improvements.

Based on this, Duane Talbert requests a variance to permit a residential structure to encroach into the rear yard setback in the R-1 Single Family Residential District. The property is located at 20 Julie Lane.

Mr. Braunfeld noted that the variance requested by the applicant is from requirements of the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations (Title IV Land Use Chapter 405 as amended) it states:

Section 405.130 (R-1 Single Family Residential)

H. Yard Requirements

1. The minimum yard requirement shall apply to each lot.

C. Rear yard depth shall be a minimum of twenty-five (25) feet, except the rear yard depth on a corner lot may be fifteen (15) feet.

Mr. Braunfeld explained that the house is located on a corner lot with the front of the home facing Julie Lane and the proposed addition to the rear of the existing home. The proposed expansion will place the addition thirteen feet from the rear property line instead of the required fifteen feet, on a corner lot. It is also noted that the adjacent homes face Sherri Lane so that the side of the home will be towards the proposed expansion further diminishing any visual encroachment.

A review of the site finds the proposed two foot encroachment would barely be visible between the two properties. In addition, the proposed addition, as supported by staff, will not create any building code safety concerns. In fact, the proposed addition will be a positive investment into the home, enhancing its value, and that of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Braunfeld stated the code considerations as follows:

1. If the petitioner complied with the provisions of this Zoning Code (does not obtain the variance they are requesting), will they not be able to get a reasonable return from, or make reasonable use of the property?

The position of the home on the corner lot creates a limited rear yard area. The proposed addition will be a positive investment into the home, enhancing its value and that of the surrounding neighborhood with no negative effect on adjacent properties, thus providing for the reasonable use of the property.

2. Does the hardship result from the strict application of these regulations?

The location of the home on the corner lot creates a limited rear yard area. The proposed addition will be a positive investment into the home, enhancing its value and that of the surrounding neighborhood. The strict application of setback regulations would make the rear yards difficult to use, resulting in a hardship.

3. Is the hardship suffered by the property in question?

The position of the home as originally constructed on the corner lot creates a limited rear yard area restricting the ability to make positive improvements to the subject property.

4. Is the hardship the result of the applicant's own actions?

The subdivision and placement of the house occurred with the original development thereby creating the hardship.

5. Is the requested variance in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations and does it preserve the spirit?

If the variance is approved it would be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations, since it will allow for the reasonable placement of the house addition, thus providing for the reasonable use of the property.

6. If the variance is granted, will the public safety and welfare have been assured and will substantial justice have been done?

The public safety and welfare will have been assured and substantial justice will have been done because the applicant will have been able to use their property to the fullest extent; there will be no ill effects on surrounding properties or the City as a whole.

Based on this analysis, staff recommends a variance to encroach into the rear yard setback in the R-1 Single Family Residential District with the following contingency:

1. The rear yard setback shall be a minimum of thirteen feet.

Mr. Meyer asked if any of the board members had questions for Mr. Braunfeld. Mr. Meyer asked if there was anyone in the audience to speak in favor, opposition or in comment of Petition 15-B. Seeing no one present to comment, Mr. Meyer closed the public hearing.

Mr. Jaggi made a motion and Mr. Shetterly seconded to approve Petition 15-B with the recommended contingency.

Mr. Meyer requested Ms. Vollmer call the roll, which resulted in the following votes:

Mr. Fann	Yes
Mr. Kendall	Yes
Mr. Meyer	Yes
Mr. Shetterly	Yes
Mr. Jaggi	Yes

There being 5 yes and 0 no vote, Mr. Meyer declared that Petition 15-B was approved.

Mr. Shetterly presented the findings of fact as follows:

1. The property is located on Lot 285 of Brookmount Estates Plat 5 as recorded in Plat Book 16, Page 25 at the St. Charles County Recorder of Deeds Office, more commonly known as 20 Julie Lane.
2. The lot is presently zoned R-1 Single Family Residential District.
3. The adjacent zoning is R-1 Single Family Residential District.

Mr. Fann made a motion and Mr. Jaggi seconded to approve the findings of fact. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Jaggi presented the Conclusions of Law for Petition 15-B as follows:

1. The variance will not impair the supply of light or air to the adjacent properties.
2. The variance will not increase congestion in the public streets.
3. The variance will not impact the safety of the community.

4. The variance will not impact on the general health and welfare of the community.

Mr. Jaggi a motion and Mr. Fann seconded to enact the Conclusions of Law. The motion carried unanimously.

PETITION 15-C:

Mr. Meyer stated that the purpose of the meeting was to consider Petition 15-C. St. Peters Village Partnership requests a variance to allow a reduction in the landscape green belt between the C-2 Community Commercial District and the R-3 Residential District. The property is located in St. Peters Village Plat Twelve and St. Peters Village Plat Thirteen, a subdivision recorded in Plat Book 22, Page 22 of the St. Charles County, Missouri Records, as consolidated in Deed Book 5471, Page 1764-1765, more commonly known as 318 Mid Rivers Mall Drive.

Mr. Meyer further stated that the evidence and testimony received this evening would be the only record considered by the Board. Title IV Land Use of the Municipal Code, as amended, shall be Exhibit #1 for this petition.

Mr. Meyer declared the public hearing open to consider Petition 15-C. The petitioner or their agent was requested to step forward to present their petition. Ms. Christine Look, Pickett Ray and Silver, was sworn in as the petitioner. Ms. Look explained that the owner of the property at 318 Mid Rivers Mall Drive is proposing the removal of one-half of the existing building – 8,430 square feet would be removed – and replaced with a new freestanding, 5,000 square foot building. The building would be surrounded with angled parking and a one-way driveway. As part of this new building, the parking is planned to the rear of the building. This shifts the building closer to Mid Rivers Mall Drive. To accommodate the rear drive and parking, the pavement will encroach into the greenbelt between the subject site and the adjacent school property. Due to this encroachment, St. Peters Village Partnership is requesting a variance to allow a reduction in the landscape green belt between the two properties

Mr. Meyer asked if there were any questions of the petitioner. Being none, Ms. Julie Powers was sworn in to present the City's position for Petition 15-C.

Ms. Powers explained the property at 318 Mid Rivers Mall Drive was developed as a retail shopping center in 1985 and is zoned C-2 Community Commercial District. The original building is approximately 17,000 square feet in area. In 2010 Scooters Coffeehouse Company constructed a freestanding coffee/drink kiosk to replace the former Mountain Mudd kiosk in front of the existing building.

Recently the owner submitted a revised site plan for consideration by the Planning and Commission. The plan shows removal of one-half of the existing building – 8,430 square feet would be removed – and replaced with a new freestanding 5,000 square foot building. The building would be surrounded with angled parking and a one-way driveway.

As part of the new amended plan, new parking is planned to the rear of the building. This shifts the building closer to Mid Rivers Mall Drive which will enhance its visibility from the adjacent road. This also allows part of the existing parking pattern of the shopping center to remain. To accommodate the rear drive, however, the pavement will encroach into the greenbelt between the subject site and the adjacent school property which is zoned R-3 Multiple Family Residential District.

The Planning and Zoning Commission will review this site plan at the February 4, 2015 meeting. To address the rear yard encroachment into the ten foot required greenbelt the applicant has requested this variance for a reduction in the greenbelt width.

The property is located in St. Peters Village Plat Twelve and St. Peters Village Plat Thirteen, a subdivision recorded in Plat Book 22, Page 22 of the St. Charles County, Missouri Records, more commonly known as 318 Mid Rivers Mall Drive.

Ms. Powers noted that the variance requested by the applicant is from requirements of the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations (Title IV Land Use Chapter 405 as amended) it states:

Section 405.200 I. Miscellaneous Requirements:

2. Where a "C-2" Community Commercial District is adjacent to any residential zoning district, a landscaped green belt at least ten (10) feet in width shall be provided continuously on the back and/or sides of the commercial property lines and shall consist of a compact evergreen hedge, foliage screening, solid masonry wall, solid wood fence, or other type of screening with a minimum height of six (6) feet above grade, so long as the degree of screening is not less than the screening afforded by the fence, and shall be maintained along the appropriate property line by the users of the "C-2" Community Commercial Property. All landscaping shall be maintained in a healthy growing condition by the property owner and the green belt shall not be used for off-street parking facilities or for loading space.

Ms. Powers noted that a portion of the building will be constructed on one-half of the site at 318 Mid Rivers Mall Drive; a portion of the building will be demolished while one-half of the building will remain. The placement of the new building is such that the parking and drive aisle are behind the building. To ensure adequate circulation, the drive encroaches into the ten foot wide greenbelt along the rear property line.

Staff notes that the shopping center abuts a residentially zoned property which is developed with two elementary schools – St. Peters and Lewis and Clark Elementary Schools. The code requires screening on commercial properties when they abut residentially zoned properties even if the development on the residential property is institutional as is the case in these circumstances. Therefore, this commercial center actually abuts a driveway which is along the west side of the schools. The existing greenbelt includes a row of trees/shrubs along the property line and then a slope down to the commercial property.

The site plan recently submitted shows an approximate four foot buffer strip which will include the existing slope up to the school property. It appears the tree buffer will remain at the top of the slope. In staff's opinion this forms an adequate buffer given the non-residential use of the adjacent school property. Further, staff notes that the four foot buffer is standard in the City along commercial property parking areas. Given this standard and the non-residential development of the adjacent property, staff believes the reduced greenbelt width is reasonable.

Ms. Powers stated the code considerations as follows:

1. If the petitioner complied with the provisions of this Zoning Code (does not obtain the variance they are requesting), will they not be able to get a reasonable return from, or make reasonable use of the property?

Compliance with the regulations would not allow the applicant to fully utilize the value of their property as the parking for the site would be impacted which, in turn, could limit the size of the future building. By allowing the greenbelt modification and the proposed building/parking area, the site can be used for its full potential.

2. Does the hardship result from the strict application of these regulations?

The applicant would be forced to shift the parking and building towards the center of the lot and, therefore, it would create a hardship for the applicant because they would have a smaller building and/or less parking.

3. Is the hardship suffered by the property in question?

The City regulations are in place to ensure compatibility between districts. However, in the subject case, the residential property is developed with schools. Therefore, the greenbelt requirements are not as essential as they are adjacent to residential properties. Given this condition, the applicant of the full greenbelt could cause a hardship for the property.

4. Is the hardship the result of the applicant's own actions?

The applicant is requesting a modified site plan but not a larger building area. Although the applicant's request for a new plan with rear parking is creating the impact on the greenbelt, the overall improvements to the site are a benefit to the site area as it will improve the appearance of the site and the Mid Rivers Mall Drive corridor.

5. Is the requested variance in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations and does it preserve the spirit?

If the variance is approved the property would be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations since the owner would be able to improve the site while retaining the existing buffer.

6. If the variance is granted, will the public safety and welfare have been assured and will substantial justice have been done?

The public safety and welfare will have been assured and substantial justice will have been done because the applicant will have been able to use their property to the fullest extent and have no ill effects on surrounding properties or the City as a whole.

Based on this analysis, staff recommends approval of the variance as requested by the applicant with the following contingency:

1. If the tree/shrub line is removed by the school district and/or the property is redeveloped with residential uses, the subject property owner shall replace the tree line with trees/shrubs or a sight proof fence as approved by the Planning Department.

Mr. Meyer asked if any of the board members had questions for Ms. Powers. Mr. Meyer asked if there was anyone in the audience to speak in favor, opposition or in comment of Petition 15-C. Seeing no one present to comment, Mr. Meyer closed the public hearing.

Mr. Fann made a motion and Mr. Jaggi seconded to approve Petition 15-C with the recommended contingency.

Mr. Meyer requested Ms. Vollmer call the roll, which resulted in the following votes:

Mr. Fann	Yes
Mr. Kendall	Yes
Mr. Meyer	Yes
Mr. Shetterly	Yes
Mr. Jaggi	Yes

There being 5 yes and 0 no vote, Mr. Meyer declared that Petition 15-C was approved.

Mr. Shetterly presented the findings of fact as follows:

1. The property is located in St. Peters Village Plat Twelve and St. Peters Village Plat Thirteen, a subdivision recorded in Plat Book 22, Page 22 of the St. Charles County, Missouri Records, more commonly known as 318 Mid Rivers Mall Drive.
2. The lot is zoned C-2 Community Commercial District.
3. Adjacent zoning is C-3 General Commercial District to the north, R-3 Multiple Family Residential District to the east, C-2 Community Commercial District to the south and Mid Rivers Mall Drive to the west.
4. The Zoning and Subdivision Regulations require a minimum of ten (10) foot greenbelt along residentially zoned properties.

Mr. Jaggi made a motion and Mr. Fann seconded to approve the findings of fact. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Fann presented the Conclusions of Law for Petition 15-C as follows:

1. The variance will not impair the supply of light or air to the adjacent properties.
2. The variance will not increase congestion in the public streets.
3. The variance will not impact the safety of the community.
4. The variance will not impact on the general health and welfare of the community.

Mr. Jaggi made a motion and Mr. Shetterly seconded to enact the Conclusions of Law. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Jaggi made a motion and Mr. Meyer seconded to adjourn the meeting at 6:45 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted:

Melissa Vollmer
Recording Secretary

Dan Meyer
Chairman