MINUTES OF RAVENNA CITY PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
November 12, 2019

The Meeting of the Ravenna City Planning Committee was called to order by Chairman, Rob Kairis at 5:43 P.M. Present were: Bruce Ribelin, Amy Michael, Andrew Kluge, Matt Harper and Paul Moskun. Also attending the meeting were Mayor Frank Seman; Director of Public Service, Kay Dubinsky; Finance Director, Kimble Cecora; City Engineer, Bob Finney; Christina West of 732 Eastland Avenue, Ravenna, Ohio; Tim Calfee of 910 Murray Avenue, Ravenna, Ohio; Larry Silenius of 123 North Walnut Street, Ravenna, Ohio, and Cliff Soudil of 464 Woodland Avenue, Ravenna, Ohio.

Mr. Kairis said the first item on the agenda is the security camera at Chestnut Hills Park. He believes the problem was that not enough money was allocated for the project. Apparently there is a pole that is needed to put the camera on at a cost of approximately an additional $6,000.00.

The clerk said the pole was $3,500.00 and it was decided to put the entire project into the appropriation. The whole project is $9,500.00.

Mr. Finney said they had the pole from the traffic signals that were removed. The cost is for the foundation of the pole as well as the electrical work, etc.

Ms. Michael said this is badly needed at the park.

There being no further discussion, it was decided by those present the issue will be forwarded to Committee of the Whole for further action.

Mr. Kairis said the next item on the agenda is fencing at Chestnut Hills Park. The background to this is there was a meeting with the owner of neighboring property as well as some of the residents. Also the former owner of the property adjacent to the park was there. There were multiple concerns about people coming onto their property, suspicions of selling drugs, juveniles who are unruly with the neighbors. In the past, it was suggested by the previous owner who suggested the city put up a fence and pay for half of it. The current proposal is the City pay for the entire thing.

Mr. Finney said the previous owner originally presented to the committee asking the City to pay 100%. They rejected that and made the offer of a 50/50 split but they wouldn’t go along with it.

Mr. Kairis said it’s a little complicated because the property is not actually in the City. But the Chief of Police was at the meeting and promised any violations of trespassing would be enforced by the City. The people in the neighborhood haven’t called the police to come and arrest anyone for trespassing. His concern is, putting up a fence even really solves the problem. They did put up their own barbed wire fence which they were forced to remove by the township. The question becomes is putting up a fence, which would extend nearly to the end of the street, is there a liability issue and something the City is responsible for? Is that something they should even consider.
Ms. Michael said the neighbor also was concerned about dead trees they say are on the City property. They had their own trees removed. They said the trees on the border that belong to the City are dangerous. If they fall on somebody, it’s the City’s liability, not theirs. There were a couple of issues. There is a tree issue but apparently the price to cut down all of the trees is around $9,000.00.

Mr. Kairis said that he doesn’t want to make that determination. There are experts who can look at that and give them a determination.

Mr. Ribelin noted the issue was discussed probably ten years ago. His understanding at the time was the cost was exorbitant.

Mr. Kairis noted that is another issue, as to whether or not it’s even worth the expense. His feeling is, until they start becoming a little more vigilant about potentially prosecuting trespassers, he thinks it is a little pre-emptive putting up a fence. He’s not so sure that it is going to guarantee to solve the problem.

Ms. Michael said that they are all saying it’s just the park but it’s also the bike path, heavily walked by high school kids, etc. Her thought is if they want to use that area to cut through are they going to go around the fence or climb it? They didn’t know there was a real problem until they came up and asked for the meeting. The Police didn’t know about it. The person who owns the property lives in Randolph and was very adamant that it was the City’s responsibility to put up a fence. Sometimes they would call the Sheriff because it’s in the township. Then the Police Department isn’t aware of it. If there is a problem, they have to know about it so it can be handled.

Mr. Kairis said that they didn’t bring up the fact they were putting up a security camera. There may be other measures he thinks they need to look into. Their vigilance in prosecuting people that are breaking the law and the City putting up a camera before pre-emptively putting up a fence because that is a pretty dramatic move and very expensive. They don’t even know for sure that it’s going to fix the problem.

Mr. Moskun said they can always go around a fence. The length of it would only be a half mile long. If they want to, they can go over or around it.

Mr. Kairis said he thought it was worth discussing and they have to do some diligence in addressing the neighborhood’s concerns. He thinks it is a bit premature to put a fence.

Mr. Finney said that in the past, he has suggested motion lights on their barn so lights would come on. The last owner rejected that idea. His other question is, has a property line actually been established.

Mr. Kairis said that was a question as well. Apparently there are stakes out there but there was some confusion about it.
Ms. Michael said the owner said she had it surveyed. She cut down the trees that were on her property that she thought were dangerous. She said the ones that are dangerous remaining are on City property.

Mr. Finney said he has heard people say they had property surveyed and it turns out it’s not a licensed land surveyor. That’s an expensive venture, just to establish a property line. You can’t rely on the pins in the woods. It doesn’t work.

Mr. Kairis said he doesn’t know what the protocol is in dealing with the trees other than tree lawn issues.

Ms. Michael said it would come from the Parks & Recreation fund.

Mr. Cecora said they could make it a capital project if it is that expansive and they feel that an arborist should come on board to do it.

Ms. Michael said that the Parks & Recreation Department are aware there is a potential problem.

Mr. Kairis said that for now he would recommend they do nothing other than put up the camera.

Mr. Kairis said the next item on the agenda is lighting at the Havre Woods Parks. As he understands it, this was a recommendation where not enough money was allocated and what is being requested is to allocate this year money next year.

After some discussion, it was determined that this project would be done next year and that the funding from this year would simply roll over into next year or let it fall off the first of the year and start over from scratch next year. No legislation is needed.

Mr. Kairis said the next item on the agenda is the public defender contract.

The clerk said this is an annual contract. The price hasn’t changed and is $150.00 per charge. This is a housekeeping issue.

There being no further discussion, it was decided by those present the issue will be forwarded to Committee of the Whole for further action.

Mr. Kairis said the last item on the agenda is a suggested change in the Codified Ordinances, Chapter 222 which talks about preparation of meetings and how meetings are conducted by Council. It seems there are some outdated information here, aside from the fact that there is a question whether it is needed at all, it is outdated. It’s mostly in the first two
paragraphs. It’s not how preparation of Council meetings are handled. For example, it states all requests should be in the hands of the law director at least seven days prior to the meeting. It’s actually the council clerk. The days aren’t right either. They typically ask the information be submitted at least three days prior to the committee of the whole. That’s to give enough time to get everything prepared by the meeting. The requests will be to change that wording. He would think there needs more consideration of the wording. The last sentence talks about the ordinances being mailed each member of council to reach their residence in a certain amount of time. This was written in 1964. The suggestion is to straighten it up to say that the copies will be provided each council member at least 24 hours prior to the time of the meeting. The next paragraph has a very minor item, where it says each ordinance will be read fully; they don’t want to take the time to reach the entire legislation. Only the title is read out loud.

After some consideration, it was decided that the issue would remain on the agenda for further consideration.

There being no further business to discuss, this meeting was adjourned at 6:05 PM.
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