Staff Report – Park Model Paradise at the Lake

Applicant:	**Kody Newland** 1934 East Camelback Road, Suite 120-611 Phoenix, AZ 85016 kodynewland@hotmail.com **Peterman Associates, Inc.** 3480 North Main Street Findlay, OH 45840 petermansw@aol.com jmschroeder@gmail.com tmjcivilone@gmail.com
Request:	Approval of Park Model Paradise at the Lake – Preliminary Plat. **Note: The Plat was tabled during LUC's September and October meetings. Text added to this staff report since the version dated 09-10-26 is shown in the bold. New additions are highlighted yellow.**
Location:	Located in the northwest corner of the intersection of State Route 235 and Township Road 250 in Stokes Township, Logan County. This is across from Turkeyfoot on the north side of Indian Lake.

Staff Analysis:	This Preliminary Plat involves 115.117 acres of land and proposes 670 single-family residential lots and 2 commercial lots (retail). Acreages: ○ private/public right-of-way acres not provided ○ 60.124 acres in single-family residential lots ○ 20.585 acres in open space Proposed utilities: ○ According to the subdivider's engineering firm (08-20-26 email), the lots in each phase are to be serviced by individual laterals coming off a water main supplied through a single, shared well. Each phase is proposed to have a single, shared well. ○ A private, low-pressure system with grinder pumps is proposed which will connect to the Logan County

	Sewer District. • **Logan County Engineer's Office** ○ ~~No comments received as of 09-02-26. LUC Staff is aware the Engineer's Office is reviewing the proposal but emphasizes is a relatively large subdivision proposal comprised of multiple documents; time is required to provide the appropriate review.~~ ○ **The Engineer's Office submitted comments in a letter dated 09-03-26. The Engineer's Office did not recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat until the comments outlined in its letter are resolved. Some of those comments are listed below and summarized for reference. (Please refer to letter for all comments.)** **1. The Preliminary Plat needs stamped by a Professional Surveyor.** **2. Change the name of Shoreline Drive because it is already in use within Stokes Township.** **3. Sheet 1, Note #3: The note states one well is proposed for each phase. Please include proposed location of all wells.** **4. Sheet 2: Provide min/max right-of-way widths, street widths, roadway slopes, and ditch slopes for all cross sections.** **5. Sheet 2: The Engineer's Office noted several missing road cross sections.** **6. The minimum pavement width is 28' for a local street or road and 36' for a collector street.** **7. Streets with curbs and gutters are required.** **8. The Engineer's Office noted roads that do not meet road width and radii requirements and requested details provided on the Preliminary Plat.** **9. Sheet 15: Coastal Drive's 'Stub 1' needs to meet the T-type turnaround criteria in the Technical Design Standards.** **10. The Engineer's Office noted several roadway curves that do not meet the**

minimum radius of curvature requirements for local/collector streets.

11. **The Engineer's Office requires measurements on the Preliminary Plat sheets that verify the intersections are spaced in accordance with the Technical Design Standards. It appears multiple intersections are located too close.**
12. **Multiple streets do not meet the 100' minimum length for angle of intersection requirements in the Technical Design Standards.**
13. **The existing tile system(s), including the main tile, will need to be replaced with a new system designed to the Technical Design Standards.**
14. **Construction plans for all structures will need to be designed for the poor soils on the site.**

- **The Engineer's Office provided responses to the disposition statement submitted by the applicant's engineering firm in a letter dated 10-08-26. (Please refer to letter for all comments.)**
- **The Engineer's Office provided responses (approvals/commentary/disapprovals) to variance requests from the Technical Design Standards in a letter dated 10-28-26. (Please refer to letter for all comments.)**

- ***Comment from LUC Staff: The Subdivision Regulations reference these types of concerns and*** *certain approvals by the County Engineer are required before a Preliminary Plat can be approved or conditionally approved by the Regional Planning Commission:*
  - ***"The Preliminary Plat and the supplementary information shall be prepared by an Ohio registered professional surveyor except for subdivisions which propose the construction of streets, sanitary sewers,***

storm sewers….for subdivisions which propose such construction, the Preliminary Plat and the supplementary information shall be prepared by an Ohio registered professional engineer and an Ohio registered professional surveyor" (§311).

- ***"The Preliminary Plat shall conform with the Technical Design Standards as required" (§313).***
- ***"The following information shall be supplied….Typical sections and tentative profiles of streets and other related improvements as required…." (§314, 4.).***
- ***"The horizontal and vertical design of all roads and streets shall be in accordance with the Technical Design Standards" (§404).***
- ***"Pavement widths shall not be less than those widths specified in the Technical Design Standards" (§406).***
- ***"The requirement of curbs and gutters will vary according to the character of the area and the density of development" (§510).***
- *"The County Engineer shall have approved the layout and design of the lots, streets and other improvements prior the Preliminary Plat approval" (§314, 4.).*
- *"The County Engineer shall have approved the preliminary drainage plan prior to the Preliminary Plat approval" (§314, 5.).*

- **<u>Logan County Soil & Water Conservation District</u>**
  - The District submitted comments in a letter dated 09-03-26. **<u>Some</u>** of those comments are listed below and summarized for reference. (Please refer to letter for all comments.)
    1. Sheet 1, Note 8: The note states the contractor or developer shall maintain all existing drainage conduits and structures encountered during construction and shall report or replace damaged pipes. The existing subsurface drainage system has surpassed its life expectancy and is likely to

experience frequent breakdowns. There is a high probability that breakdowns could result in large sinkholes and drainage blockages within the development. The outdated tile system should be replaced during the construction phase with conduits of the same size or larger.

2. This development is located in the center of a 422 acre watershed. It is essential to maintain the integrity of drainage for neighboring properties.
3. Soils on approximately 6 acres of the proposed development are mapped as Willette Muck. Per the USDA's Web Soil Survey, this is characterized by high organic matter (unstable), is very poorly drainage, and is prone to frequent ponding. Construction of any structures on these soils is not recommended.

- **In an email dated 10-22-26, the District advised a proposed plan/process to render the soils acceptable would be OK for the time being but wants a stipulation that a more thorough investigation be completed before the phase with Willette Muck is developed. LUC Staff is working with the District and the applicant to obtain a letter signed by the applicant with this commitment.**

- ***Comment from LUC Staff:*** The Subdivision Regulations reference these types of concerns:
  - *"In order to protect the health, safety, and general welfare of the public, the Regional Planning Commission may reject any proposed subdivision located in an area subject to periodic flooding as determined and illustrated in studies or publications" (§416).*
  - *If the subdivision is located in an area having poor drainage, unacceptable drainage outlets or other adverse physical characteristics…the Regional Planning Commission may approve the subdivision provided the subdivider agrees to perform such improvements as will render the building sites acceptable for the intended use" (§416). The subdivider's engineering firm submitted comments speaking to the soil types in*

	a letter dated 08-20-26, but further conversations with the District or adjustments to the proposal appear to be necessary. • **<u>Logan County Health District</u>** ○ The Health District submitted comments in an email dated 09-02-26. **<u>Some</u>** of those comments are listed below and summarized for reference. (Please refer to email for all comments.) 1. Sheet 1, Note 3: The Plat appears to show only one well, but Note 3 indicates there should be one well for each phase of the development; there are 7 different phases. Those 6 wells appear to be required but the Health District was unable to identify the proposed locations. 2. The Health District is concerned about the required 154' radius for each well because the layout proposed does not appear to allow sufficient space for the other 6 wells and those protection zones. 3. The Health District welcomed any clarification that can be provided regarding how the well locations and associated setbacks will be addressed. ➢ ***Notes from LUC Staff:*** The Subdivision Regulations reference these types of concerns: ▪ "Layout and dimensions of all proposed water lines…showing their connections with the existing systems" is required (§313, 14.). ▪ "The Subdivider shall construct all necessary public water supply improvements in accordance with the approved plans and specifications…" (§540). ▪ "Where a public water supply, in the determination of the Regional Planning Commission, is reasonably accessible or required because of pollution problems, the subdivider shall install a complete water distribution system, including a connection for each lot and appropriately spaced fire hydrants. Public water distribution shall be installed in accordance with the Technical Design Standards" (§540).

- "The County Engineer shall not approve the [construction and utility] plans until the plans have been approved by the…water and sanitary sewer service provider…" (§317).

- **<u>Logan County Sewer District</u>**
  - The Sewer District submitted comments in an undated letter and an email dated 09-03-26. **<u>Some</u>** of the submitted comments are listed below and summarized for reference. (Please refer to letter and email for all comments.)
    1. The Sewer District requires extension of a 6" forcemain +/- 1,150' east of TR250 in the right-of-way along SR235. Placement shall be in the SR235 right-of-way or centered in an adjacent 12' easement. Additional detail is provided in the undated letter. The email indicates this will be required with the initial phase of build out (AKA Phase 1).
    2. The Sewer District requires extension of a 4" sanitary forcemain +/- 1,1910' [sic] along TR250 in a 10' easement adjacent to TR250. Additional detail is provided in the undated letter. The email indicates this will be required with the initial phase of build out (AKA Phase 1).
    3. The Sewer District requires connection to an existing 4" forcemain at the edge of Parcel 43-006-00-00-003-000 (Big Bear Campground) and extension of 4" forecemain to the further (west) edge of Parcel 43-006-00-00-004-001. Additional detail is provided in the undated letter. The email indicates this will be required with the initial phase of build out (AKA Phase 1).

  - ***Notes from LUC Staff:*** The Subdivision Regulations contemplate these types of requirements:
    - "…sanitary sewers…and other improvements as required shall be constructed of extra-size as may be necessary to serve nearby land which is an integral part of the neighborhood service…in addition to the improvements required for the development of the property subdivision" (§570).
    - "If…sanitary sewers…are not available at the boundary of a proposed subdivision, or if existing

off-site improvements are insufficient from a safety or capacity standpoint, the subdivider may be required, prior to approval of the final plat, to obtain the necessary easements or rights-of-way and construct and pay for such extensions. Such improvements shall be available for connections by other subdividers and property owners" (§572).

- **<u>Stokes Township</u>**
  - Stokes Township submitted comments in letters dated 09-02-26 and 09-09-26. **<u>Some</u>** of the submitted comments are listed below and summarized for reference. (Please refer to letter for all comments.)
    1. The Zoning Officer confirmed all of the ground involved in the proposal is unzoned. In fact, all of the land north of State Route 235 is unzoned.
    2. Stokes Township requires an additional 15' of right-of-way along the west side of Township Road 250 (§406; §408, 4.).
    3. Stokes Township inquired whether additional 15' of right-of-way along the east side of Township road 250 might be dedicated by warranty deed at the intersection of State Route 235 and Township Road 250 (§572).

  - ***Notes from LUC Staff:*** The Subdivision Regulations reference these types of requirements:
    - The minimum right-of-way width for a local street or road is 60' (§406).
    - "Where a dedicated or platted half-street exists adjacent to the tract being subdivided, the other half falling within the proposed subdivision shall be platted" (§408, 4.).
    - "If existing off-site improvements are insufficient from a safety or capacity standpoint, the subdivider may be required, prior to approval of the Final Plat, to obtain the necessary easements or rights-of-way…" (§572).

- **<u>ODOT District 7</u>**
  - The District submitted comments in an email dated 08-26-26. **<u>Some</u>** of the submitted comments are

listed below and summarized for reference. (Please refer to email for all comments.)

1. The District has been in contact with the developer's traffic consultant (DGL). District personnel have reviewed traffic volume submittals and have generally agreed with the data, but are awaiting a final version of the document. Because the volume submittal is not yet complete, the District has not received/reviewed any additional Traffic Impact Study material.

➢ ***Note from LUC Staff:*** *Based on an email forwarded by the Logan County Engineer's Office, it appears a Traffic Impact Study was made available for review on 09-04-26.*

- *Section 400 reads, "The regulations in Article 4 shall control the manner in which streets, lots, and other elements of a subdivision are arranged on the land….The standards contained in this article shall be supplemented by the Technical Design Standards of the County Engineer….Plans and specifications shall be submitted and approved in advance in accordance with Section 317 [the Construction Drawings] prior to commencement of construction." Section 405 indicates a Traffic Study can be required. This means, the Traffic Study must be submitted and approved prior to the Construction Drawings* ***approval****.*

- **Mid-Ohio Energy Cooperative**
  - Mid-Ohio Energy submitted comments in a letter dated 09-04-26**, and updated comments in an email/letter dated 10-19-26 and an email dated 10-22-26**. **Some** of the submitted comments are listed below and summarized for reference. (Please refer to email for all comments.)
    1. Mid-Ohio provided its general easement requirements in its letter.
    2. Regarding easement widths, the easement width for underground facilities is 20' extending 10' on each side of the electric-line centerline and the easement width for overhead facilities is 40'

extending 20' on each side of the electric-line centerline.

3. Electric loading is required to complete the electrical design.
4. Will the developer install and maintain the electrical distribution infrastructure beyond the primary meter, or will Mid-Ohio install infrastructure and individually meter each site?
5. What is the anticipated construction schedule, and when will electric facilities be required for each phase?
6. **Recommend establishing the three-phase service point at the northeast corner of the development along T-250 and entering the development through the private secure access. Please incorporate this location into the development plans.**

- **AES Ohio**
  - AES Ohio submitted comments in an email 09-03-26. **Some** of the submitted comments are listed below and summarized for reference. (Please refer to email for all comments.)
    1. AES provided a contact for scheduling and material.
    2. AES provided a preliminary design proposal and layout (dated 09-02-26).

- **LUC Regional Planning Commission**
  1. Section 402 reads, "If the Regional Planning Commission finds that land proposed to be subdivided is unsuitable for subdivision development due to flooding, bad drainage… inadequate water supply… and other such conditions which may endanger health, life, or property; or if from investigations conducted by the public agencies concerned, it is determined that in the best interests of the public, the land should not be developed for the purpose proposed, the subdivision shall not be approved unless adequate methods are advanced by the subdivider for solving the problems that will be created by the development of land." LUC Staff recommends the applicant and the engineering firm consider preparing a disposition statement on the

	comments received from reviewing agencies addressing how concerns will be addressed. **LUC Staff cannot recommend approval or conditional approval of the Preliminary Plat until the comments submitted by reviewing agencies are resolved in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations.** 2. **A disposition statement was submitted by the applicant's engineering firm. The statement iterates and reiterates most of the right-of-way and the streets and roads are private. The Subdivision Regulations do not provide a distinction between private and public road design, and specify that "Subdivisions which propose the construction of private streets shall comply with all sections for this Article" (§340).** 3. LUC Staff believes the public water supplies—the wells proposed for each phase—must be shown and approved by EPA by some method before the Preliminary Plat can be approved (§313, 14.; §317; §540). **In other words, the applicant must provide evidence that the EPA has approved both the locations and use of wells for each phase prior to Preliminary Plat approval. This was discussed with the Prosecutor's Office.** Otherwise, there is no evidence of a public water supply available to the lots within the subdivision. If that is the case, individual private wells would need to be shown. 4. LUC Staff received approval of variances from the County Commissioners. However, the adjusted design requires additional variances. LUC Staff will work with the applicant's engineering firm once action is taken **(when the Plat is updated)** on the Township's requirement of additional right-of-way along TR250 to list-out the additional variances for the County Commissioners to consider. ▪ Variance #2: This variance should be adjusted to make clear the 30' right-of-way along the north and west property lines was a variance from §406 Road or Street Right-of-Way and §408, 4. New Half-Streets.

	▪ Variance #2: The variance should be adjusted to make clear the 30' right-of-way along the west property line was a variance from §408, 3. Dead End Streets where it ends in the southwest corner of the proposed development. ▪ Variance #4: Through lots were permitted along TR250. However, additional through lots are now shown along the right-of-way proposed along the north and west boundaries of the property. ▪ Variance #5: Some of the requirements related to forcemains being required through the development should be clarified since the Sewer District is not (currently) requiring this. ➢ ***Note from LUC Staff – Final Plat reminders:*** ▪ Easements for water and sewer must be a minimum of 20' and 10' for other utilities (§313, 12.; §414). ▪ Note: All plats shall contain a restriction that no permanent structures or plantings, etc. shall be permitted in the easement areas (§323, 7.). ▪ On the Final Plat, please add information about the variances including the date(s), resolution number(s), and applicable section(s) from the Subdivision Regulations. ▪ All bonds, surety, letters of credit, etc. shall be approved by the County Commissioners before any approval of the Final Plat may be granted (§324, 2.; §326; §330).

Staff Recommendations:	Staff recommends acceptance of the request to ***TABLE*** the Park Model Paradise at the Lake – Preliminary Plat.

Z&S Committee Recommendations:	*Options for action:* ○ *Approval* ○ *Conditional Approval (state conditions)* ○ *Denial (state reasons)* ○ *Table (if requested)*