

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Planning and Zoning Commission (P&ZC)**  
City of Belton  
333 Water Street  
Tuesday, March 20, 2018

---

The Planning and Zoning Commission met at 5:30 P.M. in the Wright Room at the Harris Community Center. The following members were present: Chair Brett Baggerly, Michael Pressley, David Jarratt, Ty Hendrick, Lewis Simms, Stephanie O'Banion, Rae Schmuck and David Fuller. The following staff members were present: City Manager Sam Listi, Director of Planning Cheryl Maxwell, Planner Kelly Trietsch, IT Specialist Ryan Brown and Planning Clerk Laura Livingston.

**Pledge of Allegiance** – Chair Brett Baggerly led all present.

**Invocation** – Ms. Schmuck gave the Invocation.

**1. Call To Order.**

Chair Baggerly called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M.

**2. Minutes from the previous Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.**

Mr. Simms made a motion to approve the minutes from February 20, 2018, seconded by Mr. Hendrick. The motion passed unanimously with 7 ayes, 0 nays. Mr. Jarratt arrived after the minutes vote was taken.

**3. Z-18-04 Hold a public hearing and consider the following zone changes on property located south of FM 439 and west of Dunn's Canyon Road:**

- Tract 1: 2.149 acres from Patio Homes to Single Family 2**
- Tract 2: 2.721 acres from Single Family 2 to Patio Homes**
- Tract 3: 14.060 acres from Planned Development Single Family 1 Patio Homes to Single Family 2**

Ms. Maxwell presented the staff report. (Exhibit A).

Chair Baggerly opened the public hearing. Ralph Masters, 3200 Canyon Heights Road, asked about Tract 1 and Tract 2; how are they going to get in there? Will Canyon Heights Road be extended and will Chisolm Trail cut into it? He said he's curious what is being recommended. Ms. Maxwell said there is a proposal to extend Chisolm Trail Drive westward. There will be access to these lots and another driveway that comes down as well. Mr. Masters said he and his neighbors would love to see a cul-de-sac at the end of Canyon Heights because of the volume of drivers who use their yards – and not their driveways – to make a U-turn. With no one else requesting to speak, Chair Baggerly closed the public hearing.

Mr. Simms said he is in favor of the transition, and the transition of a larger plot to single family lots is more congruent with the area.

Chair Baggerly asked why the plat was never recorded in 2004? Ms. Maxwell said the plat was approved in 2017 and the rezoning occurred in 2004. Mr. Hendrick asked if they would be connecting Chisholm Trail Parkway. Mr. Jared Bryan, 50 South Wheat Road, responded that

in the previous plat, Chisholm Trail drops down from a collector to a local street right past Spring Canyon and ties back into Canyon Heights, mainly keeping that as neighborhood traffic. Mr. Hendrick asked for confirmation that if it connects, there wouldn't be a need for a turnaround like Mr. Masters was talking about? Ms. Maxwell said yes.

Mr. Hendrick made a motion to approve Z-18-04, with Ms. Schmuck seconding the motion. The motion passed unanimously with 8 ayes, 0 nays.

**4. Z-18-06 Hold a public hearing and consider a zoning change from Agricultural to Retail on approximately 0.9 acre comprising lots 0009, 0008, 0007, and 0006, Block 2 of Belton Lake Estates at 3286, 3292, 3298, and 3304 Lake Road, located on the north side of Lake Road (FM439), east of Lake Ridge Drive.**

This item was withdrawn by the applicant.

**5. Z-18-02 Hold a public hearing and consider the following zone changes on property located on the north side of W. Avenue D, west of Mitchell Street:**

**Tract 1: 1.550 acres of land at 1001 W. Avenue D from Neighborhood Service and Specific Use Permit - 5 for City Yard to Planned Development Neighborhood Service to allow for an event center**

**Tract 2: 3.394 acres from Specific Use Permit – 5 for City Yard to Single Family 3**

Ms. Maxwell presented the staff report (Exhibit B).

Chair Baggerly opened the public hearing. Mr. Diego Jimenez, 1006 West Avenue C, stated his property sits behind this tract to the north side. He asked how noisy it will be? He said they can already sit outside and hear bands nearby play music on Thursday evenings and asked how much more noise are they going to have in that area? He also said there is not a road that goes to the back and asked if they are going to have to construct a road there as an exit, or will they have a cul-de-sac to turnaround in the parking lot? Ms. Maxwell said it will be a turnaround. Mr. Jimenez' main concerns are the noise and how will drivers come in and out of that property?

Mr. Christopher Hutchens, 710 Marshall Drive, identified his home on the map. He knows the building on this site and sees it every day, but he does not agree with the alcohol consumption. He is about to retire from the Army. They have small children and other small children live in the area. He will not let his 11-year-old nephew out of his sight, and he has two daughters so to have alcohol consumption, even though he realizes it is for small events, is the wrong idea. He has dealt with 18-year-olds, 20-year-olds dealing with alcohol his entire career and the traffic that will go through his area alone. People are going to get confused, it is going to happen. There is no out in that neighborhood. It will be hard when people get lost and if there are drunk people driving, there are too many small children in the area to consider an event center especially with the allowance of alcohol consumption.

Ms. Mary Heaton, 707 Marshall Drive, said she moved to this home from Salado because Johnny's Steaks & Barbeque moved in her backyard. Now she is having to deal with this. She has a special needs child that cannot tolerate the noise which is the reason they moved there but she didn't think an outdoor concert venue would happen. She stated she didn't fight Johnny's because it was a two-story home and they needed a single-level home so that pushed them to move but she didn't want to move her daughter

from the home she has known her whole life. She has cerebral palsy and she cannot tolerate the outdoor noise and music. In addition, the alcohol consumption and the traffic in the neighborhood is ridiculous. She said she just wants the Commission to know she doesn't want to fight it, but she would have to move her child from her home if it was approved.

Mr. John Maskunas, 706 Marshall Drive, said he really backs up his neighbors on their concerns, especially when alcohol is involved. He said they already face some traffic issues and car break-ins and asked where are these people going to park if there is an event center? He stated they're going to park on Avenue D and Marshall Drive, plus it will devalue their homes like crazy. Mr. Maskunas said he is all for Tract 2, provided the houses that are built there are compatible to others in their subdivision. He said a few years ago, they fought the same issue when a contractor came in and wanted to build substandard houses that would devalue property. He said he is all for new housing but the event center is the worst idea in all the history of worst ideas because it's going to cause some problems.

Mr. James Hibbler, 611 South Loop 121, said he's been driving up and down these streets for 70 years and it's gotten to where you can't hardly drive through Avenue D with all the trucks, everything from a three-ton flatbed. He said that on top of the hill near the new school, every house has five or six cars and they can't even get them on the curb. He said there isn't room and they need to do something about getting the ones that are on there, off.

Ms. Shelli Farr, 1102 West Avenue D, said she has all of the same parking problems and all of her neighbors park in the street so she can't see around to back out of her driveway. Whenever the school lets out between 3:30 and 4:30 p.m., about 25 to 30 children are walking down that street and they don't have the incentive to come down there. Their parents pick them up at that lot so the children can walk to their cars. She doesn't see how they can have alcohol consumption that close to the school. She guessed the City had already looked into that issue. She asked the City to please address the traffic and she didn't believe there are enough parking spots for an event center. People often park so close to your driveway it's hard to see and it becomes a hazard. Please consider all of these points, Ms. Farr said.

Mr. Dewaine Fertsch, 14 East Central Avenue, Suite 14, Temple, the applicant, said, he owns the property which he purchased from Todd Scott. When he bought the property he said he intended to incorporate the entire property, not as an event center but to use the whole thing. But when the City sold it to the developer that was already in the works as a single-family home set-up so he had no bearing on that decision. He asked what you do with a 5,000 square foot old armory other than just let it die sitting there. He said he can't figure out anything else to do with it. Mr. Fertsch said there will be a police officer there and there will be a bartender there and they have to regulate what goes on in there. You are required so many parking spots per square foot of that building and that has already been allotted and approved as far as parking. There should be plenty of parking. Mr. Fertsch said he tried to take some of the front of the property to allow for more parking but the City will not allow him because it interferes with the City's concept of single-family homes (on Tract 2). There used to be a circle drive and the plat showed the property line right down the middle of the drive so there was no way for him to drive his truck around the building because they had the property lines so close to the building. So, he paid \$3,500 to move over the property lines just so he could get more parking in there to accommodate the size of the building and to allow for the number of people who will park at the event center. When the outdoor events are considered, his example was setting up a bounce house or a couple sharing wedding vows under a nice oak tree in the back. A concert? No, Mr. Fertsch said. He said he's not a loud person and he can't even stand the radio. He said if anyone has questions, ask them.

Chair Baggerly said the open hearing is not the time for questions.

Mr. Fertsch said he's just trying to field them all. He said it is his property and he is trying to accommodate the city side and what they want but also try to utilize his property. The only other thing he could come up with is, he does handyman work, so he considered using it as a shop, but it's not allowed. There's limits to what he can use that building for, Mr. Fertsch said. And Mr. Fertsch said he needs to make money. He didn't buy it to let it sit or let it die. This is a retirement thing for him so he doesn't plan on messing it up, he said. If anyone has problems, he wishes they would come to his front door and he will take care of the questions. He said he's "a neighbor person," and he knows nearly everybody on his block. Chair Baggerly closed the public hearing as no one else requested to speak.

Chair Baggerly said there are a lot of questions about parking. Ms. Maxwell said they have not approved the site plan yet. It was her understanding the plans have not been finalized. Mr. Fertsch said there is ample parking for the square footage of the building. Ms. Maxwell said all requirements would have to be satisfied with the final site plan review.

Chair Baggerly asked if there are areas of No Parking on Avenue D? Members of the audience discussed the parking. To address Mr. Jimenez's question about ingress and egress for Tract 2, Chair Baggerly asked Mr. Fertsch if there are 16 lots? Mr. Fertsch answered yes. Chair Baggerly said that was well below the figure needed for entrance or exit of a subdivision? Ms. Maxwell confirmed this was correct. Ms. Maxwell said she doesn't know if this is the exact layout because there may need to be minor adjustments to ensure the lots met the required size for Single Family-3 zoning. She said we would make sure it met all the requirements before we could approve the plat and the plat would come before the Commission as well.

Mr. Fuller said in the recommendation to the Commission under Tract 1 and Item 1 there are several sentences about on-premise consumption in conjunction with catering services. He asked if this language was common to Neighborhood Services, or is this change to Planned Development-Neighborhood Service bringing this use into play, or is this a third option, an improvisation? Ms. Maxwell said that use is not allowed in Neighborhood Service by right, but can be done with a Specific Use Permit. We felt that it could be part of the PD as an additional use, mirroring what Cathedral Oaks does with a catering event if considered appropriate. Mr. Fuller said that's why he asked the question. He said there are certainly differences between the two sites as far as ingress and egress. Ms. O'Banion mentioned the Harris Center is a similar comparison to what is being proposed--an event center located in a neighborhood with a required police officer on site. Mr. Fertsch compared his vision for the event center to Cathedral Oaks, 1312 Waco Road in Belton.

Chair Baggerly said he hears the concerns that the neighbors have, and they are all valid concerns, but he said he knows from driving past this every day it's an eyesore in its current state and it's probably a spot for vandals and nerdowells to hang out.

Ms. Schmuck asked if an event center is the appropriate thing to have there? Even before she heard any objections at the meeting, when she read it she didn't believe it would be the right place for an event center. There are houses all around it and when she thinks of an event center she thinks of something a bit more isolated, where there are not private homes around it.

Mr. Hendrick said one of the concerns he heard over and over was the noise. Is there any kind of noise restrictions in the area? Chair Baggerly said City Manager Mr. Listi could explain. Mr. Listi said we do have a noise ordinance and the police department takes care of that. Schoepf's and the football stadium do get complaints occasionally, he said. There is a decibel noise limit that is monitored by the police department and it's enforced, certainly if there is outdoor activity. Mr. Hendrick said there would be a

curfew? Say, after 10 p.m.? Mr. Listi said he believed during the week it's one time, and on the weekend a different time.

Ms. Maxwell showed the allowed uses permitted in that district. Mr. Listi said the NS zoning on the property there gives quite a bit of flexibility as it is zoned now, but because an event center is not a listed use in the Zoning Ordinance it would need the Planned Development designation and that is what we are calling to your attention. There was discussion about alcohol in conjunction with that use, Mr. Listi said, and that's addressed in the PD and it would require an SUP or a PD to accommodate that. The parking as Ms. Maxwell said would have to be satisfied on site; on a Retail basis that's about one parking space per 200 square feet so it's about 25 spaces per 5,000 square feet. That's why he's adjusted the zoning line to the west to accommodate that. Mr. Listi said, Avenue D may need to be marked No Parking in the future especially since how many parents are parking in this area for the pick-up of kids. Mr. Fertsch asked about parking at the school. Mr. Listi said he has seen it and there's not enough room for everybody so they filter out onto Avenue D and into the neighborhood.

With discussion occurring in the audience, Chair Baggerly reiterated that this is not the time for open discussion. In relation to the comments about the SF-3 zoning, Mr. Listi said, the first lot lacked the minimum depth and the area requirements, given a minimum 90 feet in depth and a minimum 5,000 square feet overall for the lot. One lot did appear a bit short, he said, as it has enough area in the lot, but the lines may need to shift when platted.

Mr. Lisit said the options for the Planning & Zoning Commission are to leave the land as it is, as currently it is zoned for Neighborhood Services. There's just a slight adjustment of the line to the west to accommodate proposed parking. Options are to leave the NS district as it is right now; you could amend the NS boundary slightly to accommodate this proposed (parking) boundary and then on the SF-3 district, that property is not zoned SF-3 yet. We certainly would like to accomplish that as part of this proposal, Mr. Listi said. When that property was sold by the City we had every objective that that property would be developed into single family lots, compatible with the subdivision to the west.

Mr. Fuller asked the occupancy of the building, though that is determined at a later stage. Mr. Pressley asked about the events and whether they would be scheduled in the evening or daytime? Mr. Fertsch said it would depend on the host of the party and he said he doesn't want to be out past midnight; he would have a certain cutoff as well.

Chair Baggerly asked Mr. Listi to clarify whether they are casting two votes. Mr. Listi said because there are different conditions associated with each tract he recommended they make a motion on each individual tract.

Mr. Simms said he used to be a resident of Mitchell and Avenue D so very close to this proposed area; while he said he applauds the applicant's entrepreneurial spirit to revitalize that area, he personally feels it would be harmful to the area's residents. He would love to see some other development there but he doesn't believe an event center is the perfect fit for what is primarily a residential area. Ms. O'Banion asked if the applicant could return to request a different use at a later date? Ms. Maxwell said yes but if the PD was disapproved they might consider "cleaning up" the zoning of the strip of land to be included with NS zoning and remove the SUP for a city yard. So, the Tract 1 would remain NS, including the adjusted boundary at the west side; this would at least zone it NS and all of those NS uses would be allowed. Chair Baggerly said he could bring forward a laundromat, for example. Any of those uses are allowed right now, Ms. Maxwell said.

Mr. Fuller made a motion to disapprove Z-18-02, Tract 1. Mr. Pressley seconded the motion. Four members voted to disapprove the item, Ms. Schmuck, Mr. Simms, Mr. Pressley and Mr. Fuller. Four members voted down the disapproval, Mr. Jarratt, Mr. Hendrick, Ms. O'Banion and Chair Baggerly. In the event of a tie, the motion fails. Ms. O'Banion made a motion to approve Tract 1 as NS entirely, including the adjusted boundary to the west. Mr. Simms seconded the motion. Tract 1 was approved as NS, unanimously, 8 ayes, 0 nays.

Mr. Simms made the motion to approve Tract 2 as recommended for SF-3 District. Mr. Jarratt seconded the motion, which was approved 8 ayes, 0 nays.

**6. Z-18-03 Hold a public hearing and consider a zoning change from Agricultural and Planned Development Commercial 1 to Planned Development Commercial 1 for an RV Park on 21.757 acres located at 3360 S IH 35, on the east side of northbound IH35, south of Grove Road.**

Ms. Maxwell presented the staff report (Exhibit C).

Chair Baggerly opened the public hearing, with no one requesting to speak he closed the public hearing.

Ms. O'Banion asked if City Staff knew if the RV Park is for short-term usage or is there any definition related to that? Ms. Maxwell said in Chapter 19 the standard states that you cannot stay there for more than 90 consecutive days. Ms. Maxwell deferred to the applicant. Mr. Suresh Lavani, 14100 Abervil Trail, Austin, said mainly the RV Park is for short-term such as daily or weekly visitors, occasionally monthly, but mostly short-term.

Ms. O'Banion said to Mr. Listi that she has not followed the hotel/motel tax laws as closely since she left that industry, but when she was in that industry she learned that if you're staying fewer than 30 days there is a hotel/motel tax that can be applicable, and the City may want to check into that. Mr. Listi discussed the length that visitors may stay at the RV Park. Ms. O'Banion said this is a need in the area as she was in the tourism business for quite some time because of the amount of fishing tournaments and horse shows. She said she wanted to clarify how these parks are being used whether it be long-term or short-term for local events because that is a great economic impact to our community, and that it is in a good location.

Ms. Schmuck made a motion to approve Z-18-03. Ms. O'Banion seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously 8 ayes, 0 nays.

**7. Z-18-05 Hold a public hearing and consider a zoning change from Planned Development Retail to Amended Planned Development Retail (Signage) on a 2.121 acre tract of land at 127 Lake Road, located at the southwest corner of Lake Road (FM439) and Commerce Street, west of Main Street (SH317).**

Ms. Maxwell presented the staff report (Exhibit D).

Chair Baggerly opened the public hearing. Mr. David Leigh, owner of the building at 127 Lake Road, said he and Matt Wood came up with the proposal amendment and they knew at the time when they were going to a three-story building there would be several areas they would have to address that are not currently in the code so they worked with former Planning Director Erin Smith. We knew that

this was going to have to happen (signs) and we knew there was going to have to be a variance at some point to which Ms. Smith had said let's wait until it's finished and do it all at once and suggested we amend Planned Development, Mr. Leigh said. So, as the staff has changed, they have worked with the City on this. The issue we are dealing with is mainly a variance because we are trying to get the highest and best use not because we are trying to work the system, so we really are trying to go with what's best for the community and what's best for the building and what's best for the tenants. Specifically, on this subject – he used J. Neely's Burrito Bar as an example – this business is on the first floor and fronting Lake Road. The ordinance refers to the applicant when applying for a sign and as owners they did not apply for those tenant's signs – the tenants applied. The longest facing façade on Lake Road is 68 feet and when staff looks at it's 115 feet facing Commerce Street so depending on where the tenant is located you could potentially get 115 feet plus 68 feet. He estimated it to be 180 feet per floor, with three floors that amounts to significantly more than the 400 feet and we think that is too much. We also know that ours is a weird shape because our primary entrance faces the south so when you look at the main entrance to come in and park and there is no accommodation for signage on that side if you start dividing it up. So, we're in a weird spot. What we have done with City Staff is try to find a happy medium. We don't want 1,000 postage stamp size signs all over the building but we also don't want one massive one that is 400 square feet, so we are trying to get something in the middle mainly to try to accommodate our current tenants. Edward Jones needs a sign, Maedgen Construction is planning on putting a sign, the Wood Group is also planning on putting a sign on the north and the south side, so that's four additional signs of the eight that could go on the first floor if you divide the façade and what they can rent out. We modeled this building after several buildings in Austin. There are some buildings around Fifth or Sixth Street, around Lamar Boulevard, where REI and Whole Foods and some buildings that have signs on multiple stories. He gave another example in Austin and showed some photos of examples.

With no one else requesting to speak, Chair Baggerly closed the public hearing.

Mr. Jarrat said he appreciated Mr. Leigh's presentation to find the best use and best approach. As a member on the Zoning Board of Adjustment, it's almost always over signage and rarely over anything else. He would like to see a solution come out of this that is transferable to the multistory buildings that are probably going to come out of this. He said otherwise you end up in an arms race and you end up, as we have seen, when somebody has got to be the first person to have to live under the new ordinance and they have less square feet and less exposure. Mr. Jarrat said he thinks they have the opportunity to do it correctly here in a way that accomplishes the spirit in terms of entrepreneurial growth but also recognizes there are some aesthetics here and not just flat advertising. Mr. Jarrat said he liked the presentation of that. Now, to the tricky bit, he said. As owners/developers you already have some examples because several businesses already have signs so you can calculate whether it's a reasonable expectation of what other signs might look like. Is that fair, Mr. Jarrat asked. Mr. Leigh said there's a picture that shows the faces and what it would look like. Chair Baggerly said he was a little concerned that the signs would be plastered all over the building but the architecture makes it look as if it's three separate buildings and each separate unit of the building has a sign on it. He said he agreed with what was said but he didn't know that using Extraco as an example is appropriate because a lot of the spaces in that office are not walk-in business.

Mr. Fuller asked the intent of the monument sign; is it small placard representation or naming the site with the monument sign? Mr. Leigh said it's easy for a CPA renting at the Extraco building to say "I'm located inside the Extraco building." We don't see 127 Lake Road like that, but more like "come to J. Neely's on Lake Road," so we have an example of the monument sign. We're not 100 percent sure we're going to put a monument sign to start with but certain tenants would like to have some signage. As the building owner, we only want enough signs to allow for our tenants to conduct

their business, but we don't want to have to maintain or penetrate the building for the signs. We have to have some way to manage that without having to come to ZBA or to P&ZC every time we have a new tenant. We want some attention. There are some that will say we want to take all the linear feet that is allowed but I'd rather be pragmatic/neutral and go with that, Mr. Leigh said, instead of go for the moon. He said he doesn't know that they would use it all right now. On the third floor its entirely Fairway Mortgage. On the first floor they have three tenants but it's designed for four to eight tenants. On the second floor they have two main tenants but they have an open office/collaborative office, which could potentially mean 15 tenants but they are not going to get signs. Again, it's not a hot mess but it's different than what we typically see, Mr. Leigh said.

Mr. Fuller said he's OK with different. Mr. Fuller said as an example of how this should have been easy but wasn't: the center adjacent to the Scott & White Clinic on 190 West Business Road, oddly enough those are all the same size frontages, largely, and everyone's signs should have been the same size but there were still lots of applications for sign variances. He said he's glad he's thinking through the structure of this. The three-story building itself is a look-at-me, great looking building, Mr. Fuller said. The foundation itself was impressive alone, he added. The reason he asked about the monument sign is at the corner is a terrible place for people to be looking for where they need to go. Mr. Leigh said there is a lot of green space there so it would be offset 20-30 feet so it's not a distraction and to that point some tenants have questioned if people really see the monument sign when they're driving down the road. We could argue that, but monument signs are what is allowed and we know it would have to be elevated.

Mr. Pressley said if we approve this as requested, are we setting a standard going forward? Possibly, Chair Baggerly said. This would be an amended Planned Development, so Chair Baggerly thinks he would be setting a precedent for this building, maybe not necessarily anything else that comes before us. Mr. Listi said he is hopeful for development of similar buildings in Belton and discussed the challenges that can arise when it comes to signage for multiple tenants in a multistory building. Chair Baggerly said he does think this building is unique because of its mixed use, so he wasn't sure he could apply a blanket approach to it, that being said he didn't think that Option B is unreasonable.

Mr. Fuller said what we want to achieve is a clear definition to manage the signage growth so we don't end up with 8 or 10 variance requests to the ZBA. Mr. Simms said the higher the sign goes up the smaller the sign appears and the bigger you must make it to look comparable to what's on the first floor, so allowing them to allocate the way its needed on each floor and visibility is an appropriate recommendation. Mr. Fuller said one thing Mr. Leigh brought up that is worthwhile, to accommodate tenants there are company's specific brand requirements and Option B satisfies the degree of flexibility that would be helpful. Mr. Pressley asked who would be responsible for the care and maintenance of each sign? Mr. Leigh said it will be joint. The approval for the installation must get approval by the owner and the City. It will be common area maintenance which is typical for a multitenant building like the parking lot and the lights. For the monument sign, the tenant would pay to put the sign up there and if there is an electric charge for the sign or to be cleaned once a quarter they would pay their prorated share through the landlord.

Chair Baggerly asked if the building has sign standards in place. Mr. Leigh said they tried, except it's challenging. Some went straight to the City and dealt with it, so one thing we want to enforce are black and white signs with no color. The only one that is different right now is Texas Title, but that's our plan every sign has to get approved. When he looks at the area across Walmart there are way too many signs, and they are way too disparate. We are trying to be consistent, Mr. Leigh said.

Mr. Simms made a motion to approve the amended Planned Development Retail for signage, Z-18-5, Option B. Mr. Jarratt seconded the motion, which was approved 8 ayes, 0 nays.

Ms. Schmuck excused herself from the meeting at 6:56 p.m.

**8. P-18-06 Consider a final plat for Pro Star Rental, a 10.00 acre tract of land located east of IH-35 and south of Grove Road, generally north of Shanklin Road in the city limits of Belton.**

Ms. Maxwell presented the staff report (Exhibit E).

Chair Baggerly entertained a motion. Ms. O'Banion made a motion to approve P-18-06, with Mr. Simms seconding the motion. Item P-18-06 was approved with 7 ayes, 0 nays.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

---

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission