

## Staff Response to OPC Comments/Suggestions from July 15 Deliberation

***This document contains the questions and comments emailed to staff by the OPC following the July 15, 2013, Deliberation, along with staff's response.***

---

**Chair Parker's Question:** "As I stated last night, I think the major concerns of OPC members related to the clarity of expression, not the substance or intent of the proposed revisions. My suggestions constitute an attempt to clarify the revision.

I am not aware of the jurisdiction of the Design Review Board in this matter. The language proposed in the draft under review is not clear. It implies the Board can intervene but does not specify under what conditions it may intervene. For that reason, I have made a suggested addition to the text. 'Visual Screen (Type II). Purpose: This type of screening is intended to create a visual separation that may be less than one-hundred (100) percent sight-obscuring between incompatible land use zones...from the street.

Materials: Screening shall consist of either or both: natural vegetation consisting of evergreen trees OR a combination of at least sixty (60) percent evergreen trees and up to forty (40) percent deciduous trees, interspersed with large shrubs and ground cover; a sight-obscuring fence. Tree, shrub, and groundcover spacing shall be appropriate for the species type and consistent with the intent of this section. (See Section....Walls). The fence may be less than one-hundred (100) percent sight-obscuring. 'Note: if the code does not elsewhere provide for review by the Design Review Board, the following may be appropriate following Section 1, #3.'

Compliance with the provisions for Type II and Type III visual screens shall be determined by the Design Review Board as an element in its design review process."

***Staff response:*** *Staff removed the reference to the Design Review Board (DRB). Staff agrees that it is not clearly written and does not know why the DRB is referenced under Type II Screening only. In researching the issue, staff learned that in practice, the DRB already reviews screening for projects that are not exempt from design review by the board. Some projects are not subject to review by the DRB, and can undergo staff-level design review or are exceptions to requiring review. If the Olympia Planning Commission wanted to extend design review for solid waste screening to the DRB, it would occur in Chapters 18.100 through 18.180 where the DRB has "jurisdiction" to administer. Staff believes that removing the DRB reference from Chapter 18.36.060 provides a simpler, more straightforward approach in the text and intent of the section. Staff also removed "between incompatible land use zones" and did not include "from the street" in the sentence, "This type of screening is intended to create a visual separation that may be less than one-hundred (100) percent sight-obscuring." The reference to "land use zones" and the "street" is addressed in the very next sentence. It is staff's judgment that this change improves readability.*

## Staff Response to OPC Comments/Suggestions from July 15 Deliberation

**Commissioner Watts's Question:** "2. Open storage: should it read 'department finds such storage IS visually obstructive?'"

**Staff response:** *The proposed draft to the Screening Code is intended to address screening of solid waste containers because of the challenges in applying the current code in practice and the impact it has on solid waste operations. Staff is not aware of any issues or controversies related to the current language for open storage and how it is presented or administered in practice. This language appears to be working, so staff is not proposing any changes to this section.*

**Commissioner Horn's Question:**

"1. Add the following underlined language at the end of the first sentence: 'This type of landscaping is intended to create a visual separation that may be less than one hundred (100) percent sight-obscuring between incompatible land use zones and for screening waste containers and mechanical and electrical equipment.'

2. In the second sentence, restore the 'and' that was deleted. To me, the 'and' makes the sentence more understandable and is grammatically correct. Also, add 'electrical' in addition to mechanical equipment.

3. After 'Materials,' add the word 'Vegetative' before 'Landscaping.' This may address Kim Andresen's concern about different kinds of landscaping."

**Staff response:** *Staff has revised the proposed code to include text that better defines the use of vegetative and hard materials for screening. The reference to 'electrical' has been added; it was inadvertently omitted in the previous draft. The word 'and' is put back in, and 'Vegetative' is added before 'landscaping'.*

**Commissioner Bardin's Question:** "Add after, 'When a Type II screen is not feasible, a Type III Visual Buffer should be used.' In areas that have heavy public traffic or are recreational in nature, Type II visual screening should be used."

**Staff response:** *In staff's research on this matter, most of the dumpsters and containers in question are associated with businesses that have been around for quite a long time. As discussed at the July 15 meeting, the Waste ReSources Utility is able to work directly with existing customers on dumpster locations to facilitate safer, more efficient and aesthetic placement. Any project that triggers a review would fall under the screening code, and staff would have the opportunity to work on a more suitable location or screening that meets the code.*

## **Staff Response to OPC Comments/Suggestions from July 15 Deliberation**

**Commissioner Hoppe's Question:** "During the last OPC meeting, I Googled a few US cities for examples of code requirements for solid waste enclosures. I'd invite you to review the attached docs for content/layout. I feel the proposed Olympia code revision as written is a little thin on direction/details. One area is the lack of a requirement for screening if contents were visible from a nearby upper level."

**Staff response:** *The proposed code amendment is related to screening of waste receptacles in a broader context. The code defines that solid waste containers must be screened with a structure, vegetation or both. The details of enclosure access and physical attributes are addressed in Chapter 8 of the [Engineering Design and Development Standards \(EDDS\)](#). The EDDS are updated every two years and formally adopted by Council. The EDDS are applied to any project or development that triggers land-use review, requires a construction/building permit, and/or will have an effect on solid waste collection. The City does not currently require roof structures on enclosures.*