

Wednesday, September 16, 2026

Bradley Bodenmiller
LUC Regional Planning Commission
10820 State Route 347
East Liberty, Ohio 43319

Re: Park Model Paradise At The Lake Subdivision Review #1

Brad,

Please see our responses below to comments we have received from various organizations regarding the preliminary plat for Park Model Paradise At The Lake Subdivision.

Logan County Soil & Water Conservation District

In reference to a submitted letter to LUC RPC dated September 3, 2026

“Item number 8 on the Title Sheets states that the contractor or developer shall maintain all existing drainage conduits and structures encountered and shall repair or replace damaged pipes...Most of the existing subsurface drainage system was originally installed in 1916 and consists of 18 to 24 inch clay tile. This system has surpassed its life expectancy and is likely to experience frequent breakdowns. Simply repairing the existing drainage conduits encountered during construction does not seem sufficient and would not provide a reliable long-term solution. 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 The outdated tile system should be replaced during the construction phase with conduits of the same size or larger...This development is located in the center of a 422 acre watershed. It is essential to maintain the integrity of drainage for neighboring properties. Soils on approximately 6 acres of the proposed development are mapped as Willette muck. According to the USDA Web Soil Survey, Willette muck is characterized by high organic matter (unstable), is very poorly drained, and is prone to frequent ponding. Construction of any structures on soils mapped as muck is not recommended.”

Comment from LUC Staff:

““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...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.”

Peterman Response:

Are we to interpret the comments from Soil & Water as being official requirements? Should we just change the note on the Title Sheet to say the contractor will replace all existing pipes as they are encountered during

construction? Will the Soil & Water District require soil borings/testings to be done? If so, how many/what locations on the development? Just in the area of muck or across the entire development? Would those borings need to be done over the entire development before Phase 1 or would borings be completed in phases?

Logan County Health District

In reference to comments submitted in an email to LUC RPC dated September 2, 2026

“After reviewing the materials, we noted that the plat appears to show only one well, while the plat language, specifically note #3, indicates that there should be one well for each phase of the development. The project calls for seven different phases, so six additional wells should be needed. However, we were unable to identify designated space on the sketch plat for the other six wells that would appear to be required...We are also concerned about the required 154-foot radius for each well, as the current sketch does not appear to allow sufficient space for the additional wells and their protection zones. I attached the EPA approval letter for the initial well along with the plat map for your reference...We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the proposal and would welcome any clarification you can provide regarding how the well locations and associated setbacks will be addressed as the project moves forward.”

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 system...’ is required. ‘The Subdivider shall construct all necessary public water supply improvements in accordance with the approved plans and specifications...’ (§313,14) ‘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’ (§313). ‘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).”

Peterman Response:

The wells for future phases were not shown on the preliminary plat. They have been/will be added to the revised drawing set. Peterman is in discussion with Ohio EPA regarding well locations. Potential variances may need to be obtained from Ohio EPA regarding well isolation radius as the development is pretty congested. Not every well will have the same isolation radius. The radius is determined based on pumping rate/demand. It is possible some wells will have larger or smaller radius requirements. Ohio EPA indicated to me in an email that future wells could be potentially located close to the proposed well for Phase 1 (meaning a future well could be closer than 154 feet to the Phase 1 well). Potentially all wells for the development could be located near the Phase 1 well. This is a private community. The water distribution and treatment facilities will be privately-owned. The water distribution system is not designed for fire flow. There are no proposed fire hydrants in the distribution system. Dry hydrants will be provided at all retention ponds to assist firefighters in cases of emergency.

Logan County Sewer District

In reference to an email submitted to Peterman dated September 3, 2026

“In order to meet the requirements of the Commissioners variances regarding the additional parcels to be served, and the LCSD Engineering standards for sewer extensions, the sewer main extensions discussed yesterday will need to be installed with the initial phase of the build out. We are working on a guidance document and exhibits that will provide the detailed locations of existing infrastructure and materials so

that a detailed plan can be designed...My intent is to provide that to you as soon as possible. I am also submitting these requirements to the LUC as part of the plat approval process.”

In reference to the submitted comments in an undated letter and email to LUC RPC dated September 9, 2026. (The Sewer District sent an email to Peterman dated September 10, 2026 saying they “haven’t sent anything yet to LUC. We are still collecting information for the guidance document.” There seems to be some discrepancy regarding what was sent to LUC).

“Sanitary Sewer Extension Requirements: 6” Sanitary Forcemain Extension: Extend 6” Forcemain approximately 1,150’ from East of TWP RD 250 in the North Side ROW for SR235 to Manhole TF-80. Double 45 or long sweep 90 into manhole. Match invert of 6” forcemain to invert of downstream pipe. Remove existing double 45 on existing 6” sanitary forcemain and replace with 6x6x6 Tee Wye. Wye pointed to match existing flow direction. Install Valves on all 3 sides (upstream, downstream, extension). Forcemain shall be placed in SR235 ROW or centered in adjacent 12’ easement. 4” Sanitary Forcemain Extension – TWP RD 250: Install approximately 1,190’ of 4” sanitary forcemain from 6” forcemain north to edge of property along Twp Rd. 250. Private forcemain in parcel 43-006-10-01-011-000 to be abandoned. Install forcemain in center of 10’ dedicated easement adjacent to Twp Rd. 250 ROW. Install 6x6x4 Tee Wye (Wye pointed north with flow direction towards east to match existing flow direction). Install 4” Gate Valve at Tee Wye. Reconnect Existing Properties with LCSD approved marker and connect tracer wire. Existing customers to be re-connected to the new forcemain, in accordance with LCSD Construction Standards, upon completing and testing. 4” Sanitary Forcemain Extension – SR235: Connect to Existing 4” Sanitary Forcemain at edge of Parcel 43-006-00-00-003-000 (Big Bear Campground – 15147 S R 235, Lakeview, OH) and reinstall LCSD approved marker and re-connect existing and new tracer wire. Extend 4” Sanitary Forcemain to furthest edge of property of parcel 43-006-00-00-004-001 (14959 S R 235 Lakeview, OH). Install Flushing Connection at end of 4” forcemain. Mark end with LCSD approved marker and connect tracer wire...Design engineer shall evaluate sanitary forcemain extensions and provide air/vacuum releases as necessary for the sewer to function properly. All work shall be in accordance with LCSD Construction Standards unless otherwise approved by variance in writing.”

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 the 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 right-of-way and construct and pay for such extensions. Such improvements shall be available for connections by other subdivisions and property owners’ (§572).”

Peterman Response:

The requirements from the Logan County Sewer District will be/have been incorporated into the revised drawing set. A low-pressure sewer system with individual grinder pumps is proposed. This will be a privately-owned system. The system will connect into a proposed public forcemain per the District’s requirements. We are still waiting on the official guidance document and associated exhibits from the Sewer District as of the date of this letter.

Stokes Township

In reference to comments submitted to LUC RPC dated September 2, 2026

“Good afternoon Brad, In reference to proposed Paradise Park Plat. All of the ground is in an unzoned part of Stokes Township. As of now, all land on the North side of SR 235 in Stokes Township is unzoned. Permit need from Stokes Township No.”

In reference to comments submitted to LUC RPC dated September 9, 2026

“We have reviewed the Preliminary Plat and have determined that Stokes Township, Logan County, Ohio, will require a fifteen-foot (15’) right-of-way along the west side of Township Road 250. This is consistent within the requirements of Section 402 Right-of-Way and Pavement Widths and 408, 4. Half Streets in the Logan County Subdivision Regulations...Although it is not part of the proposal, the Township is curious about additional right-of-way dedicated by warranty deed on the east side of Township Road 250 where the subdivider owns additional property at the intersection...This right-of-way shall extend from County Road 235 north to the Logan/Hardin County line, where the plat indicates the right-of-way is apparently wider...”

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).”

Peterman Response:

A 15’ right-of-way will be/has been shown on the revised drawing set. Are there any other requirements from Stokes Township that will need to be incorporated in the revised drawing set at this time?

ODOT District 7

In reference to comments submitted to LUC RPC dated September 2, 2026

“ODOT District 7 has been in contact with the developer’s traffic consultant (DGL). To date, District personnel have reviewed traffic volume submittals and have generally agreed with the data, although we are still waiting on a final version of the document. Since the volume submittal is not yet complete, we have yet to receive or review any additional Traffic Impact Study material.”

Notes 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 09-04-2026. 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.”

Peterman Response:

Peterman had a virtual meeting with LUC to discuss the Traffic Impact Study. It has been determined that the TIS does not need to be completed before preliminary plat approval, but it does need completed and approved before construction drawing approval. Can ODOT/DGL provide an expected timeline for completion and approval? Does more data need to be obtained?

Mid-Ohio Energy Cooperative

In reference to comments submitted to LUC RPC dated September 4, 2026

“The development team must comply with Mid-Ohio Energy Applicable Terms and Conditions for Supplying Electric Service, recorded easement requirements, and the NESC. Standard easement width: Underground facilities require a 20-foot-wide easement, extending 10 feet on each side of the electric-line centerline. Overhead facilities require a 40-foot-wide easement, extending 20 feet on each side of the electric-line centerline. Mid-Ohio Energy reserves the right to determine final facility placement. All line extensions require the cooperation and easements of every affected property owner. Required easements will be obtained by Mid-Ohio Energy at the member’s cost. The easement grants Mid-Ohio-Energy reasonable ingress and egress by foot, vehicle, machinery, and equipment for construction, inspection, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, relocation, and extension of its facilities. Trees, vegetation, structures, buildings, parking lots, swimming pools, and other obstructions that interfere with or endanger Cooperative facilities are not permitted within the applicable easement corridor and may be cut, trimmer, controlled, or removed by Mid-Ohio Energy. Roadway extensions must run parallel with the roadway and be placed immediately within or immediately outside the public road right-of-way. Creek, stream, roadway, and other special crossings will be reviewed during final facility design. A member-provided trench must meet Mid-Ohio Energy specifications, be at least 36 inches below finished grade, and be approved before service conductors are installed. Joint-use trenches may require additional depth. Transformers must be located within 25 feet of a permanent driveway with an aggregate base. At Mid-Ohio Energy’s discretion, meter locations may be placed within 75 feet of the home’s entrance drive. Underground secondary conductors will not be installed under driveways. Communication cables, wires, and fiber must maintain at least 24 inches of horizontal separation from Mid-Ohio Energy poles. Communication structures, vaults, pull boxes, system equipment, and open excavations must remain at least 72 inches from Cooperative poles. Primary single-phase or three-phase underground installations longer than 1,320 feet require primary junction cabinets at 1,320-foot intervals. Mid-Ohio Energy will determine cabinet quantity and placement. Trenching, right-of-way clearing, underground protection permits, and easement costs are borne 100% by the member. Street crossings and routes across adjacent property will be determined during final electrical-facility design. The developer shall coordinate all crossings, permits, easements, and utility conflicts with Mid-Ohio Energy before construction. Landscape plans shall not interfere with Mid-Ohio Energy easements or access to facilities and must comply with applicable regulatory requirements and the NESC. Development electrical loading for Park Model Paradise, including the expected load per site and anticipated total demand of development. This information is required to complete the electrical design. Primary metering: Will the developer install and maintain the electrical distribution infrastructure beyond a primary meter, or will Mid-Ohio install the infrastructure and individually meter each site? What is the anticipated construction schedule, and when will electrical facilities be required for each phase? Before construction begins, Mid-Ohio Energy will work with the developer to complete the electrical-facility design and layout.”

Notes from LUC Staff:

N/A

Peterman Response:

Will the easements that are required by Mid-Ohio need to be shown on the revised preliminary plat drawing set? We currently don’t have any electrical linework shown on the drawings, as that is something that typically the utility company would lay out. Are we required to show electrical linework on the drawings?

AES Ohio

In reference to comments submitted to LUC RPC dated September 3, 2026

AES put together a preliminary layout dated September 2, 2026.

Notes from LUC Staff:

N/A

Peterman Response:

Is there anything that you are requiring at this time? We currently don't have any electrical linework shown on the drawings, as that is something that typically the utility company would lay out. Are we required to show electrical linework on the drawings?

Logan County Engineer's Office

In reference to email sent to Peterman dated September 3, 2026

"This office has conducted a review of the...project and we recommend not approving of the preliminary plat until the issues outlined below are resolved. 1. Please provide our office with the payment required per Appendix C of the Logan County Subdivision Regulations (LCSR). 2. The preliminary plat title is 'PARK MODEL PARADISE AT THE LAKE SUBDIVISION' and the project description on the border of the plan sheets states 'PARK MODEL PARADISE AT THE LAKE SUBDIVISION – PHASE 1'. The preliminary plat was submitted for the entire subdivision so please update the border to clarify this ambiguity. 3. Preliminary plat needs to be stamped by a Professional Surveyor and the date of the survey is required (LCSR Section 313). 4. With respect to the boundaries of the subdivision with acreages being required per LCSR, Section 313: a. Phases 1 thru 6 are shown on the Vicinity Map but the boundaries are not discernible and no acreages are listed. b. Phase 7 should be identified. c. The commercial development has been included as a part of this submittal – is it to be classified as Phase 8? 5. Change the name of Shoreline Drive because there is already a Shoreline Drive in Stokes Township. 6. Preliminary plat, p. 1, Note #1: Needs to note that the development includes two commercial lots. 7. Preliminary plat, p. 1, Note #3: States one well is proposed for each phase – please include the proposed location of all wells either on the preliminary plat or the construction plans. 8. Preliminary plat, p. 1, Note #5: States Paradise Lane right-of-way is to be 110' from SR 235 to Coastal Drive but the plat shows this right-of-way to be reduced to 60' before Coastal Drive. 9. Preliminary plat, p. 1, Note #6: Is the "positive drainage" meant to indicate positive drainage away from building structures? 10. Preliminary plat, p. 1, Note #7: Please begin this note with "Stormwater structures and retention ponds..." 11. Place the location of Silver Street on page 1 of the plat. 12. Preliminary plat, p. 2: Provide minimum and maximum right-of-way widths, street widths, roadway slopes, and ditch slopes for all cross sections. 13. Preliminary plat, p. 2: Paradise Lane: Currently there is an overlap with stations; please clarify which stations correspond with what cross-sections. Also, add a cross section for the entrance/exit lanes and a cross section for the median. 14. Preliminary plat, p. 2: Missing proposed cross sections for the following roads: Marble Way; Indiana Street; Emerald Court; Lagoon Street; Sapphire Lane; Ohio Place; Shoreline Drive; Seashell Court; Silver Street. 15. Preliminary plat, p. 2: On the roadway cross-sections, Item 407: Tack Coat and Item 408: Prime Coat need to be design per the Logan County Technical Design Standards (LCTDS). 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. 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. c. We will wait to see what you're 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). 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. 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. 19. Preliminary plat, p. 15: Coastal Drive's 'Stub 1' needs to meet the T-type turnaround criteria shown in the LCTDS. 20. Preliminary plat, p. 33: Arizona Street vertical curve from station 9+51.79 to 10+51.79 does not meet the LCTDS. 21. Regarding roadway curves: a. The following curves do not meet the minimum radius of curvature requirements for local streets: C7, C12, C16, C17, C24, C25, C28, C32, C33. b. The following curves do not meet the minimum radius of curvature requirements for collector streets: C3, C48, C53, C54, C55. c. It's advised to place a 100-foot tangent between reverse curves with reverse curves which are near the minimum radii requirements. 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. 23. Multiple streets don't meet the 100' minimum length for angle of intersection requirements (LCTDS p. 1-5).

With regards to the construction plans that will be submitted after the preliminary plat is approved: 1. Our office is prepared to issue a variance letter for the pavement sections as proposed, with the correct modifications for the tack coat and prime coat as mentioned above. If the roads were ever requested to be turned into public roads, they would have to meet our minimum structural numbers. 2. Regarding the Sapphire Drive access point to TR 250: Construction plans will need to provide details to ensure security gates will be at least 100-feet from the pavement edge of TR 250 (LCTDS p. 1-7). 3. The existing tile system(s), including the main tile, on this property will need to be replaced with a new system designed in accordance with the LCTDS. This includes designing a routing path for the 100-year storm event with drainage easements in place for surface runoff not contained in the storm sewer system. 4. Construction plan submittal will need to provide calculations and drawings showing roadway pavement drainage meets LCTDS Article 3 requirements. 5. Construction plans for all structures (pavement, building, stormwater, etc.) will need to be designed for the poor soils on the site. 6. Construction plan submittal will need to provide details for pavement radii at all intersections to verify they meet the LCTDS Section 102 requirements. Please show these radii on the drawings. 7. At a minimum the stormwater drainage plan for the construction plan submittal will need to include the following on the drawings: tile size and slopes, catch basin inlets and outlets, and arrows to indicate the direction of water flow. 8. Construction plan submittal will need to include verification of approved access from SR 235 (LCTDS p. 1-7). Construction plans will need to incorporate ODOT's proposed accommodations or improvements for SR 235 access."

In reference to email sent to Peterman dated July 30, 2026

"I am ok with giving a variance letter for the pavement sections as proposed. 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. If they ever wanted to turn the streets into public roads, they would have to meet our minimum structural numbers."

Comment from LUC Staff:

"No comments received as of 09-02-26. LUC Staff is aware the Engineer's Office is reviewing the proposal but emphasizes it is a relatively large subdivision proposal comprised of multiple documents; time is required to provide the appropriate review. Certain approvals by the County Engineer are required before a Preliminary Plat can be approved or conditionally approved by the Regional Planing Commission: 'The County Engineer shall have approved the layout and design of the lots, streets and other improvements prior

to the Preliminary Plat approval' (§314, 4.). 'The County Engineer shall have approved the preliminary drainage plan prior to the Preliminary Plat approval' (§314, 4.)."

Peterman Response:

1. Email was sent to Engineer's office on 9/14/2026 asking for clarification on how the review fee is to be calculated.
2. This drawing border change request will be/has been implemented in the preliminary plat drawing set.
3. Where in Section 313 of the LCSR does it say the preliminary plat needs to be stamped by a Professional Surveyor? Item 3 says "Names, addresses and telephone numbers of the owner, subdivider, and professional surveyor or professional engineer who prepared the plat; and the name, address, and telephone number of the professional surveyor who performed the boundary survey." If a surveyor does need to stamp the pre plat, I respectfully recommend including that language under Section 313 of the LCSR so that we (and others) would know for future reference. Please correct me if I missed something.
4. 4.
 - a. Is this comment referring to the Title Sheet of the Preliminary Plat? If so, the phase boundaries have been/will be added and the acreages have been/will be listed on that sheet.
 - b. Same as comment 4. a.
 - c. The commercial lots could be classified as Phase 8. A conversation may need to be had with the Owner to find out which Phase he plans on putting the commercial lots in.
5. Shoreline Drive will be renamed to Kellison Drive.
6. This note has been/will be updated to include the requested wording.
7. The location of the proposed wells for the future phases has been/will be shown on the updated preliminary plat drawing set. (There may be some potential issues locating the future phase wells regarding the isolation radius. The Owner indicated he would like to put wells at the centers of cul-de-sacs, but that may present an issue with the isolation radius required by Ohio EPA).
8. The note will be/has been updated to appropriately describe the right-of-way limits.
9. Yes.
10. This note has been/will be updated on the revised drawing set.
11. The street label has been/will be added to the Title Sheet.
12. The requested data has been/will be added to Sheet 2.
13. The station information has been/will be clarified on Sheet 2. Cross-sections have been/will be added per request on Sheet 2.
14. These road cross-sections have been/will be included on Sheet 2.
15. 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.
16. 16.
 - a. Is this just an informative statement?
 - b. 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?
 - c. Have you done the calculations internally?
17. 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 as being local roads, and thus showing 28' streets from back of curb to back of curb.
18. 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?

19. Can we apply for a variance for this?

20. Could you clarify how the LCTDS are not met?

21. 21.

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

b. Same as 21. a.

c. Are you enforcing this or just recommending it?

22. 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?

23. 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.

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?

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.

LUC Regional Planning Commission

In reference to response letter from LUC RPC dated September 10, 2026

"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 the land.' LUC Staff recommends the applicant and the engineering firm consider preparing a disposition station on the comments received from reviewing agencies addressing how concerns will be addressed. 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). 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. 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 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: This 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 the force mains being required through the development should be clarified since the Sewer District is not (currently) requiring this.

Peterman Response:

Is LUC planning on denying development on the property based on existing conditions? How are we to interpret the comments regarding Section 402? See the section under Logan County Health District for well information. What do you mean by “once action is taken” regarding the additional 15’ right-of-way requested/required by Stokes Township? With the additional variances that resulted, what would be the timeframe on the Commissioners having meetings/discussions? Will more meetings/hearings need to be had? Will these new variances need to be reflected in the revised preliminary plat drawing set?

General Comments:

Based on the County Engineer’s comments, a lot of the geometry of the roadways could be altered significantly. This will take time to update the drawings (both preliminary plat and construction drawings) with the required design changes. Can variances be applied for with respect to the County Engineer’s requirements? If so, what does that process look like and how long would that take? With this being a private development with private roads, do we need to meet LCTDS regarding all design aspects? Regarding the statement “...we recommend not approving the preliminary plat until the issues outlined below are resolved.”, is it fair to say the County Engineer is 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.

We would appreciate detailed answers to our questions. Please let us know if there are any other comments or concerns

Thank you,

James Schroeder

James Schroeder, EIT
Design Engineer