

Email from former council member Paul Roberts to the mayor and council, Sept. 29, 2026. Text of the email as sent. Phone numbers, private email addresses and a home street are blacked out by Lago Vista Watchdog. Web link wrappers removed.

From: Paul Roberts <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2026 6:12 PM
To: Chief Ron Joy <Ron.Joy@pd.lagovistatexas.gov>; Eric Zeno <Eric.Zeno@lagovistatexas.gov>
Cc: Development <Development@lagovistatexas.gov>
Subject: P&Z Meeting Follow Up | October 1 FLUM Discussion — Retain P&Z's Recommended Planning Direction

Mayor and Council (on BCC),

Thank you to staff for updating the October 1 Council packet for Item VIII.3 to include the July 27 FLUM and the accompanying place-type descriptions and density guidance. I appreciate having these materials available to Council and the public for this discussion. Pg. 38:

<https://d3n9y02raazwpg.cloudfront.net/lagovistatexas/2e02a31f-daa6-11f0-bb28-005056a89546-f780b1e5-e473-47e0-9d06-6d298598ff63-1790705734.pdf>

I support retaining P&Z's recommended designations and density guidance, including Rural Residential Tier 1 for Shoreline Ranch. I ask Council to decline the requested substitution of Neighborhood Residential and direct staff to move the recommended plan toward completion and adoption.

Because Mr. Sullivan's September 29 correspondence describes me as an "unexpected supporter," I want to clarify my July 9 remarks. I agreed with his example involving the recently approved hotel, and I recognize that I spoke broadly about reflecting entitlements in the FLUM. My intended point concerned recognition of that recent approval. I did not intend those remarks as an endorsement of Neighborhood Residential for Shoreline Ranch or a requirement that every FLUM designation mirror existing zoning. Existing approvals are relevant, but Council should also consider the appropriate long-term planning direction for each area.

For clarity, I recognize that an LUE allocation alone does not authorize changes to an approved PDD. A redesign may require a PDD amendment, and a proposed zoning amendment inconsistent with the FLUM must first address that inconsistency through the applicable process. Those procedural requirements matter. They do not, however, establish that Council should change the community's planning direction to facilitate the owner's preferred redesign.

The same 2023 ordinance Mr. Sullivan cites expressly preserves Council's discretion over the comprehensive plan and provides that a complete amendment application does not bind Council to amend it. An amendment process provides an opportunity to seek a change; the requested change still needs a persuasive planning justification.

Likewise, a difference between existing zoning and the FLUM does not, by itself, establish that the planning designation is erroneous. The October 1 staff report explains that the FLUM serves as a long-range policy guide and does not rezone property or create development entitlements. Existing

lawful approvals should be respected while Council independently evaluates the planning direction that should guide future changes.

The October 13, 2022 P&Z minutes supplied with Mr. Sullivan's materials capture the central consideration: "Roy commented it's not what's beneficial to the owner, it's what's beneficial to the community." Although that Commission recommended the requested amendment, the principle recorded in those minutes remains the appropriate question for Council today.

The distinction between the proposed place types is substantial. Page 41 of the updated packet gives Rural Residential Tier 1 density guidance of no more than 0.33 dwelling units per gross acre and a typical minimum lot size of three acres. Neighborhood Residential carries density guidance of one to four dwelling units per gross acre. These are planning guidelines, not newly granted development rights, but they describe materially different directions for future land-use decisions.

Consequently, density and neighborhood character belong in this discussion. Detailed development plans would receive later review, but Council is being asked now to change the planning framework against which those plans would be considered.

Mr. Sullivan himself raised these planning concerns during the August 3, 2023 Council discussion. At approximately 1:21:20, he said, "we're looking for diversity of housing here in Lago Vista," and explained that moving estate lots to Low Density Residential would reduce that choice. At approximately 1:53:38, discussing the request to designate the entire property Low Density Residential, he described it as "a naked attempt to increase the density on that parcel."

He also indicated openness to Estate Residential or a combination of Estate and Low Density Residential. Council ultimately denied the request 6-1 on his motion, seconded by Councilmember Chelaine Marion. He now acknowledges that he believes that decision was wrong. I continue to find the concerns he expressed about housing choice and residential intensity persuasive. Those are substantive planning considerations that remain relevant today.

Mr. Sullivan's presentation expressly acknowledges that the purchaser knew what it was buying. A developer should evaluate existing rights, restrictions, infrastructure costs and planning designations before acquiring property and price the investment accordingly. If profitability depends on obtaining favorable changes afterward, that is the purchaser's business risk. It should not become the community's responsibility to make the investment work.

Existing residents are property owners with rights and responsibilities too. We investigate what we purchase, comply with applicable restrictions, pay our taxes and accept the obligations of ownership. We also make substantial investments based on our own approved development framework, neighboring approved uses and the City's stated planning direction. Those investments and reasonable expectations deserve substantial weight when Council considers changing that direction.

I support retaining the rural planning direction for this area because large-lot housing, open landscapes, compatibility with surrounding properties and preservation of neighborhood character are worthwhile community objectives. Infrastructure improvements are important, but they do not

replace those objectives. Residents and the City will live with the consequences of these decisions long after the development phase ends.

Please retain P&Z's recommended designations and density guidance, including Rural Residential Tier 1 for Shoreline Ranch, and establish a definite timetable for completing the remaining work and bringing the plan forward through the required hearing and adoption process.

Thank you,

Paul Roberts

[REDACTED]