OFFICE OF THE
LOGAN COUNTY ENGINEER
P.O. BOX 427
1991 COUNTY ROAD 13
BELLEFONTAINE, OH 43311
www.lceo.us

SCOTT C. COLEMAN, P.E., P.S. **TELEPHONE: (937) 592-2791**
LOGAN COUNTY ENGINEER **FAX: (937) 599-2658**

October 8, 2026

SENT VIA EMAIL TO:
Peterman Associates
3480 North Main Street
Findlay, OH 45840
ATTN: Todd Jenkins, P.E. (TMJcivilone@gmail.com)
James Schroeder, E.I.T. (jmschroeder.769@gmail.com)

RE: Review of the Preliminary Plat for Park Model Paradise at the Lake Subdivision – Response to disposition comments received September 24, 2026

Below you'll find our response to your disposition. Two questions that came up a few times that will be addressed now and not in the below responses: what if the roads are private and can we ask for a variance?

With regards to the private roads, they need to be designed in accordance with our technical design standards per Section 340 of the subdivision regaulations: "Subdivisions which propose the construction of private streets shall comply with all sections of this Article."

With regards to a variance request, a variance can always be requested. When it comes to road layout and geometry, in order for us to consider any variance to our specifications the variance will need to adhere to the most recent version of 'A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets' to ensure the safety of the public.

For the below responses to your questions, we have kept our original review comment with the original review number and in bold text we copied all or part of your disposition (labeled 'PA') and posted our response (labeled 'LCEO').

1. Please provide our office with the payment required per Appendix C of the Logan County Subdivision Regulations (LCSR).

PA: Email was sent to Engineer's office on 9/14/2026 asking for clarification on how the review fee is to be calculated.

LCEO: Said email referenced Inspection fees and you can wait to calculate and pay these until after the preliminary plat is approved. As of this writing, the $200.00 Review fee that is due with the submittal of the preliminary plat has not been paid.

3. Preliminary plat needs to be stamped by a Professional Surveyor and the date of the survey is required (LCSR Section 313).

PA: "Where in Section 313 of the LCSR does it say the preliminary plat needs to be stamped by a Professional Surveyor?"

LCEO: You're correct, the Professional Surveyor requirement is found in Section 311: "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."

15. Preliminary plat, p. 2: On the roadway cross-sections, Item 407: Tack Coat and Item 408: Prime Coat need to be designed per the Logan County Technical Design Standards (LCTDS).

PA: Why do the tack coat and prime coat need to be designed per LCTDS? Are they not already designed to the LCTDS? If not, could we get some clarification? Also, the road are all private.

LCEO: The tack coat is shown as Item 408 and should be shown as Item 407. Also, no prime coat is shown. Section 201 of the LCTDS: "A prime coat (Item 408) shall be required between Item 304 and Item 301 or 448. The application rate shall be at least 0.50 gal per sq. yd. A tack coat (Item 407) shall be required between Item 301 and Item 448. The application rate shall be at least 0.10 gal, per sq. yd."

16. Regarding proposed traffic volumes:

a. For all proposed residential phases (670 lots), the design A.D.T. would be 6,700 vehicles (LCTDS p. 1-1). This does not account for the estimated traffic of the commercial lots.

PA: Is this just an informative statement?

LCEO: Yes.

b. Please calculate the proposed A.D.T based on the LCTDS for each road segment so that we can ensure the roads are being designed for the estimated traffic demands.

PA: The consultant, contractor, and County Engineer had an email conversation around July 30, 2026. The contractor had proposed a pavement section for the County Engineer to review. He was prepared to issue a variance. Why is pavement section design now a concern again?

LCEO: This request for A.D.T. is not related to the pavement section but rather to make sure the streets are designed and classified correctly (i.e. Local street versus Collector street) so that we know the layout of the streets meet the LCTDS.

c. We will wait to see what your A.D.T. calculations show but as of now it appears that Paradise Lane and Palm Drive should be classified and designed as Collector streets (35 MPH) and the remaining streets should be classified and designed as Local streets (25-30 MPH).

PA: Have you done the calculations internally?

LCEO: No, and as the review agency we'll only be checking your calculations.

17. The minimum pavement width for a local curb and gutter street is 28-feet and the minimum pavement width for a collector curb and gutter street is 36-feet (LCTDS p. 1-4). A minimum street width of 20-feet is only acceptable for local street types without curb and gutter. This project is a high residential density development and thus curb and gutter streets are required.

PA: Is this comment just saying that curb and gutter streets are required? We are proposing curb and gutter streets throughout the entire development. We were treating all streets in the development has being local roads, and thus showing 28' streets from back of curb to back of curb.

LCEO: We were stating the width of each type of street in case the A.D.T. shows a need for any Collector streets. Also, your 28' measurement from back of curb to back of curb doesn't adhere to the LCTDS p. 1-4: "Pavement width on curb and gutter type streets is measured from face to face of gutter."

18. Preliminary plat, p. 9, 13, 14 and 16: Emerald Court, Ohio Place, Beach Court, and Seashell Court need to meet the LCTDS road width and radii requirements. Please show these details on the 'Preliminary Plat' plan pages.

PA: Details have been/will be shown on the revised set of drawings. Can/Should we apply for variances for these cul-de-sac designs, if that's even an option? Since these roads are private, are they required to meet LCTDS criteria? Referencing the pavement thickness and structural number discussion, and how your office would require that we meet your standards if the roads were ever to be requested to become public, can the same reasoning be applied to other design aspects (i.e. geometry) of the roads? Meaning, if the roads are private, are they allowed to differ from the LCTDS criteria?

LCEO: No, the same reasoning doesn't apply because we want to make sure the geometry of the roads is designed to keep motorists as safe as possible and repairing a deteriorated roadway is much easier than changing the layout of the roads.

20. Preliminary plat, p. 33: Arizona Street vertical curve from station 9+51.79 to 10+51.79 does not meet the LCTDS.

PA: Could you clarify how the LCTDS are not met?

LCEO: Per LCTDS Section 101, the minimum stopping distance of 200' would require a minimum rate of curvature value of 19.

21. Regarding roadway curves:

a. The following curves do not meet minimum radius of curvature requirements for local streets: C7, C12, C16, C17, C24, C25, C28, C32, and C33.

b. The following curves do not meet minimum radius of curvature requirements for collector streets: C3, C48, C53, C54 and C55.

PA: These are not roadway curve labels. The labels refer to lot dimensions. Does the comment still apply?

LCEO: The drawings appear to show the curves in question along the centerline of the proposed roads. Regardless, we will need horizontal layout details for all road segments so please make sure these are clearly labeled on your revised plat drawings.

c. It's advised to place a 100-foot tangent between reverse curves with reverse curves which are near the minimum radii requirements.

PA: Are you enforcing this or just recommending it?

LCEO: Recommending.

22. Provide measurements on the 'Preliminary Plat' plan pages verifying the intersections are spaced in accordance with the LCTDS Section 102 requirements. It appears the following intersections are located too closely: Sandal Way/Coastal Drive and Paradise Lane/Coastal Drive; Lagoon Street/Paradise Lane and Kiwi Drive/Paradise Lane; Palm Drive/Paradise Lane and Sandal Way/Paradise Lane; and Sandal Way/Paradise Lane and Kiwi Drive/Paradise Lane.

PA: Is this related to the variance request that was originally submitted (and approved with conditions) to the County Commissioners? Could you provide clarification or discuss whether this is an issue that needs addressed or are we okay with our intersections?

LCEO: This is not related to a previous variance request and all intersections need to be in accordance with the LCTDS Section 102.

23. Multiple streets don't meet the 100' minimum length for angle of intersection requirements (LCTDS p. 1-5).

PA: Could you clarify which streets don't meet the requirements? LUC did not make note that this could be a potential variance request back when we originally submitted variances to the Commissioners.

LCEO: It's the owner and designer's responsibility to request variances, not the LUC. We will not clarify which streets as we used an engineering scale to find multiple streets that appear to not meet the angle of intersection requirements – please provide measurements on the plat so we can confirm all the streets meet these requirements.

Additional questions received in the disposition:

PA: Regarding the email sent to Peterman dated July 30, 2026, is the Logan County Engineer's Office requiring soil borings for the development? If so, how many/what locations on the development? Just in the area of muck or across the entire development? When could those soil borings be done? Would those borings need to be done over the entire development before Phase 1 or would borings be completed in phases?

LCEO: The email I sent was in regards to the proposed pavement design and read in part: "Please keep in mind that you do have some poor soils on the site that you may need to consider with the pavement section. You will know more once it is graded and they may need to address soil problems in some pavement areas. That may include soil stabilization, geotextiles, or thicker pavement sections. We will note this in the variance letter as well, but the developer should be aware that they may run into some issues based on soil type." We would not require soil borings for private streets.

PA: Regarding the statement "...we recommend not approving the preliminary plat until the issues outlined below are resolve.", is it fair to say you are not requiring design changes but rather recommending design changes? One could interpret "we recommend" as a suggesting statement, rather than an enforcing statement. Please clarify that statement.

LCEO: We do not approve of the preliminary plat as initially submitted.

Respectfully,

Scott C. Coleman, P.E., P.S.
Logan County Engineer

SCC/mjk

cc: File; LUC Planning (bradbodenmiller@lucplanning.com)