

City of Glendale

*5850 West Glendale Avenue
Glendale, AZ 85301*



Meeting Minutes - Final

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

1:30 PM

Workshop

Council Chambers

City Council Workshop

Mayor Jerry Weiers

Vice Mayor Ian Hugh

Councilmember Jamie Aldama

Councilmember Joyce Clark

Councilmember Ray Malnar

Councilmember Lauren Tolmachoff

Councilmember Bart Turner

CALL TO ORDER**ROLL CALL**

Present 7 - Mayor Jerry Weiers, Vice Mayor Ian Hugh, Councilmember Jamie Aldama, Councilmember Joyce Clark, Councilmember Ray Malnar, Councilmember Lauren Tolmachoff, and Councilmember Bart Turner

Also present were Kevin Phelps, City Manager; Michael Bailey, City Attorney; and Julie K. Bower, City Clerk.

WORKSHOP SESSION

1. [17-028](#) STRATEGIC PLANNING & BALANCED SCORECARD INITIATIVE
Staff Contact: Jean Moreno, Executive Officer Strategic Initiatives and Special Projects

Ms. Moreno said the actions taken to date, had included steering committee training, a Council introductory session, a facilitated stakeholder feedback session and a facilitated Council session. She said the Council session outcomes had identified strong value and mission concepts and identified key vision themes. These themes included financial strength and stability, compelling economic development environment and public/private partnerships, a safe community, and quality amenities, services, transportation and infrastructure that met the diverse needs of the community. The next step would be to identify the key strategic theme areas to be used with the executive team to identify core objectives to achieve. Ms. Moreno said the objective for today was to review the proposed statements, obtain Council comments on any changes, and receive consensus direction.

Ms. Moreno said values were the most important factor and some of the highest ranked values included integrity, excellence, innovative, community driven and learning organization. The integral concepts of the values should be inclusive and action-oriented. She said the values were created using an organizational statement structure with a “we” proclamation, using the present tense, describing an ideal state and behaviors, and explaining why we had the value. The organization would brand around the values by using it on email tags, business cards, ID cards, the website and letterhead.

Ms. Moreno said the first value was integrity and read the statement.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if the word “decisions” should be added to the statement.

Councilmember Aldama asked if the words “fair and equitable” could be added to the statement.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if Councilmember Aldama wanted that added instead of the word “inclusive.”

Councilmember Aldama said it was in addition to “inclusive.”

Councilmember Clark said that was redundant and either the word “equitable” or the word

"inclusive" should be used. She agreed with Councilmember Tolmachoff's comment to add the word "decisions."

Councilmember Aldama said inclusiveness should stay because the Council should be inclusive regardless of the ethnicity of who lived in the City. He believed equitable and inclusiveness needed to remain.

Ms. Moreno said she was looking for direction on the inclusion of "decision-making" and "equitable."

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked if "equitable" would be better placed under community-driven. She said everything did not need to be included under the integrity statement.

Councilmember Aldama agreed that made sense. The word "equitable" was a word worthy of redundancy and asked that the Council consider that. He said it would be appropriate under the community-driven section as well.

Councilmember Clark supported Councilmember Tolmachoff's suggestion but did not support Councilmember Aldama's suggestion.

Councilmember Turner agreed with Councilmember Aldama's suggestion that Council appreciate the distinction between what was equal and what was equitable. He felt it fit best in the last sentence of the community-driven section.

Councilmember Aldama agreed to put the word in the community-driven section.

Mayor Weiers asked Ms. Moreno to read the integrity paragraph with that word added.

Ms. Moreno said the statement now read: "We are guided by integrity in all that we do. Throughout our organization there is an unquestionable level of integrity, ethics, transparency, and honesty guiding our communications, interactions, and decision-making. We are fair, principled, accountable, and inclusive in all that we do. The example is set by City Council, City Management, and every staff member. We do this to create trust within the organization and throughout the community."

Mayor Weiers said there was a consensus on the new statement.

Ms. Moreno next read the excellence value statement.

Councilmember Clark said the word "provide" was used too many times and suggested substituting the second use of "provide" with "create."

Councilmember Turner suggested adding an adjective to the title. He suggested removing the word "can-do" from the first sentence of the paragraph.

Mayor Weiers suggested changing the statement to say "committed to excellence" and strike everything else.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked Mayor Weiers for clarification of the excellence statement.

Mayor Weiers said he would like to make it simpler. He said excellence was what he was after.

Mr. Phelps said staff wanted to design some strategies around operations and finances. He said operational and financial stewardship were key components of the organization. Mayor Weiers was correct that they wanted excellence in all areas but Mr. Phelps recommended that Council consider keeping the it in.

Councilmember Aldama said he agreed to end the statement at excellence.

Mayor Weiers asked Councilmember Turner to repeat his first suggestion.

Councilmember Turner suggested to add a descriptor to the first part of the statement, such as the words "sound" or "responsible."

Councilmember Clark didn't think it made that much difference. The statement outlined what the Council was committed to and was specific on how they expected to achieve that.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said Council should keep in mind they want people to read the core values and to understand them. She suggested keeping it short and understandable.

Councilmember Clark said it set the blueprint for staff and it might be more directed to staff than the general public.

Mr. Phelps said Councilmember Clark was correct. He said the general headline was the value communicated to the public, but they wanted to make sure there were definitions so the staff knew what that looked like in action-oriented steps. He said it was also important for the public to see the definition so they knew what the Council meant by the values.

Vice Mayor Hugh agreed with Councilmember Turner to take out the words "can-do."

Councilmember Malnar said he felt more detail was sometimes better. He liked the way the definitions were written and said the detail would help everyone understand what had been agreed.

Ms. Moreno read the revised statement: "We are committed to excellence through operational and financial stewardship. Our approach to excellence begins with a positive attitude. We are committed to delivering high quality services to our diverse community at an affordable cost, with demonstrated value, in an expeditious manner. We design our services with our stakeholder's needs in mind. We provide opportunities to gather feedback on our services in an inclusive way and look for merit in every idea. We do this to ensure we are good stewards of taxpayer dollars, to create organizational and community pride in the services we provide, and to create added value for our community."

Mayor Weiers said there was consensus.

Ms. Moreno read the title and description for the innovative value: "We empower our employees to be innovative. We are an organization that constantly examines how we can get better and welcomes creative ideas and new thinking. We value efficiency, technology, and agility and we have the courage to try new approaches. We do this to create a flexible organization that can respond quickly to change, to create value by providing more cost-effective services, and to provide a means for employee ownership in

the services we provide.”

Councilmember Clark said it was wonderful.

Vice Mayor Hugh liked it.

Councilmember Turner liked the statement.

Councilmember Aldama also approved of the statement.

Mayor Weiers said there was consensus on the value.

Ms. Moreno read the title and description for the community-driven value.

Councilmember Turner said this was the place to insert the concept of equity. He suggested inserting the word into the last sentence.

Councilmember Clark agreed.

Vice Mayor Hugh also agreed.

Councilmember Aldama also agreed.

Ms. Moreno read the title and description: “We are community driven. All people who live, work, do business in, and visit Glendale are our priority. We value community engagement and we constantly seek feedback to assess the varying needs of our community. We welcome everyone and value the richness of skills, background, and experience that a diverse community provides. We do this to honor our heritage, to create openness, and to ensure we are equitably delivering the services that are most valued and needed in our community.

Mayor Weiers said there was consensus.

Ms. Moreno read the title and description for the learning organization value.

Councilmember Clark suggested removing part of the learning organization definition.

Ms. Moreno said the last statement that Councilmember Clark wanted to remove was the statement about the community value. She asked if Council would consider shortening that statement.

Councilmember Clark said the first sentence said “we do this in order to attract and retain the most qualified people and to invest in skills to develop qualified leaders.” She wasn’t sure if the rest of the paragraph was needed.

Councilmember Aldama said leaving that wording in was necessary and letting the community know why the City invested in people was important. He said the community wanted to know why they traveled to learn new things.

Councilmember Clark said that was already stated in the first part of the definition.

Mr. Phelps said the definition could be shortened a little bit. He said all the other core values ended with a “why we do this” statement and for consistency, this one should too.

Councilmember Clark had no problem with that, but felt the why had already been stated and felt it was repetitive.

Mayor Weiers asked if it could be shortened.

Ms. Moreno provided some suggestions on shortening the definition, including taking out the middle part of the definition.

Councilmember Turner liked the whole definition and suggested replacing "constantly" in one of the sentences. He made another suggestion in the wording of the last sentence.

Councilmember Tolmachoff suggested adding the word "committed" to the definition.

Councilmember Clark suggested a change using the word "committed."

Ms. Moreno asked if there was consensus to shorten the definition and add the word "commitment."

Ms. Moreno read the title and description: "We are a learning organization. We know that our ability to develop and deliver the highest quality services and to achieve operational excellence for our stakeholders is dependent upon having a highly trained and developed workforce and elected representation. We are committed to developing skills and cultivating leaders. We do this to ensure that we are constantly getting better in everything we do and to create lifelong learners."

Mayor Weiers said there was a consensus.

Ms. Moreno said a mission statement should be everlasting, inspiring, memorable, applicable and explain why the organization existed. She read the proposed mission statement: "We improve the lives of the people we serve everyday."

Ms. Moreno said the mission statement defined who was taking action and the word "we" implied everyone in the organization. The statement also defined why we existed, who we did this for and also provided clear expectation.

Vice Mayor Hugh said the mission statement was perfect.

Councilmember Clark agreed it was perfect.

Councilmember Turner agreed.

Councilmember Aldama said it was good.

Ms. Moreno said the vision statement objective was to be memorable, compelling and inspiring, applicable, achievable and stated what we would be. She said the discussion addressed key issues such as financial strength and stability, economic development, a safe community and quality amenities. She read the proposed vision statement: "We are the community of choice for residents, businesses, and employees."

Councilmember Turner agreed with the statement.

Councilmember Aldama also agreed.

Vice Mayor Hugh said it was fine.

Councilmember Clark said Glendale strived to be the community of choice, but said she wasn't sure it was quite there yet.

Ms. Moreno said the statement was structured with the words we are because that was the community it intended to be. She explained they intentionally stayed away from certain words because they wanted to make a proclamation of where Glendale would be by saying we are the community of choice.

Councilmember Clark had no objection.

Mayor Weiers said there was consensus.

Ms. Moreno provided a timeline of the next steps. She said the item would be brought back to Council in the spring for implementing the next step. She said the goal was to have the component finalized by July. The next step was to work with departments to link their department strategies to the organizational strategy.

2. [17-042](#)

ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT (ZTA) ZTA16-02 (City Council Input on Expanding Locations Where Chickens May be Kept)

Staff Contact and Presenter: Sam McAllen, Director, Development Services

Staff Presenter: Jon M. Froke, AICP, Planning Director

Mr. McAllen said the item was to provide input on expanding locations where chickens were kept and to receive Council guidance for wording for the zoning text amendment for the item.

Mr. Froke said in January 2016, Council gave direction to initiate a zoning text amendment to expand where a reasonable number of chickens might be kept in Glendale. In August of 2016, a neighborhood meeting was held and the item was sent to the Planning Commission in September 2016. A second Planning Commission workshop was held in December 2016 and additional feedback was received from the Commission, including the size of the lots available for chickens, distance from neighbors, quantity of chickens, and permitted locations for chickens. He said staff was seeking input from Council on the initiative.

Mr. McAllen said once input was received, a zoning text amendment would be drafted which would be shared with the community through the citizen participation process. The item would be submitted to the Planning Commission for recommendation, and then brought to Council for review.

Mr. McAllen said staff would like Council feedback regarding whether chickens should be kept in Glendale. He discussed several options for Council consideration, such as expanding to all single-family zoning districts; expanding to include all occupied properties and multi-family zoning districts; expanding based on the size of the property; expanding based on the use of the property; not expanding and/or any other options identified by Council.

Councilmember Turner asked if each item should be considered separately.

Mr. McAllen explained the three questions before Council were where did they want chickens to be, the number of chickens and how chickens should be kept on the property.

Councilmember Turner said a couple of the Councilmembers had prepared proposals.

Mayor Weiers asked if Councilmember Turner had something prepared.

Councilmember Turner said he did.

Mayor Weiers asked him to provide his proposal.

Councilmember Turner provided copies to the Councilmembers.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said policy questions 2 and 3 only applied if consensus was reached on policy question 1.

Mr. McAllen said that was correct.

Councilmember Tolmachoff suggested discussing policy question 1 first.

Councilmember Clark had also prepared a proposal and wanted to speak to whether or not chickens should be allowed. She said the issue did not affect her and she was neither pro nor anti chicken. Many hours and resources had been expended on a problem that should never have come to this level. Today people had the resources to take on additional hobbies or activities and a new class of pets had been created. She did not consider chickens as pets and said every other municipal jurisdiction in the valley considered chickens as fowl or poultry. Half of the people were opposed to chickens and half supported them. She said the City was being asked to resolve the issue. Chickens should not be in an urban environment but she would support increasing the zoning limitation to R1-10.

Councilmember Turner said the item began possibly as a dispute between neighbors or an odor problem. The issue could have been corrected by the owner taking care of the noise or odor but Code Enforcement got involved. He said the only option now was removal of the chickens and the option of working together to resolve the problem was no longer available. Chickens were in neighborhoods throughout Glendale. Unless the problem was addressed on a wide scale, Council was not going to solve the problem and it would continue to be an issue. Councilmember Turner said this was about liberty and less regulation was better. Many communities had relaxed their regulations to allow residents to have chickens. His research had shown no outbreaks of disease or drop in home values and had not found one community that had rolled back its decision.

Councilmember Turner proposed allowing chickens on a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet that had active residential use on the lot. On a lot that was 5,000 - to 6,000 square feet, there could be a maximum of 5 hens. On a lot that was 6,000 - 7,000 square feet, there could be a maximum of 6 hens and an additional hen for each 1,000 square feet of lot size up to a maximum of 12 hens. Any hen house or coop must comply with the setback requirements for storage or accessory buildings. He said the Planning Commission recommendations were on point and provided those to Council.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said there were already zoned areas in the City that allowed chickens and anyone wanting to raise chickens could live in one of those areas. She said the proposal would require that someone would have to live on a lot smaller than 5,000 square feet or leave the City if they did not want to live near chickens. She said that was not considerate of all residents. Her constituents were overwhelmingly opposed to the issue and she didn't want people to have to leave Glendale. She was concerned

about compliance and the staffing issues it would create if more officers were required to enforce new regulations. Councilmember Tolmachoff addressed the problems it would create for HOAs and the costs involved with updating CC&Rs.

Councilmember Clark could not support going to a lot size of 5,000 square feet but would like to find a compromise. She said complaints would have to be received before Code would get involved. She said her proposal of allowing chickens on 10,000 square foot lots was a good compromise.

Councilmember Malnar said he grew up on a farm and was familiar with caring for chickens. Most people in the small town where he grew up did not like raising chickens and it was much more cost-effective to buy eggs at the local store. He had received communications from constituents who wanted to raise chickens and those who did not want to raise chickens. He said the hardest part was to balance the rights of both groups.

Councilmember Malnar said the current ordinance allowed residents who wanted chickens to enjoy their property and care for those animals. He said if a text amendment was approved, Council would be giving a minority of residents a right to better enjoy their property. He said that would come at a cost to the residents who did not want chickens in their neighborhoods. He said creating this type of program would also need funding and suggested a chicken tax to provide revenue. He said Council should leave the current ordinance in place without amendments.

Councilmember Aldama had a copy of a map that showed the area that would be affected by the zoning change. He asked if that map showed the number of homes that would actually have chickens if the ordinance passed.

Mr. McAllen said the first map showed the parcels where chickens were currently allowed and the second map showed those parcels as well as the single family residential districts.

Councilmember Aldama did not know how many chickens were in homes right now. He said the maps provided did not represent how many homes would actually have chickens with the zoning change. He had not realized the issue would be as divisive as it had been. Each Councilmember would advocate for their district but also needed to advocate for the entire City. He said there needed to be a compromise among the Councilmembers to advocate for the whole City. He said many people in his district wanted chickens.

Vice Mayor Hugh wanted to see the item moved to the Planning Commission. He asked if HOAs could be excluded if the zoning text amendment passed.

Mr. McAllen said it was his understanding that it would not have an impact on HOAs with existing rules.

Mr. Gruber said his office could research the issue regarding the effect on HOAs.

Vice Mayor Hugh suggested six chickens as a compromise number. He said the chicken coops would also have to follow any setback guidelines.

Councilmember Aldama said the Sonorita neighborhood was designated as M-1 and had residential property within that area. He would like M-1 included. He asked how Code Enforcement would address the issue with the current number of Code Enforcement

employees.

Mr. McAllen said there had been about 60 cases per year over the last three years. He said the only additional enforcement would be those properties that had chickens that weren't in compliance.

Councilmember Aldama asked if Code enforced anything in the backyard if it wasn't visible.

Mr. McAllen said if it was a health and safety issue, such as mosquitos or stagnant pools, it was enforced, but the officer had to be able to see the violation.

Councilmember Aldama asked how chicken issues would be enforced if a call was received about a violation.

Mr. McAllen said the Code Department did work with neighbors and had cited an incident when the chickens had strayed from the backyard.

Councilmember Clark would like more discussion about Vice Mayor Hugh's HOA suggestion. She did not agree with the comment that having a chicken coop would be similar to having a backyard shed. Councilmember Clark didn't think applying shed setbacks would be appropriate for chicken coops. She did like Councilmember Aldama's suggestion of adding M-1 to meet the needs of the Sonorita neighborhood.

Mayor Weiers said his home had agricultural zoning so he knew that there would be animals near his property. He said there were chickens in his neighborhood. He didn't like some of the aspects such as the droppings that were left on his property but did appreciate the fact that there were no scorpions around his property. He supported liberty but taking away someone's right was not fair. He could not support changing the current code if it was going to create problems. If a person wanted to have chickens, he or she should move to an area that allowed them. He encouraged the Council to leave things as they were.

Councilmember Turner said Council had to stay focused on the issue. There had not been any interest in having roosters on residential properties. He said ordinances were in place for people to seek relief from an odor or noise problem due to chickens. The zoning change did not force people to have chickens. Other cities that allowed chickens had not had a problem with it.

Councilmember Turner agreed with Vice Mayor Hugh to protect the HOAs and wanted to structure the change in a way to lessen the impact on HOAs. He said if a person living in an HOA wanted chickens, it would be their responsibility to work with neighbors and the HOA to see if that could happen. He said chicken owners should be provided an opportunity to correct any problems that might come up. Councilmember Turner said, with his proposal, it was the use of the property that determined whether or not it could have chickens. He said Council wouldn't be solving the problems if it limited chickens to lots of 10,000 square feet or larger.

Councilmember Clark hoped Council could come to some sort of compromise but didn't think that was going to happen because several Councilmembers were opposed to moving forward with the issue. She could not support allowing smaller lots to have chickens.

Councilmember Aldama said in order to get speed humps for a neighborhood, neighbors

had to obtain a certain number of signatures on a petition. He asked if it would be possible for homeowners with lots of 5,000 to 9,000 square feet, to obtain signatures on a petition and lots over 9,000 square feet being allowed to have chickens.

Mr. Froke said the City did not allow petitions for zoning. It was voted for or against by the Planning Commission and Council.

Councilmember Turner said some communities did require petitions to allow chickens and that was something that could be included in the zoning text amendment.

Mr. Froke said that was a policy question. He said if a person was seeking permission from a neighbor for something, it was very difficult for staff to enforce that. He explained there were other means for a zoning text amendment. He said members of a neighborhood could file their own zoning text amendment with payment of a fee.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said without a consensus, it was not a good use of staff time to move forward.

Mayor Weiers asked if there was a consensus for Councilmember Clark's amendments.

Councilmember Clark wanted to amend her proposal to include M-1.

Councilmember Turner wanted to reach common ground on the issue. He said if some constituents understood it would take a proactive action of their HOA to allow chickens, much of the opposition might go away.

Councilmember Clark said there was no consensus to move forward with the compromise she had offered. She asked if a citizen could initiate a zoning text amendment.

Mr. Froke said there were a number of ways for the zoning ordinance to be amended and explained the various ways.

Councilmember Clark asked if that would go through the Planning Commission and then to Council.

Mr. Froke said that was correct.

Councilmember Clark said it could be done through a citizen initiative process.

Mr. Froke said that was correct.

Councilmember Clark asked if there were any other ways.

Mr. Froke said the Planning Commission could initiate a ZTA as well as City Council.

Councilmember Clark said there was no consensus for her proposal.

Mayor Weiers asked if there was a consensus for Councilmember Turner's proposal.

Councilmember Clark said no.

Councilmember Turner asked if Council could reach a consensus on his proposal if the minimum lot size were higher and if it also included Vice Mayor Hugh's idea regarding HOAs.

Mayor Weiers asked Councilmember Turner to state the two items.

Councilmember Turner said Vice Mayor Hugh had suggested the zoning text amendment be written that unless an HOA specifically allowed for chickens, that chickens would not be allowed in the HOA. He suggested increasing the minimum lot size to 7,000 square feet. Councilmember Turner said the lot sizes were sufficient in older areas and the houses were generally smaller in size. He said this was not a one size fits all situation.

Councilmember Tolmachoff disagreed it was an HOA issue. She believed residents in areas that did not allow chickens deserved the right to live in a neighborhood without chickens. She didn't think it was responsible for the Council to leave it up to the HOAs to determine whether chickens were allowed. She believed it was a property rights issue.

Councilmember Clark agreed it was a property rights issue and with a smaller lot size, more and more people were affected who had no say in the issue. She said only a very small portion of the City population had any clue about what was going on and she didn't want to give anyone living in a smaller lot permission to have chickens. Using the larger lot size would expand it only to properties that were large enough to deal with chickens and only expanded those property rights to 400-500 additional properties.

Mayor Weiers asked if there was consensus on Councilmember Turner's proposal with 7,000 square foot lots.

There was no consensus.

Vice Mayor Hugh asked if Councilmember Clark would allow the Planning Commission to have a hearing if the lot size was increased to 10,000 square feet.

Councilmember Clark said she would agree to the 10,000 square feet if it included M-1.

Vice Mayor Hugh said he supported that.

Councilmember Malnar asked if they were talking about R1-10, which was much different than 10,000 square foot lots.

Councilmember Clark said R1-10 was her original intent.

Councilmember Malnar clarified it was not 10,000 square foot lots.

Councilmember Clark said R1-10 and M1.

Councilmember Aldama said it didn't sound like there was consensus to move forward, although he did support chickens at residential homes. He said Council was talking about the property rights for those who opposed chickens but asked that Council remember the property rights of those who supported chickens. He did not know what the lot size magic number was.

Councilmember Clark said currently chickens were only allowed in SR-12 and up, and everyone who had chickens in any other zoning designation was illegal. She said the issue was whether the Council wanted to expand those rights somewhat, and she was willing to do that, however, she was not willing to grant a la carte rights.

Councilmember Turner asked Councilmember Clark if she would only consider R1-10

lots.

Councilmember Clark said she would only consider R1-10.

Councilmember Turner believed in the rule of law, but sometimes the rules were wrong and needed to be amended. He felt there was a consensus to move forward and asked the Council to think about other communities that had handled the issue.

Councilmember Malnar said in the west valley, Glendale had six areas zoned for chickens. Peoria only had two areas zoned for chickens. Surprise had larger lots zoned for chickens. He explained those cities had greater restrictions than Glendale. He mentioned other cities that allowed chickens but were more restrictive than Glendale currently was.

Mr. Froke said the matrix was prepared because of a question from the Planning Commission to look at the ten largest cities in the state. He said M-1 zoning was one of the light industrial districts.

Mayor Weiers said he didn't know what the consensus was at this point.

Councilmember Clark said if Councilmembers Turner, Aldama and Vice Mayor Hugh were willing to move this forward considering only R1-10 and M-1, she would join them in that effort.

Vice Mayor Hugh said he would move forward with it.

Councilmember Aldama said he had to stand by the community and his district and they would like to have the opportunity to have chickens. If Council only considered the larger lots, his whole community would be cut out of consideration and he could not do that to them.

Councilmember Turner had a sense that the problem did not exist at the 10,000 square foot level, but did exist in regular neighborhoods with smaller lots. He said the support for the issue was in those neighborhoods.

Mayor Weiers asked if there was a consensus to move forward.

Councilmember Clark said there was not a consensus and she stood with those who did not support it.

Mayor Weiers said there was no consensus to move forward and Council would take a brief break.

3. [17-024](#)

**COUNCIL ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST: REQUEST TO ASSESS
POSSIBLE INSTALLATION OF A PERMANENT FLAG POLE IN
THUNDERBIRD CONSERVATION PARK**

**Staff Contact and Presenter: Erik Strunk, Director, Public Facilities,
Recreation and Special Events**

Mr. Strunk said staff was asking to move forward to study a request regarding placement of flags at Thunderbird Conservation Park. The request was made in regard to placement of a residential American flag at Arrowhead Point Trail. Unless there was written consent by the parks and recreation director, City Code did not allow for the unauthorized placement of items within City parks. A total of 13 flags had appeared throughout the

park and direction was given to remove the flags. Mr. Strunk said staff was seeking direction and comment on the permanent installation of a flag pole which was requested by Mayor Weiers at Arrowhead Point. He said the flag would be lit, have an aircraft warning light and would be maintained by a community group.

Mr. Barnard said Parks Maintenance or Park Ranger staff tried to make contact with owners of items left in the City parks. He said some items that staff had found in parks included signs, shopping carts, trash and debris, abandoned vehicles and sports equipment. He explained Thunderbird Conservation Park was to be preserved in as natural a state as possible and encroachment prevented. The master plan that was in place helped manage the park as a conservation park and the majority of the amenities were around the exterior of the park. He said unauthorized placement of flags or other items in valley conservation parks was not permitted.

Mr. Strunk wanted to make it clear that in no way were they equating the American flag with the pictures of the other trash and other items that had been left at the parks over the last few years. He said staff was asking for direction to pursue the issue. If directed to proceed, they needed to look at building codes, the U.S. Flag code, as well as the Thunderbird Conservation Park master plan. He said the matter would also be presented to the Parks and Recreation Commission for review. He said staff would also need to look into solar lighting for that area and the dark sky ordinance. After public participation and recommendation from the Parks and Recreation Commission, in approximately June, the item would be presented to Council for review.

Councilmember Clark asked if there was a particular entrance to the park that was considered the main entrance.

Mr. Strunk said it would probably be on 59th Avenue, near the ramadas and amphitheater.

Councilmember Clark would like to see a flag at the main entryway into the park, which might satisfy both the patriotic and conservationist visitors.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said the people who loved the park did not seem to be supportive of a flag at Arrowhead Point. She agreed with Councilmember Clark that the flag could be enjoyed by everyone if it was in a more accessible location, such as the entry into the park. She also said it would be easier to maintain the flag on a long-term basis if it was closer to the entry. She said homes near the park could object to a lighted flag at Arrowhead Point.

Councilmember Malnar was supportive of either option, but the purpose of putting the flag at Arrowhead Point was so it could be enjoyed by a large audience. He said an aircraft beacon probably wouldn't be too intrusive to nearby residents. He did not think lighting would be appropriate. His concern was maintenance of the flag and raising and lowering of the flag might be problematic. He hoped to form a partnership with community members who would be willing to take care of the flag for as long as it was there.

Councilmember Aldama supported the flag location at Arrowhead Point. He suggested some alternative type of post that would blend into the mountain background.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked about any terms of use of the land as it was a gift from the Department of Interior.

Mr. Strunk said staff would have to research the legal implications, but did find out that

the land was gifted to the City by Maricopa County many years ago as a conservation park.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked how big of a slab and footing would be needed for a 25-foot flag pole.

Councilmember Turner did not support a 25-foot, lighted flag pole on the top of the mountain. He would support a flag pole of that size in the entryway on 59th Avenue or Pinnacle Peak. He did not want the flag to negatively impact the conservation nature of the park.

Mayor Weiers said it was not necessary to pour cement when installing flag poles. Usually, a hole was drilled and the pole was put down in the hole and that was it. He said the item came to him from the Chamber of Commerce Veteran's Committee. Mayor Weiers was supportive of the request. The Chamber not only wanted to pay for it, but also wanted to install the flag. There was also interest from the Boy Scouts and Civil Air Patrol and many veterans in the community. He could support the flag pole near the entrance, but he did not think that was what the veterans wanted.

Mayor Weiers was looking for consensus to move forward so staff could find out if the pole could legally be installed and to obtain help from interested groups.

Councilmember Aldama said there would be necessary maintenance on the flag and there would be many individuals and organizations who would be interested in raising and lowering the flag. He supported moving forward and looking at all available options.

Councilmember Clark agreed and said she would like to see the flag at the top of the mountain, but if that was not possible, would like to see it located at the entrance to the park.

Councilmember Tolmachoff was supportive of taking the issue to the Parks and Recreation Commission for a survey, as well as talking to other patrons of the park. She wanted them to research the legality of putting in a 25-foot pole. She said the park belonged to all of the citizens of Glendale.

Mr. Phelps said staff had done a great job of phasing the project. He said the first phase would determine the legal issues of the project. The public engagement would occur during the second phase. Staff was looking for consensus to move forward on the first phase. He said alternative locations could be included in the first phase.

Mayor Weiers said there was consensus to move forward with phase one.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Mr. Phelps had no items to report.

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Mr. Bailey had no items to report.

COUNCIL ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Councilmember Aldama requested staff bring back the donation box ordinance.

Councilmember Clark asked for a discussion of procurement policies and under what

circumstances contracts of five years should be allowed. She asked for a discussion of specific policies the City could implement to spur development in downtown Glendale. As part of the discussion, Council should be provided a list of the vacant downtown properties, including vacant lots and City-owned properties. The third item was a discussion of the development and implementation of City policies regarding lobbyists.

Councilmember Malnar asked for identification of, and research about, high impact land uses that tended to have a negative impact on neighborhoods. He wanted to know if it was appropriate to have a stricter land use policy for some specific type of businesses near residential neighborhoods.

Councilmember Tolmachoff asked for a list of all City-owned properties, vacant land or any other property owned by the City.

Mayor Weiers asked if Councilmember Tolmachoff wanted rights-of-way included in the list.

Councilmember Tolmachoff said no. She wanted the list to include only vacant lots, parcels of land and buildings.

Vice Mayor Hugh said he supported looking at downtown Glendale for redevelopment ideas.

MOTION AND CALL TO ENTER INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION

It was moved by Councilmember Clark, and seconded by Councilmember Malnar, to enter into Executive Session. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mayor Weiers, Vice Mayor Hugh, Councilmember Aldama, Councilmember Clark, Councilmember Malnar, Councilmember Tolmachoff, and Councilmember Turner

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The City Council entered into Executive Session at 4:03 p.m.

A motion was made by Councilmember Aldama, seconded by Councilmember Malnar, to adjourn. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Mayor Weiers, Vice Mayor Hugh, Councilmember Aldama, Councilmember Clark, Councilmember Malnar, Councilmember Tolmachoff, and Councilmember Turner

ADJOURNMENT

The City Council adjourned at 5:07 p.m.