

Emails from former council member Kevin Sullivan to the mayor and council (Oct. 1 and Sept. 29, 2026) and to P&Z members (Aug. 14, 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: Kevin Sullivan <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, October 1, 2026 6:33 AM
To: Eric Zeno <Eric.Zeno@lagovistatexas.gov>
Cc: Joel Scott <[REDACTED]>; Mark Brown <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: P&Z Meeting Follow Up

Mayor and council,

I wanted to follow up on my email from Tuesday with some additional information and insight.

Before I return to the Shoreline Discussion, I just wanted to point out two more changes I talked about previously. They are both circled in my attachment and focus on the 1431 corridor/area. Please give strong consideration to these two areas being designated as full Commercial. They are two of the few areas we can realistically host full commercial to help with diversity of our tax base.

Mr. Prince asked me last night for the 2007 ordinance regarding the Shoreline Ranch PDD amendment. I was going to attach it in my first email, but it was large and wouldn't send with all the other attachments. I've attached the original 2002 PDD and the 2007 Amendment as one document to this email for your convenience.

Regarding my tongue-in-cheek comments about an unexpected supporter, I wanted to be clear that I don't actually believe Mr. Roberts will be a supporter. In fact, I believe he will lead the charge to argue for a Rural Residential FLUM designation for the Shoreline Ranch property. That said, I think it is informative to look at additional public comments he made at the Joint council/CPAC meeting on December 19, 2024. Mr. Roberts speaks for most of the time from the 20-minute to the 30-minute mark of the video. Specifically, around the 21:45, 22:15, and 27:23 marks, he discusses that FLUM designations should primarily match existing entitlements echoing what he said at the July 2026 P&Z meeting. He also commented that he wanted to ensure the FLUM designations were proper to guarantee eventual development. He did not want to make designations that would leave the land undeveloped forever.

To take that last comment a little further, consider conditions on the ground in Lago Vista. In the surrounding area, there are several developments consisting of multi-acre lots which match Rural Residential. When you look closely, these areas are primarily in the ETJ and not in the city limits. Folks who buy such lots to build houses generally don't want to be in the city. One of the few such areas in the city limits is Mr. Roberts' street, [REDACTED]. His street alone has approximately 18 lots, averaging 4.19 acres each, totaling about 75 acres. Those lots have been available for decades—probably 3 decades, but let's be generous and call it just 2 decades. In that time, a former owner of the development, Brian Atlas, and Mr. Roberts have built homes on only 2 of the 18 lots. That is it. The rest of the lots remain undeveloped. At that absorption rate of about 1 per decade, [REDACTED] should be built out in another 160 years. To me, anointing Shoreline Ranch—over 500 acres of land—as Rural Residential would be equivalent to saying we don't want it

developed. The proposed FLUM adds over 1000 acres of Rural Residential designation. How could that possibly make sense?

I have readily admitted I was part of the council that created this problem. I admit it again now and feel that later in my time on council, I attempted to correct what we messed up in 2023. Again, look at the joint council/CPAC meeting of 12/19/2024, specifically the 1 hour and 11-minute mark. This is the entire council, CPAC, and Halff representatives continuing to discuss the FLUM. At this point, we are discussing the eastern side of the city where Shoreline and other developments exist. There is consensus among us all that the entire area should be designated as Neighborhood Residential. There was discussion earlier in the evening that existing entitlements led to that conclusion. We instructed the Halff representative to designate the land as Neighborhood Residential. How is that not reflected in the FLUM today given that was the will of the council and the CPAC?

My understanding is Mr. Roberts acknowledges his previous comments about the FLUM matching entitlements but feels he spoke in generalities and that specific circumstances could cause the city to deviate from the norm of acknowledging existing entitlements when making designations on the FLUM. What would those considerations be? Proximity to a former council member's home? That is cynical on my part, but I'd ask you to consider how such a deviation from the norm would be perceived. I'll take it further and ask you to confer with legal about the advisability of explicitly acknowledging that the city will treat landowners differently. That just seems ripe for legal liability. Especially when it can easily be proven that there is no market-driven reason for unequal treatment of one landowner over another.

I'll close with this thought for your consideration as you prepare for today's CMP/FLUM discussion. I said on the dais many times that the city needs to be firm but fair with developers. We need to be careful about going too far in attempting to stymie their use of the land they own. Why did I say that? Am I some lackey for the development community? Of course not. I pointed out clearly that the more cities like Lago Vista abuse developers, the more those developers seek relief from the state legislature. Treating developers poorly just leads to legislation like SB 840 and SB 15. Both of those laws seriously limit a city's ability to stop dense development. Fortunately for Lago Vista, there was a small city carve out that allowed us to ignore those laws. My warning has always been: if we treat developers fairly, they won't run to the legislature to try to get the small city carve out removed. How do you think our story would be received by the legislature? A developer has vested rights to develop to a Neighborhood Residential level. The city subsequently designates that developer's land as Rural Residential on the FLUM in error, and the developer protests that designation multiple times without relief. The city subsequently passed a law stating it will not consider a zoning change application if the change does not match the underlying FLUM designation. The two acts by the city, both occurring after the original entitlements were granted, put the developer in a Catch 22 situation where they can't even petition the city for a modification of their entitlements that matches what they are already entitled to. It may just be me, but this is the classic example of a horror story a developer can tell the state legislature to get the small city carve out lifted. That is a result Lago Vista does not want.

Looking forward to the discussion this afternoon.

Best regards,

Kevin

On Tue, Sep 29, 2026 at 11:26 AM Kevin Sullivan <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Mayor and Council,

I've blind copied you all to avoid any possible TOMA violations from a Reply All. With Mr. Turner's departure, I've addressed this to Acting Assistant City Manager Eric Zeno. If there is anyone else from staff who should be copied let me know and I'm happy to forward this email.

At this Thursday's meeting, the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) and its accompanying Future Land Use Map (FLUM) are on the agenda as item number VIII.3. I plan to be there to speak on behalf of Shoreline Ranch and will specifically request a Neighborhood Residential designation on the FLUM for that property.

Neither the CMP nor the FLUM you are considering is included in the packet. How do you know what is under consideration? How is the public supposed to know what is under consideration?

Regardless, I wanted to send you some material to support this discussion. Below, you will find an email I sent to Planning and Zoning Commission members the day after I spoke at the August 13th Planning and Zoning meeting. The presentation that I have attached today is an update of the one I covered with P&Z. The post meeting comments I made to P&Z are still valid and worth consideration.

I'll cover highlights from the presentation at the meeting because 3 or 6 minutes won't be enough time to do the entire presentation justice. Therefore, I wanted to provide this material for your advance review. The presentation follows a timeline format to make it easy to understand the progression. The cliff notes version is:

- Shoreline Ranch has entitlements on the property that are equivalent to the new Place Type Neighborhood Residential
- The FLUM designation for Shoreline Ranch has been wrong/in error since the approval of the 2030 CMP
- The current land owners of Shoreline Ranch acquired the property in 2022 and have been trying to work with the city ever since to get the FLUM corrected just so it can request a modification to the PDD
- City law changed in early 2023 that requires a zoning change to be consistent with the FLUM to even be considered.
- The incorrect FLUM designation and an over bearing city ordinance change that took effect after the current owners purchased the land has resulted in a Catch 22 situation that has stymied their efforts ever since
- All the owners are asking is that the FLUM designation for their property be aligned with their entitlements so they can come back and ask for a PDD amendment that is modern, market driven, and has a chance for success

In the presentation, I've referenced several meetings where key activities and decisions took place. I've attached a file with specific dates and meeting timestamps so you can easily review the discussions yourself.

I've also attached the FLUM map that former Development Services Director Jordan Strohmeyer placed in the 7/9/2026 P&Z meeting. You will see in the map she provided that she designated Shoreline Ranch as Neighborhood Residential.

Finally, I believe I have an unexpected supporter for our request. At the 7/9/2026 P&Z meeting, when the commissioners discussed the CMP/FLUM, I got up and spoke and asked them to be careful with the FLUM designations they make. I used the recent hotel project as an example. The land for the hotel project was designated as Regional Commercial/Retail in the 2030 CMP/FLUM. If that designation changed to something that did not allow hotels, and we needed to make a subsequent PDD amendment, we would be unable to proceed until we applied for and were granted a FLUM amendment back to something that allows hotels. You can see how that would be an unnecessary burden. Former council member Paul Roberts spoke after me on this same item. I have the timestamp for his comments listed in the accompanying file. He also commented that the FLUM should reflect entitlements. He stated this multiple times and conveyed agreement with my comments. Again, I provide the meeting date and timestamp for his comments so you can review them yourselves.

If you have any questions about the enclosed material, please do not hesitate to reach out to me via email or phone/text. I'll be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Regards,
Kevin

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kevin Sullivan <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Aug 14, 2026 at 6:56 AM

Subject: P&Z Meeting Follow Up

To:

P&Z Members,

I'd first like to thank you all for allowing me to speak for as long as you did. You recognized this was an important issue and wanted to learn more and for that I'm grateful.

I wanted to follow up the meeting by sending you some information and providing some additional insight.

First, I've attached the presentation I made. I wanted you to have an electronic form of it to review when/how you like.

Second, I've attached the minutes from the 10/13/22 P&Z meeting when the commission unanimously approved the Low Density Residential designation for Shoreline Ranch. As I

mentioned, it is not unprecedented for the P&Z to recommend assigning such a designation to the property.

Third, I've attached the text of the January 2023 ordinance, which introduced multiple hurdles regarding FLUM updates and restrictions on zoning change requests. You can see in the highlighted text where the requirement for a zoning change request to be consistent with the CMP/FLUM was introduced. Mr. Roberts tried to argue that the FLUM does not matter, going so far as to call my claim a canard. You can look to this ordinance update to see I'm telling it like it is: a zoning change request MUST be consistent with the CMP/FLUM or it won't even be considered. But don't take my word for it, look at what you did recently for the AutoZone property. You would not allow consideration of that zoning change to move forward because the change does not match the underlying FLUM. That example makes my point.

Fourth, I've attached the FLUM map that staff created from the Stewart/Harris map from the discussion board post in February. I think staff correctly captured their intent for the most part. I would point to Shoreline Ranch with an RR1 designation, Winn Ranch with an RR1 designation, the 1431 corridor with a Neighborhood Activity Center designation, and the southeast corner of Lohman Ford and 1431 with an RR1 designation as areas you might want to review further. Shoreline Ranch and Winn Ranch because the designation you assigned does not match existing entitlements, the 1431 corridor because that is our one true Regional Commercial/Retail area, and the southeast corner because it is land near our most heavily traveled intersection and it should probably be Regional Commercial/Retail as well. I've outlined in red each of those areas to highlight them.

Fifth, Mr. Roberts also argued that the property owner of Shoreline Ranch knew what they were buying when they bought the land and should be limited to developing according to the entitlements they bought. My question is, why does the city have a defined process to update/modify zoning if landowners are going to be restricted from using it? That makes no sense.

Sixth, Mr. Roberts also tried to make the case that Shoreline Ranch had a certain number of LUEs and if we wanted to change how those were distributed throughout the property, we could do that without a PDD amendment. I think all of you are aware that to be granted a PDD, an applicant must present and have approved both a Concept and Detailed Plan. Those plans include things like street layouts and how utility lines will be laid out throughout a development. I've attached the Concept and Detail Plan requirements from LV Code for your review. So, of course, we cannot redesign the development without coming back for a PDD amendment, and as we discussed, we can't come back for a PDD amendment that mimics our current entitlements due to the 2030 Master Plan FLUM designation and the proposed new CMP FLUM designation.

Finally, I spoke to Ms. Aird on my way out of the meeting. As we discussed my presentation, she asserted that the FLUM was automatically updated when entitlements were granted. I corrected her that Lago Vista ordinances do not provide such an automated update of the FLUM. After further discussion, she agreed that I was right and asserted that is something that P&Z should take up and rectify. I wholeheartedly agree with that assessment and encourage y'all to take up that issue and make such a recommendation to council.

In closing, if you have any questions about this material or anything that I said at yesterday's meeting, please do not hesitate to reach out to me. I've blind copied you all on this email so no one can accidentally reply all and possibly violate TOMA.

Best regards,

Kevin

--

Kevin Sullivan

KS & Associates, REALTORS®

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]