

City of Olympia Policy

Heritage Interpretive Installations and Displays

BACKGROUND: The Department of Community Planning & Development (CPD) protects and enhances quality of life, sustainability, and safety through our plans, regulations, and programs, including design review and guidance.

PURPOSE: To establish a process for thoughtful review of requests for permanent or long-term heritage interpretive installations on City property and City rights-of-way outside of City parks, to ensure consistency with City planning, public works, and relevant codes, and provide for thoughtful consideration of the nature of each proposal and the various options available.

AUTHORITY: Policy of CP&D, and the Olympia City Council.

1.0 Policy:

- 1.1 Proposals for heritage interpretive installations will be evaluated by CPD for appropriateness, compatibility, and contribution to telling an important story.
- 1.2 City design guidelines applicable to the proposed location may consider nearby landscape and architectural design in addition to interpretive content, to ensure site-appropriate design.
- 1.3 Proposals that include artwork will be referred to the Olympia Arts Commission's process for Gifts of Art.
- 1.4 Proposals for installations in City parks will be referred to the Parks Department.

2.0 Procedure

- 2.1 The City Historic Preservation Officer will serve as the primary point of contact for individuals or entities interested in placing heritage interpretive installations on City property.
- 2.2 To facilitate City consideration of proposals, applicants should be prepared to provide a site map, design detail including content, technical specifications, narrative addressing the criteria in section 2.5 (a – k) below, and a proposed timeline. When proposed for location in City right-of-way, the applicant shall seek a right-of-way permit and submit the same information through the City's permit portal.
- 2.3 A Review Panel shall be convened to review the proposed interpretive addition. The panel shall include members representing CPD Planning, Engineering, and Building; City Public Works, a Transportation planner,

and the Historic Preservation Officer, who shall engage the Olympia Heritage Commission for review and represent their input.

2.4 The Review Panel reviews each proposal to determine the suitability of the interpretive addition based on City planning and code requirements, and the criteria outlined below (2.5). The Preservation Officer will work with the applicant as needed to encourage submission of information to satisfactorily address these criteria and enable the Review Panel to reach a recommendation regarding a proposed interpretive amenity.

2.5 The Review Panel shall consider relevant code restrictions and city planning guidance and shall apply the following criteria in reviewing each application.

2.5 (a) **Historic Content**

Does the proposal provide an enriching experience that reveals and celebrates the values of our city, while broadening understanding of Olympia's culture and heritage?

Does the proposal honor individuals or events of lasting significance to Olympia?

Does the information come from a reliable source, and is it well researched, balanced and complete?

2.5 (b) **Aesthetic Quality**

If a display is proposed, does the proposal have strong aesthetic merit? Is it professionally designed, does it meet or complement the design and material choices of the location?

Does the design complement the design of nearby built structures and surrounding environment?

2.5 (c) **Proposed Location**

What is the relationship between the interpretive display, its content, and its proposed site?

Is the interpretive display adequately scaled for the proposed site?

Does the site present any special obstacles?

Does the proposal preserve important views?

2.5 (d) **Donor Restrictions/Requests**

Are restrictions/requests clearly identified? If accepted, can the expectations be met?

2.5 (e) **Technical Feasibility**

Can the interpretive display be built and installed as proposed?

Are adequate professional resources identified to do the work?

Is the proposal consistent with organizing principles and policies

of applicable design guidelines and any other governing documents?

2.5 (f)

Technical Specifications

The proposing entity must provide scale drawings for review and/or model(s) consisting of a site plan and elevation describing the following:

1. Surrounding site conditions if applicable
2. Dimensions
3. Materials
4. Colors
5. Electrical, plumbing, or other utility requirements
6. Construction and installation method

Panel may require additional support material depending on the nature of the proposed installation.

2.5 (g)

Budget

It is assumed the cost of the interpretive display and delivery to the site shall be paid for by the proposing entity.

Costs for site preparation and installation will be estimated by CPD and may also be the responsibility of the proposing entity.

2.5 (h)

Durability

Will the material last? How long is the material expected to last in a public, non-archival exhibition setting?

What age have other works in the same material(s) attained?

Is the work suitable for its location? For example, what effect will sunlight, saltwater, wind, and other elements potentially have on the structure?

Are seismic considerations relevant?

2.5 (i)

Vandalism and Safety

Is the proposed interpretive display prone to vandalism or a safety hazard at the proposed site?

Will the display have a graffiti-resistant coating or can one be easily applied?

2.5 (j)

Maintenance and Preservation

Are there unusual or ongoing costs?

Is the work removable if necessary?

2.5 (k)

Timeline

Has a realistic timeline been presented that includes permit review if needed?

3.0 Acceptance of Proposal of Interpretive Installation

- 3.1 The Review Panel makes a recommendation to the CPD Director regarding each proposed interpretive display. The recommendation will be presented to the City Manager for formal acceptance or rejection of the proposal. If the proposed installation will have substantial community impact, the City Manager, at their discretion, may forward the proposal to the Olympia City Council for review and approval.
- 3.2 For each proposal, the CPD Director or designee shall communicate an acknowledgment of acceptance or rejection on behalf of the City.
- 3.3 CPD will manage the development of accepted proposals.
- 3.4 Depending on the nature of the accepted proposal, the applicant may be required to enter into an agreement with the City.
- 3.5 Installed displays will become property of the City and maintained and/or relocated and/or removed per the established practice of the Public Works Department.

CPD Director _____ Date _____