

Design Standards (DS) 1

From: "Robert Ballard" <manchesterrealty@wavecable.com>
To: <sdiener@co.kitsap.wa.us>
CC: <jangel@co.kitsap.wa.us>
Date: 4/1/2007 5:44 PM
Subject: Manchester Plan

April 2, 2007

Scott Diener
Community Planning Manager
Kitsap County Department of Community Development

Dear Scott,

I am writing you perhaps to put a different light on much of the testimony and media coverage regarding the existing Manchester Plan. I am currently the only one in town living a mixed use concept, "living above the store", I must say you can not beat the commute! I happen to think that the Manchester plan has been working well and has significantly improved the community. Much of the good that is happening is not being mentioned or published. I believe the plan indeed has served the "greater good". I applaud the Counties continuing efforts in all the work it took to get the plan adopted. And I thank you for leading the way for the revision.

The hottest topics appear the height of the downtown corridor and a proposed moratorium. In regards to the moratorium, if that idea has merit I would question why it is not imposed in the entire sub-area and not just in the commercial district. There are certainly view issues in the residential sector. It is curious the some vocal proponents of the commercial moratorium have projects in the residential area. I keep hearing it said it said the Manchester Plan is toothless and does not match the original intention of the community. It clearly does not match the intentions of those few whose views will be impacted and those that are against any change. This group is becoming quite vocal and getting fairly well organized. I believe the majority of Manchester residents feel that the downtown corridor has languished and are excited to see some long awaited positive change. Since the plan was adopted investors are now lined up to rebuild the down in a mixed use environment. This is the use we decided as a community we wanted to establish. I think this shows a great accomplishment to the community and especially Kitsap County government for leading us there. I believe the majority although fairly silent are elated to see Manchester heading toward reaching its potential.

Its a good plan but it is not perfect, some of the problems we are having lie in language in the plan, we needed to be more concise and it has caused some confusion. The plan "encourages two story mixed use development" here is an example of the language not being concise. Many of us say the intent is a maximum of two stories of residential over the commercial area. But the common interpretation is that a maximum of two story buildings are encouraged. The charrette we had three story buildings but had lofts on the 3 floor. I discussed this with Eric Baker who by the way did a great job in reflecting the intent of community into the plan. Leaving the height to 35 feet was no mistake. The 35 foot height limit in Manchester was never raised to that, it was always 35 feet, this is a misconception that was even quoted by the hearing examiner in the Colchester Commons review. We have 35 houses built here in town that are three stories. It is true the commissioners did reduce the commercial area and lowered the heights in the view corridor which is what the community wanted. We must remember goal # 1 was to establish a vital commercial district. The plan must be economically feasible to accomplish this.

I do believe impacting views is a serious issue and we should do all we can to lesson the impact of development on surrounding neighbors. I also believe it is certainly not fair to spoil someone's development rights by not allowing a reasonable and historical use of their property. It will certainly be a interesting debate. Perhaps we can come up with some innovative compromises. There are many other issues in the plan to discuss. I look forward in working with you in this regard in the future.

Thank you for your time.

Bob Ballard

DS 2

From: "Craig and Nancy abramson" <abramson2803@comcast.net>
To: <sdiener@co.kitsap.wa.us>
Date: 4/12/2007 1:39 PM
Subject: POSSIBLE SPAM! SCORE = 18.4 Manchester Director's Interpretation

Dear Scott,

Thank you for sending the notice in the Port Orchard Independent, I never read those. I'm glad the Director has seen fit to interpret the Manchester community's desire to restrict commercial buildings to two stories rather than as many as can be fit into 35 feet. I'm also pleased that parking and traffic are going to be important issues in the development plan reviews in the commercial zone. I wish we had a better handle on the "character" but believe the condominium projects have certainly placed a sense of urgency to identify design guidelines for the future.

Thank you for your work,

Craig Abramson

DS 3

From: Larry Keeton
To: bettecummings@wavecable.com, CEndrese@co.kitsap.wa.us, JAngel@co.kitsap.wa...
CC: carriwho@aol.com; Scott Diener
Date: 4/24/2007 7:03 AM
Subject: Re: MANCHESTER

Ms Cummings:

I appreciate your comments.

If this is how you and other members of your community feel, I would recommend they participate or follow the current design standard efforts underway. I've included Mr. Diener into this email so he can have one of his staff let you know when the next meeting is scheduled.

Regards,

Larry Keeton
Director, Community Development

>>> "Bette Cummings" <bettecummings@wavecable.com> 04/23/07 9:42 PM >>>

The commercial development of our Manchester downtown is of vital interest to us. We simply are not in agreement with any commercial building being more than 28 feet and two stories. The character of our town would be compromised and the land value for all of us living here would be decreased if it were. We feel that the proposed project will have a huge impact on the traffic that would be increased. Our summer now has no available parking, with the post office and library lots often so filled that it is impossible to even get in there to use these facilities. With the new businesses that are being proposed as well as additional condos, traffic on our street will be a real problem. We now face many cars/vehicles racing down our street (Main) that it is often difficult and dangerous to back out into traffic.

What businesses are being planned to be put into the first floor of the proposed buildings?

If three story buildings are allowed to be built, the character of our Manchester will be completely lost. We love the area we live in and want to keep it as attractive and with its unique character. Please help preserve our downtown area.

Sincerely,
Bette and Bob Cummings

DS 4

From: "Paul Gilligan" <pgilligan@RH2.com>
To: <sdiener@co.kitsap.wa.us>
Date: 6/6/2007 9:41 AM
Subject: Manchester Downtown Development

Scott;

This is a draft of the email to send to Professor Kasprisin (206.543.4190 kpd@whidbey.com). Will you please review and comment and send your comments to me before I send it. If you could add some dates it would be helpful. Talk to you soon.

Paul

Professor Kasprisin;

My name is Paul Gilligan and I am a member of the Manchester Community Council. We have not met but I have been active in the Council since 2000 as a member of the Sewer Committee. I am also an active member of the Public Safety Committee.

The Charrette you conducted as part of the original community plan with a group of graduate students was very well received by the MCC and the vision you presented lives on in the minds of our members. However, developers have now come to Manchester and presented plans to Kitsap County that do not fit well with the vision your team created. Specifically, 3 and 4 story structures are being planned instead of the 2 story buildings described in the plan. The buildings do conform to the 35 foot height requirement, and do meet the letter of current code requirements, but in the minds of many, they do not conform to the character of Manchester described by your team's architectural concepts.

The situation at the present time is that the County Commissioners have been responsive to our organization's request that the Hearing Examiner reconsider permits for the developers' proposed structures. In addition, the MCC, under the leadership of Scott Diener (360.337.4966) at Kitsap County has developed alternative concepts that have worked elsewhere in the County. Two of these concepts will be selected by the MCC for further consideration.

I have been asked by our President, Ron Rada, to contact you and see if you could be persuaded to gather a team of graduate students to work with the MCC and refine the selected concepts so that the development of Manchester Commercial Core may proceed amicably with interested developers. I know this must be a very busy time for you, but perhaps the time will also fit well with your summer graduate program. Please let me know if you are interested or not, and if you are I will arrange a conference call with Scott, Ron, myself, and you to discuss an approach which may work for the benefit of your program and the future development of our community.

All of us at the MCC thank you for your past involvement with the development of Manchester, and we hope that we can get together for the next critical stage. We hope to hear from you soon.

All the best,

Paul Gilligan
Sewer Committee
Manchester Community Council
360.871.4171
thegilligans@wavecable.com

This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the addressed recipients. If you are not the addressed recipient you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Any views or opinions presented in this email are those of the author and may not represent those of the company.
RH2 Engineering, Inc, www.rh2.com

DS 5

From: "Melaine&Dennis" <mdcoulter@wavecable.com>
To: <sdiener@co.kitsap.wa.us>
Date: 6/13/2007 1:17 PM
Subject: FW: Manchester Community Plan Meeting (Out of Office)

I am forwarding my comments sent to Katrina regarding the Manchester design standards voting last night.

-----Original Message-----

From: Postmaster@CO.KITSAP.WA.US [mailto:Postmaster@CO.KITSAP.WA.US] On Behalf Of Katrina Knutson
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2007 12:54 PM
To: Melaine&Dennis
Subject: RE: Manchester Community Plan Meeting (Out of Office)

Greetings:

I will be away from the office June 13th-June 17, 2007. If you require immediate assistance prior to my return, please contact Community Planning manager, Scott Diener, at sdiener@co.kitsap.wa.us or (360) 337-4966.

Best,
Katrina

Katrina,

I will be unable to attend next week's meeting, but would like to offer my opinion of last night's Open House. The materials presented for review in the library were extremely biased toward the 28 ft, 2 story solution. They were clearly labeled 'not to scale' but they presented a worst case guess of what the downtown could look like and the opinion of the 'vocal minority' as to the impact of growth in Manchester.

The map depicting which properties would have their views affected did not reflect the opinion of those property owners but the assessment of the group pushing for the lower limits.

At one point I was discussing with others my understanding of the issue which is toward a more structured approach to deciding what the height limits should be and was told we were there to vote and not discuss because we needed to keep the people moving through the library. It was clear to me that several people I was talking with had not attended previous meetings and were in need of more information. The biased pictures on the walls did not give them all the information they needed. Several times developers have stated that it would not be economically feasible to develop two-story projects in Manchester. The design standards leadership has answered that often times with a challenge that the developers are simply trying to make a big profit and that two-stories would be OK. At no time have they offered any evidence of developers willing to build a two-story project. That kind of information was not available last night and when talking with others, I was told to move on.

I am not a developer, I am a homeowner in Manchester who would like to see the area grow and prosper. Imposing a height limit that would stifle growth

will protect the views of those most affected, but it would also prevent the community from potentially providing the types of services I would like to see locally.

Whatever the voting results are, I am afraid the results will not be based on informed decisions. There is too much of a push to make a quick decision even though several previously submitted 35 ft projects will not be affected, a more disciplined approach is necessary.

Thank you for your time.

Dennis Coulter
360-769-2613

-----Original Message-----

From: Katrina Knutson [mailto:KKnutson@co.kitsap.wa.us]
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2007 12:25 PM
To: Katrina Knutson
Subject: Manchester Community Plan Meeting

Greetings:

Thank you to all who turned out for the open house last night.

The next Manchester Community Plan meeting will be Tuesday, June 19, 2007 from 6:30-8:30pm and will be located in the Commissioners Chambers at the new Administration Building (619 Division Street in Port Orchard). All are encouraged to attend. Attached, please find the DRAFT agenda for the above stated meeting.

Additional information can be found on our Manchester Website at:

http://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/community_plan/subareas/manchester/default.htm

Thanks again for the opportunity to work with you.

Best,
Katrina

Katrina N. Knutson, Associate Planner
Kitsap County
Department of Community Development
Community Planning Division
614 Division Street MS-36
Port Orchard, WA 98366-4682
(360) 307.4201
KKnutson@co.kitsap.wa.us

DS 6

From: <carole9@ix.netcom.com>
To: <KKnutson@co.kitsap.wa.us>, <sdiener@co.kitsap.wa.us>
Date: 6/20/2007 9:44 AM
Subject: preference results

Just a thought as I was recording the results.

June 12- Preference Vote	Percentage out of 220
35 ft with 3 stories – 70	32
35ft with 2 stories – 6	3
32ft with 2 stories – 12	5
28ft with 2 stories – 82	37
20 feet 1 story – 40	18
Other – 10	5

Clearly the citizens of Manchester favor two storied structures with the majority of "preferences" for 28 feet or less.(55%)

Can you use this information to back-up the director's interpretation?

DS 7

From: "Mattie Walters" <mati360@wavecable.com>
To: "Katrina Knutson" <KKnutson@co.kitsap.wa.us>
CC: <lkeeton@co.kitsap.wa.us>, "Scott Diener" <sdiener@co.kitsap.wa.us>
Date: 11/21/2007 12:07 PM
Subject: Manchester Community Plan

Katrina Knutson, Associate Planner
Kitsap County
Department of Community Development
Community Planning Division

Dear Katrina,

If you would forward this to the county commissioners, I would appreciate it.

To the Kitsap County Commissioners:

I am writing to urge the passage of the Manchester Community Plan with the density and height set at two story and 28 feet in Appendix A, Design standards. There have been many hearings, much testimony, letters, and preference polls, all of which express the agreement of the community in this regard and the Plan needs to be finally in place with the design standards reflecting the community preferences.

Thank you,

Mattie Walters
7849 E. Main St.
Manchester, WA

DS 8

From: <CARRIWHO@aol.com>
To: <KKnutson@co.kitsap.wa.us>
CC: <sdiener@co.kitsap.wa.us>
Date: 11/30/2007 8:07 AM
Subject: Manchester Community Plan

Katrina-

Please forward this letter on to all three County Commissioners asap. Thank you.

Dear County Commissioners-

I urge you to accept of the Manchester Community Plan and the Downtown Design Standards. Our community put in many long hours writing and rewriting the Plan to fine tune the language so we had a plan that would be enforceable. At our own expense, we had two land use lawyers review and comment on the language and we incorporated their suggestions to that end. Of most importance is the language that supports and protects Manchester as a LAMIRD.

Through the process of hearings and community meetings, it is apparent to me that few people in this county, be it county employees or residents, truly understand what a LAMIRD designation means and how to enforce that designation. We are charged with protecting Manchester as a rural village, not an urban center, and our plan reflects that. You have the power to protect our village from the assault of urban development and the GMA, in it's latest rulings of record, supports your endeavors to do so. Please don't let a few projects completely destroy the character of our community. We are at a crossroads in the future of Manchester and it is every decision made now that will determine if we survive as the community the majority of the residents want to be. Support us in our fight to retain our rural character and pass the Manchester Community Plan.

Thank you for your time and attention to our community.

Carrilu Thompson
30 year Resident
P.O. Box 431
Manchester, WA 98353
360-871-4958

*****Check out AOL's list of 2007's hottest products.
(<http://money.aol.com/special/hot-products-2007?NCID=aoltop00030000000001>)

From: Mark Rebelowski <rebelowski@yahoo.com>
To: Katrina Knutson <KKnutson@co.kitsap.wa.us>
Date: 7/10/2007 11:53:47 PM
Subject: Re: Open House Tonight

Greetings,

Unfortunately I have been out of town during the past 2 meetings and have been unable to input my votes with the group.

I do not feel the entire community is being represented in this community or has had proper notification. Does the county feel that notices in the newspaper are sufficient notice to the roughly 3000 plus registered voters in the Port of Manchester district which actually is fewer then the actual voters this plan pertains to? Only those whom signed up and made it to county meetings get your email.

I had suggested that a mailing go out to all of the people residing in this comprehensive plan; but this was said not to be cost effective; yet some members of the community have spent hundreds of dollars to show there own interpretations of there beliefs to the community by un scientific demonstrations of possible building heights. I believe this has been an unfair and total misrepresentation of actual potential heights in the commercially zoned core of downtown Manchester.

It is my hope for design standards to be mandatory, but the height issue should remain 35' ; regardless of how many stories the builders can fit into that design height.

Thank you for the chance to voice my opinion

Mark Rebelowski

Katrina Knutson <KKnutson@co.kitsap.wa.us> wrote:
Hello All:

Just a reminder that an open house on height preference will occur tonight from 6:30-8:30pm at the Manchester Library.

We look forward to seeing you there!

Best,
Katrina

Katrina N. Knutson, Associate Planner
Kitsap County

Department of Community Development
Community Planning Division
614 Division Street MS-36
Port Orchard, WA 98366-4682
(360) 307.4201
KKnutson@co.kitsap.wa.us

Respectfully yours

Mark Rebelowski

rebelowski@yahoo.com

360-731-9840

7.16.07

My Wife and I just purchased a waterfront lot on Colchester Drive, with the intention of building a home to live in. We chose the area due to the view, and the probability that downtown Manchester would regentrify into a nice downtown core, which would enhance our investment.

The reduction of the height restriction will most certainly reduce the feasibility to develop downtown Manchester, which in turn will affect our own investment.

Sincerely,
Gordon Payseno

July 16, 2007

Katrina Knutson
 Kitsap County Planning
 614 Division St.
 Port Orchard, WA 98366
 Sent Via Email: kknutson@co.kitsap.wa.us,

Dear Ms. Knutsen,

My name is Ron Hutchinson. I live on Colchester Drive and am a part owner of some commercial property in downtown Manchester. I am writing in regards to the proposed design standard revisions that effect downtown Manchester.

The revised design standards address many areas that could make the commercial core of Manchester an attractive, quaint little area once developed. Unfortunately, the reduction in the building size from thirty-five feet tall and three stories to twenty-eight feet and two stories is counterproductive and unfair to property owners.

At first blush, the height restriction seems like a good idea. The buildings would be small and aesthetically appealing, while not blocking any more view than residential structures are allowed. Unfortunately this "downzone" in allowed building height would likely put a stop to the revitalization of downtown Manchester, and it is a completely unfair change to property rights. Please consider the following two points:

- **The height / size change is completely unfair:** The primary reason for the opposition to thirty five foot tall / three story buildings in Manchester is to provide view protection for a few residences on the lower section of the hill above downtown Manchester.

An issue rarely considered is that the height limit in the commercial area of Manchester has been thirty-five feet for many years. The residents who would gain view protection, purchased their homes or property knowing that the properties in front of them could be built up to the thirty-five foot height limit. The people who purchased property in the business district purchased the right to build up to 35-foot tall buildings. **If the revised design standards are adopted, the rights purchased by the commercial property owners will be taken from them and given to the handful of residents who purchased their properties with no view protection. This would be completely unfair.** An editorial in the June 27, 2007 Port Orchard Independent completely supports this point.

- **Few if any new buildings will be built:** The new design standard requirements being proposed will enhance and beautify the area, but they also drive the development cost of new buildings extremely high. Any builder or

developer will confirm that the cost of construction per square foot decreases as more stories are added to a building. Costs of many major building components, i.e. engineering fees, permits, utility and site work, landscaping, roofing, etc. stay basically the same when an extra floor is added to a planned building. Restricting all new commercial buildings in Manchester to two stories will not allow adequate revenue to cover the necessary construction costs. It will be financially unfeasible to develop new buildings if restricted to a maximum of two stories. Ultimately, there will be little change in downtown Manchester. The town will languish with run down buildings and vacant lots for years to come.

This is verified by the fact that four projects have been planned since the original Manchester Plan was adopted in 2002. All of these planned projects have been three story, mixed use structures with the ground floor retail / commercial use, and the upper two floors having residential units. Despite strong opposition by many members of the Manchester Downtown Design Committee the County approved "The Anchors" which is located at the old grocery store site. If the proposed two-story height restriction is approved, the developers of the remaining three projects have openly stated that they will scrap their plans and not develop the sites.

Most Manchester area residents welcome a revitalized downtown core with new, attractive buildings, expanded services and amenities. I hope the planning commission will understand that the proposed twenty-eight foot / two-story height limit is counterproductive and unfair.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my opinion.

Sincerely,

Ron Hutchinson

From: Katrina Knutson
To: Lovely, Bart
Date: 7/17/2007 5:58:12 PM
Subject: Re: POSSIBLE SPAM! SCORE = 7.4 MANCHESTER HEIGHT LIMIT

Mr. Lovely,

Thank you for the comments. I have entered them into the record.

If you require further assistance, please contact Philip Fletcher at pflatche@co.kitsap.wa.us or myself.

Best,
Katrina

Katrina N. Knutson, Associate Planner
Kitsap County
Department of Community Development
Community Planning Division
614 Division Street MS-36
Port Orchard, WA 98366-4682
(360) 307.4201
KKnutson@co.kitsap.wa.us

>>> "Bart Lovely" <blovely@wavecable.com> 7/17/2007 4:35:16 PM >>>
DEAR KATRINA,

AS A LAND OWNER AND HAVE DEVELOPED PROPERTIES, THE HEIGHT LIMIT IS NOT A FAIR THING OR NICE THING FOR BOTH PARTIES. BUT TO STOP A DEVELOPER OR A HOME OWNER FROM MAKING THE MOST OF HIS PROPERTY IS NOT RIGHT. HOW CAN ONE LOOSE A COMPLETE FLOOR FROM HIS PROJECT AND EXCEPT TO MAKE MONEY ON THE DEVELOPMENT. THIS MAKES NO SENCE. THE HOME OWNER BEHIND THE DEVELOPMENT THATS VIEW WILL BE BLOCKED, IF THEY OUR A NEW OWNER SHOULD HAVE BEEN TOLD OR FOUND OUT WHATS IN FRONT OF THEM THAT MAY CHANGE THIER VIEW INTO THE FUTURE. IF THE PROPERTY OWNER WITH VIEW TO BE BLOCKED IS AN OLD OWNER, IS AT THE MERCE OF THE RULES THAT COME WITH CHANGING TIMES.

THANK YOU,

BART LOVELY

CC: Diener, Scott; Fletcher, Phillip

DS 13

From: <carole9@ix.netcom.com>
To: Phillip Fletcher <PFletche@co.kitsap.wa.us>
Date: 7/18/2007 3:59 PM
Subject: Re: Design Standards
Attachments: JW+revision[1]with comments.doc

I hate when I do that- sorry
 Carole

See attachment

-----Original Message-----

>From: Phillip Fletcher <PFletche@co.kitsap.wa.us>
 >Sent: Jul 18, 2007 2:08 PM
 >To: carole9@ix.netcom.com
 >Subject: Re: Design Standards

>

>Carole:

>

>No attachments came through with your email. Please re-send.

>

>Thanks,

>

>Philip

>

>>>> <carole9@ix.netcom.com> 7/18/2007 1:35 PM >>>

>Phillip,

> Thank you for taking the time to meet with Carrilu and I this morning. I hope we were able to provide some helpful information. Did we mention that we had a contractor on the committee and it was reviewed by a land use lawyer???

>Also, last Friday Palmer's project - Colchester Commons- was due to go to auction due to foreclosure. Is it possible for you to find out what happened? It never went to auction so he found more financing or sold to another person.

>

>Attached is the DS with our comments in blue. Please thank JW for his input. For the most part he was right on the money!

>

>Carole

>

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Design Standards is to implement the goals and objectives of the Manchester Plan. The height of 28 feet two story for mixed-use development and the setbacks are consistent with the requirements in the View Protection Overlay Zone that surrounds the commercial area. We will rewrite this introduction so reads more smoothly. These standards apply to the Manchester Village Commercial zone in the Manchester Type 1 LAMRID (Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development).

Deleted:

Comment [1]: I would suggest that this sentence is given its own paragraph after the general discussion of the reason for the design guidelines. Seems out of place.

The Manchester Commercial Design Standards are to direct future growth and development of Manchester and to ensure that the design and density of any development or redevelopment in the rural village be consistent with Type 1 ROW 36:70A.070 (5) (d) (1) (C).

Any existing structure or facility that does not conform to these standards is exempt from compliance, unless the building structure is increased in footprint or is added to in height. All single-family residential structures are exempt from these commercial design standards, unless the use changes from residential to commercial.

As part of the development application, a written design concept narrative good and elevation drawings shall be submitted that will identify the significant site features, support the reasoning behind the architectural design and site plan proposal, explain how and why the existing site features are incorporated into the project design, and demonstrate how the proposal is consistent with the general goals of the Manchester Community Plan.

Deleted: statement

Any and all development or redevelopment in terms of building size, scale, use, or intensity shall be consistent with the character of the existing area.

Due to the extreme close proximity to Puget Sound, all commercial development and redevelopment shall be subject to SEPA. No commercial project shall be granted an issuance of non-significance without mitigation. We want an EIS for every project in the commercial zone.

Comment [2]: Please Note: A Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance is still a determination of Non Significance, otherwise this require an EIS for every project....

All developments shall be required to incorporate appropriate site enhancements, including good construction of pedestrian walkways, street lighting, street foliage and/or road improvements. A covenant of agreement running with the land shall be recorded with Kitsap County Auditor and filed with the Department of Community Development and Public Works as part of the development.

Deleted: which may include

wrong date

Manchester Draft Design Standards
4/16/07

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 23

Chapter One Site Planning

Definition: Site Planning is the determination of the location, orientation, and relationships of buildings, parking, landscaping, open spaces, access, and other features on the subject property and their relationship to the surrounding neighborhood.

Goal: The goal of Site Planning is to promote development that is functional, visually coherent, and visually compatible among existing structures and that will achieve a high-quality appearance, enhance the Manchester community, and achieve the plan objectives of the Manchester Village Design Standards. Much of the charm of Manchester is derived from the spectacular views of Puget Sound and all development and redevelopment should therefore be done with the goal of preserving and enhancing these views for all residents and visitors.

Objectives of Site Planning are:

- To maintain the small town charm and quaintness that Manchester currently offers.
- To incorporate ample parking with any structural design.
- To improve pedestrian and vehicular circulation.
- To create attractive and compatible streetscapes.
- To protect the quality of the natural environment within the village limits and adjacent boundaries.
- To preserve the spectacular views.

All development in the commercial area of Manchester shall include site planning measures to define the street edge, provide pedestrian access, provide amenities, support ample parking and comply with downtown design objectives.

Final plans and specifications shall be consistent with preliminary plans. Development and redevelopment shall be built in exact conformity with final plans and specifications.

A Building Location and Orientation

Buildings in the Manchester Commercial Village shall be sited to provide functional outdoor spaces, greenbelt areas, and public parking spaces that will enhance the use of the village. Structures will maintain continuity between developments by relating the building and use to the street frontage and, doing so in a manner that will encourage and accommodate pedestrians. The following elements must be addressed:

1. Buildings and main business entrances must be oriented to the street frontage.
2. The setback of new buildings will allow for 8-foot walkways, to include walkways ADA compatible, with remaining width of walkway used for landscaping design.
3. Building setbacks shall be treated as pedestrian-oriented spaces and landscaped in accordance with Chapter Four. Minimize paved surfaces

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 23

except for enhanced walkways, pedestrian-oriented spaces, and on-site parking.

4. Parking - Follow County codes Chapter 17.435 EXCEPT-
 - a) Multi-family dwellings in the commercial zone must provide 2(two) spaces per dwelling.
 - b) Underground parking must be publicly accessible 24/7

c) Where feasible, on street parking be provided. .

5. Ingress/egress: limit driveways to one entry lane and one exit lane per 300 feet, or to one lane accommodating two-way traffic if the site frontage is less than 150 feet.

6. Outdoor storage areas or outdoor sales areas in front of commercial establishments shall not be visible from the street. *Exception:* Outdoor sales areas are permitted if the merchandise and supporting appurtenances are moved in each day at the close of business hours. The County may allow outdoor sales if the sales are done in areas that conform to pedestrian-oriented space standards and the merchandise is attractively displayed. Examples that may be permitted under this provision include garden shop or nursery displays of plant materials, outdoor art galleries, and examples of completed home construction projects.

Open storage of bulk materials, such as topsoil or peat, shall not be visible from the street.

Signage is addressed in Chapter Five.

B. Relationship to Adjacent Properties

1. Locate service areas, outdoor storage areas, and other obtrusive site features away from neighboring properties to reduce conflicts with adjacent uses. Where the County deems necessary, landscape screening will be planted along property lines adjacent to "incompatible uses". Incompatible uses include, but are limited to outdoor storage areas adjacent to a residentially zoned property. The buffer must conform to the requirements of Chapter Four, Landscape Design.

If changes in topography between the residential and adjacent property are sufficiently great, then modifications to the above buffer options may be allowed with County approval of the variance.

2. Integrate outdoor storage areas and loading facilities into the site design to minimize their size, reduce visual impact, and to allow for pedestrian and vehicular circulation between sites, where appropriate.

3. Arrange artificial outdoor lighting during site construction so that the light is directed away from adjoining properties. Lighting shall be directed down to the intended area to be illuminated.

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Comment [3]: Numbering is off...

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 23

4. During construction, ensure that site development meets the requirements of the Kitsap County Noise Ordinance and consider ways to minimize impact upon neighboring properties.

Construction hours will commence no earlier than and end no later than those specified in Kitsap County Code Section 10.28. we intentionally set the times outside of county code because of the proximity of residences in the area. Keep as original.

Deleted: 8:00am

Deleted: 7:00pm

5. Incorporate dust, soil erosion, and storm water control measure as required by the Kitsap County Storm Water Management Ordinance. A Site Development Adaptive Plan (SDAP) for all major construction in the MCV is required.

C. Corner Lot Requirements

When a development is located at a corner intersection, such development shall incorporate outdoor spaces at or near the intersection corner. All buildings or major remodels located on properties at the intersection of two public streets are required to employ one or more of the following design elements or treatments to the building corner facing the intersection:

1. A pedestrian-oriented open space in addition to the otherwise required setback.
2. A building entrance, lobby, atrium, or pedestrian pathway at the corner.
3. Pedestrian traffic shall be oriented to the crosswalk.

D. Open Space

1. Site buildings so that the required open space are usable. The intention is not that every open space must have a use, but rather that buildings should be oriented to make effective use of the site.
2. Site development plans shall coordinate with adjacent outdoor spaces and streetscape.
3. Where feasible, incorporate pedestrian open spaces, such as covered walkways, courtyards, and plazas, as well as open passageways between buildings and blocks.
4. Where feasible, incorporate outdoor seating and dining areas that face the street.

D. Related Guidelines

1. See Chapter Two for traffic and pedestrian circulation and parking elements
2. See Chapter Three for building elements related to site planning
3. See Chapter Four for landscape design elements
4. See Chapter Five for signage
5. See Chapter Six for lighting
6. See Chapter Seven for utilities and service areas

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 23

Chapter Two Roads, Parking, Walkways and Amenities

Overview: This chapter concerns the relationship of the components of a roadway, including the traveled road section, on-street parking, storm water runoff collection system, pedestrian walkways, access points, and utilities, together with street amenities, such as landscaping and street trees, pocket parks, street lighting, and street furniture, that occur within the public right of way.

A. Roads and Walkways in the Public Right-of Way

Goals:

1. To provide for connectivity between components of the commercial district and provide for efficient vehicular circulation and pedestrian safety.
2. To require all major road improvement projects to conform to Kitsap County standards.
3. To require that all new developments mitigate direct traffic and parking impacts on roads through the commercial district by means of construction of necessary roadway improvements as warranted through a cumulative traffic impact analysis and maintaining adequate parking for the new development as well as existing developments.
4. To provide street designs and development patterns that accommodate pedestrians, vehicles, transit users, and bicyclists in a way that balances their uses.
5. To minimize visual impacts of utilities, such as poles, wires, signal controller boxes, and transformers.
6. To reduce impervious surfaces by utilizing earth-friendly materials.
7. To encourage existing development and to require new development to participate in area wide streetscape improvements as a means of building community, attracting tourism, and ensuring economic prosperity.
8. To set standards for road construction design that accommodates parking, street tree plantings, street furniture, and pedestrian lighting within the public right-of-way.

1. Roadway Design

1. Develop a clearly marked bike route through the commercial district.
2. Where applicable, encourage changes in road surface, including paving materials, texture and speed tables.
3. Design roadways to meet the future level of traffic volume projected as well as the land use design objectives of Manchester's Village Commercial area.
4. Locate parking on street, where feasible, within the constraints of right-of-way and pedestrian needs to protect pedestrians and slow traffic.

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 23

5. No vegetation except street trees shall impede vehicular line of sight. What are street trees? Even street trees should not impede line of sight.

2. Walkway Construction

1. Install walkways in widths determined on a basis of the road right-of-way width available. Walkway width shall be as follows:

- a). Minimum walkway width shall be 6 feet.
- b). Where right-of-way width is constrained, necessary portions of the parcel being developed or redeveloped shall be allotted to accommodate walkway construction.
- c). Along continuous roadways, the walkways must connect between properties.

2. For walkway surfaces, the use of concrete or an approved brick-paver inlay is required. Vehicular crossings of pedestrian walkways shall be clearly marked and identifiable, with surface treatments such as color change, surface materials or texture changes, or slight grade changes.

3. Locate public walkways primarily within the right-of-way area. In special instances sidewalks may need to extend to private property. (See 2 (1) (b) above)

4. Provide lighting fixtures as described in Chapter Six, Lighting.

5. For café zones or outdoor dining in the public right-of-way, ensure that outdoor dining areas or walkway areas conform to all the following:

- a) Requirements of a minor Site Plan Review (Kitsap County Code 17.400)
- b) Are lighted with low-intensity lighting that is directed down toward the seating area and does not spill out onto adjacent properties.
- c) Are contained within the property boundary to the rear or side area of site, within screened fence or hedge. Such areas may be allowed along a building frontage subject to the following criteria:
 1. Provide clear separation between pedestrians and vehicles through the use of planters, decorative fencing and low walls.
 2. Are able to provide minimum of ADA walkway clearance.

3. Vehicle Circulation

1. Where pedestrian circulation crosses vehicular routes, provide a change in grade, materials, textures, or colors to emphasize the crossing point and improve visibility.

- a) Site new driveways away from or immediately opposite street intersections. Limit the number of driveways to no more than one driveway per every 150 feet for arterial roads and one per 75 feet for secondary and local access roads. Parcels less than 150 feet in width will be required to share access and parking with

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 23

adjacent parcels. This does NOT abrogate minimum parking requirements for each parcel and/or project.

2. Accommodate access requirements of emergency vehicles and services, per the Kitsap County Fire Code, in all elements of the site design.
3. Integrate service functions into the circulation pattern in such a manner that minimizes conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians.

4. Parking

Parking Objectives: Typically the largest percentage of land use in a commercial district is parking. Parking areas should be designed and situated so they do not detract from the goal of providing a "pedestrian-friendly" downtown.

1. Connect parking areas on adjacent properties or create service alleys behind buildings.
2. Soften the visual impact of parking areas with trees and shrubs. In site design of parking areas, incorporate the use of screening such as hedge material or planters, to screen parking from pedestrian routes or adjacent properties. (See Chapter Four, Landscaping)

B. Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation

Definition: Bicycle and Pedestrian circulation constitutes pedestrian walkways that are both formal standardized public walkways and informal paths worked into a site's landscape design that provide a means for pedestrians to travel through the community along the street or other public routes.

Goal: To improve the pedestrian environment by making it easier, safer, and more comfortable to walk between businesses and to access the street walkway, transit stops, and parking lots.

Objectives:

1. To provide pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks, crosswalks, and bus shelters that will connect all modes of transportation, including auto, bus, ferry, van pools, and bicycles.
2. To provide attractive, safe, continuous pedestrian access routes in the downtown area of Manchester that connect uses and public spaces in a system of public sidewalks and private walkways.
3. To make pedestrian circulation routes as obvious and simple as possible, clearly indicating an identifiable path between vehicles and access into buildings or sites.

Guidelines:

1. Provide a clear unobstructed route for pedestrians along all public roadways.
2. Provide pedestrian paths or walkways connecting businesses and the entries of multiple buildings on the same site. All likely pedestrian routes should be considered in the design phase to eliminate "short cuts" which damage landscape areas.

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 23

3. Where pedestrian circulation crosses vehicular routes, provide a change in grade, materials, textures or colors to emphasize the conflict point and improve its visibility and safety.
4. Focus circulation routes upon main entries and exits, and identify and accommodate secondary access points.
5. Minimize redundant pavement that reduces the amount of site available for landscaping and storm water absorption.
6. The businesses need to provide the following:
 - a. Streetscaping that addresses the requirements of the Site Plan Review (Kitsap County Zoning Ordinance, Section 410)
 - b. A pedestrian path of at least 6 feet wide from the public street walkway to the building main entry.
 - c. Adequate lighting at the building entries and along walkways and paths through parking lots. (See Chapter Six, Lighting).
7. Make all site facilities and amenities accessible to people with disabilities in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Accessibility requirements include the provision of special parking spaces, ramps, and signage and all shall be noted on the approved site plan.
8. Provide bicycle storage spaces with all commercial development and redevelopment at the rate of at least 5% of the number of auto parking spaces.
9. Construct internal site walkways a minimum of 4 feet in width. A lesser walkway width is allowable in low pedestrian traffic areas, as required for handicap access and constructed to A.D.A. standards.

C. On-site Pedestrian Amenities and Spaces

Definition: Pedestrian-oriented spaces are defined as the area between a building and a public street or pedestrian path which promotes visual and pedestrian access onto the site and which provides amenities and landscaping that enhance the public's use of passive activities, such as resting, reading, and picnicking.

Pedestrian amenities and spaces are the streetscape, the visual and functional supporting elements of a roadway design, provides aesthetic interest and comfort to the pedestrian. Street amenities serve to define the public space of a sidewalk as well as the adjacent roadway corridor. Pedestrian amenities include private spaces such as pedestrian-friendly furniture, lighting and art.

Goal: To ensure a coordinated system of street corridor improvements that protects and accommodates the needs of the pedestrian while allowing efficient vehicular circulation and parking.

Design Objective: To provide functional amenities for the pedestrian that is safe, comforting and aesthetically pleasing.

Guidelines:

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 23

1. Curtilage. Where the front building façade is not directly adjacent to the sidewalk, develop the space between the sidewalk pavement and the building (the front yard) as a garden, lawn and/or pedestrian oriented space.

A pedestrian-oriented space is encouraged to have:

- Landscaping that does not act as a visual barrier.
- Site furniture, artwork, or amenities such as fountains, furniture.
- Pedestrian weather protection.
- Space for transit stop with seating.
- Window displays over the majority of the front façade.
- Pedestrian lighting

A pedestrian-oriented space shall NOT have:

- Asphalt or gravel pavement
- Adjacent unscreened parking lots
- Adjacent chain-link fences
- Adjacent blank walls without treatment.

2. Site Lighting. Provide lighting at all building entrances, exit points, and pedestrian-oriented spaces. Specific lighting detail standards are addressed in Chapter Six, Lighting.

DRAFT

Chapter Three Architectural/Building Design

Definition: Architectural/Building design includes the building scale, mass, form, size, color, and materials as they relate to the site and to adjacent structures and properties.

Goal: To maintain the small town charm and character of the Manchester Village through incorporation of architectural design features that will promote architectural compatibility as well as design continuity.

Comment [J4]: Quaintness is a difficult word to define. Character ties back to the LAMIRD language and the community plan language.

Deleted: quaintness

Deleted:

Objectives:

1. To encourage and promote development that features excellence and comfortable amenities in building design.
2. To protect the quality of the natural environment within the village boundaries and adjacent properties.

A. Compatibility Goals: To promote compatibility within design guidelines.

Exterior building design and detail on all elevations visible from adjacent properties or a public right-of-way shall be coordinated with regard to color, types of materials, number of materials, architectural form, and detailing to achieve harmony and continuity of design.

1. Design Character

- a) Proposed structural plans and specifications must invoke the small town charm and character of the Manchester Village through their architectural scale, roof form, building details, windows, materials, and signs. Preferable design characteristics are described below:

1. Steepened rooflines or appearance of steepened rooflines with east to west orientation and a minimum pitch of 3:12.
2. Multiple gables
3. Dormers
4. Multiple-paned windows
5. Front porches and/or covered walkways
6. Corner and window trim details
7. For flat roof structures, articulated cornices & parapet designs

This needs to be deleted. We don't want flat roofs because they are ugly when viewed from above.

- b) Design rear and side facades visible from public streets or neighboring properties with detailing the same as the principle facades of the building to maintain compatibility.

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 23

2. Building Height

In the Manchester Commercial District, the building height limit is two-stories at no more than 28 feet combined height. Neither new buildings nor redevelopment of existing buildings will have more than one level of residential area. Underground parking will not count as a story if it is entirely contained underground as defined in Kitsap County Code Section 15.08 055. good

B. Human/Pedestrian Scale

1. Pedestrian-Oriented Facades

- a) For all development, include at least three of the following design elements or techniques:
 - Sculptural, mosaic, or other architectural details
 - Transparent window area or window displays at or below eye level along at least 50 percent of the length of the ground floor façade for retail.
 - Pedestrian weather protection
 - Decorative light fixtures
 - Landscaping
 - Decorative building materials, including decorative masonry, shingles, brick, or stone
 - Individualized patterns or continuous wood details such as fancy butt shingles in a geometric pattern, decorative moldings, brackets, wave trim or latticework, ceramic tile, stone, glass block, or similar materials.
 - Other materials with decorative or textural qualities as approved.
 - Gable or hipped roof
 - Building articulation, with upper story set back from the face of the building.
 - Decorative artwork.
- b) Provide a porch, covered entry, or other building element that defines an outdoor space, such as trellis, overhang, or canopy. Entries should include weather protection, planters or building façade artwork.
- c) Treat code-required elements, such as parapet walls and screen walls, as an integral part of the architecture.

C. Architectural Scale

The following set of guidelines is intended to address building design details as might be seen at the scale of a pedestrian. Buildings that are stylized in an attempt to use the

building itself as advertising shall not be allowed, particularly where the proposed architecture is the result of a "corporate" or franchise style. Large, boxy buildings with no architectural detailing that overpower the building site and do not promote the rural character of Manchester will be deemed incompatible.

A. Building Scale

1. For all new buildings, there must be provided at least three of the following features along the facades visible from the public right-of-way and pedestrian routes.
 - a) Upper story setback
 - b) Building articulation with design elements such as the following:
 - Repeating window patterns
 - Including a porch, patio, deck, or covered entry
 - Including a balcony or bay window
 - Changing the roofline by alternating dormers, stepped roofs, gables or other roof elements.
 - Changing materials
 - Provide a lighting fixture, trellis, trees or other landscape feature
 - c) Substantial landscaping and/or pedestrian-oriented open spaces along the building façade.
 - d) Avoid long or continuous wall planes. Buildings should exhibit more detail and elements appropriate for close-range pedestrian view.

D. Building Materials

1. Exterior Materials

- a) Use durable and high-quality exterior materials. Highly reflective materials are not allowed. Materials should be those of typical use in the Northwest including:
 - Bevel or lap siding
 - Rock, stone, and brick material
 - Architectural shake-style roofing
 - Non-reflective metal roofs
 - Cedar shingles

- b) If sheet materials, such as composite fiber products or metal siding, are used as a siding material over more than 25 percent of a building

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 23

façade, use material with a matted finish in a color specified in the building materials section. Include the following elements:

1. Visible window and door trim painted or finished in a different but complementary color
2. Corner and edge trim that covers exposed edges of the siding material

c) The use of concrete blocks (concrete masonry units or "cinder blocks") are prohibited as a showing, exterior material.

d) Do not use the following materials in visible locations

- Smoked or mirrored glass
- Corrugated fiberglass
- Chain-link fences in front yards
- Synthetic materials with reflective surfaces, including galvanized steel and gloss vinyl siding

e) Select all vents, gutters, downspouts, flashing, electrical conduits, etc., to match or complement the color of the adjacent surface.

f) Provide approved address numbers that are a minimum of 4 inches in height and readable to the public from the street fronting the property.

g) Minimize the visibility of rooftop equipment by grouping all plumbing, vents, ducts, satellite dishes, antennas and rooftop mechanical equipment away from public view through use of architectural screening details, such as parapets, walls, and rooflines.

3. Colors

The Manchester Community Council (MCC) will keep a sampling of acceptable colors of paint and colors of traditional building materials, such as wood, brick, or slate. Erase the original and use JW's suggestion

Comment [j5]: This will be problematic in staff review of any project for current planning.

Or instead:

1. Glaring, obtrusive, or high-contrast color schemes are not encouraged except as small accents.
2. Trim and detailing (fascia, cornice, pediments, windows, doors and trims, moldings) color is encouraged to contrast or compliment the main color or materials.
3. Large graphics or bright accent colors shall be limited to fifteen percent of the main facade area, excluding glass. Bright, high-contrast color banding is limited to maximum four inches in width.

Comment [j6]: Something similar to this would give staff something to go on in their review of projects.

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 23

E. Building Equipment and Service Areas

1. Mechanical Equipment

1. Locate, design, and/or screen building mechanical equipment to minimize visual impact from public streets and neighboring properties.

2. Screen plumbing vents, HVAC equipment, and other building equipment from public view as feasible.

DRAFT

Chapter Four Landscape Design

A. Landscape Plan Concept

Goal: The intent of these standards is to preserve the small town character of Manchester, to enhance the quality of new construction, to promote landscaping in the commercial zone and to reduce the impact of development on drainage systems, natural habitats and Puget Sound. Landscaping should be suitable to the rural nature of Manchester and should complement and enhance the character of Manchester as a community bordering marine and rural areas.

Objectives:

- To provide visual screens and barriers as a transition between differing land uses.
- To define plant species that are low maintenance, non-invasive and limited in height and growth patterns.
- To provide visual relief from parking areas and integrate new landscaping into the natural environment.
- To provide appropriate physical separation between vehicular and pedestrian traffic.
- To provide decorative landscaping as a focal setting for signs, special site elements and pedestrian areas.
- To provide increased areas of permeable surfaces to allow for infiltration of surface water into groundwater resources, reduce the quantity of storm water discharge and to improve the quality of storm water discharge.

Landscape Plan Requirements

a. Submit a landscape design plan and be prepared to demonstrate that the plan addresses the following considerations:

- 1) A unified pedestrian circulation system with amenities and plantings
- 2) A coordinated system of open spaces and/or planted areas that provide the required pedestrian areas. The plan should indicate how the various spaces and plantings relate to the project's site design objectives.
- 3) Screening of service or unsightly areas.
- 4) Plantings and/or site features that enhance the building's architectural qualities.

b. A Landscape maintenance plan shall be provided and adhered to.

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 23

In addition, the design should consider the following landscape design objectives:

- a) Coordinate the selection of plant material to provide a succession of blooms, seasonal color, and a variety of textures.
- b) Provide a transition in landscaping design between adjacent sites, within a site, and from native vegetation areas so as to achieve greater continuity.
- c) Design landscaping to create definition between public and private spaces.
- d) Design landscaping to provide transition between built structures (vertical planes) and the site (horizontal planes)
- e) Use plantings to highlight significant site features and to define the function of the site, including parking, circulation, entries, and open space.

2. Landscape Types

a). Planting strips and barriers

Use planting strips or planting areas as barriers and/or screens to separate land uses or specific activities and to provide visual relief from parking areas and buildings. Planting areas should be a mix of evergreen and deciduous shrubs whose height and width will be proportionate to the area being planted and be maintained at a height of 25 feet or less. Trees, shrubs, ground covers, and/or grasses that are native to the Puget Sound region and that are appropriate to the conditions of the site are preferred. Care must be taken not to visually block lines of sight for vehicles, pedestrians, adjacent properties or signage.

b). Decorative Landscaping and Special Areas

1. Use decorative landscaping as a focal setting for signs, special site elements, and pedestrian areas. The area may be planted with trees, shrubs, ground cover, grasses, or cultivated flowerbeds.

2. Use plant materials as visual barriers or to add ambiance to special site elements for pedestrians, such as seating areas. Additions such as sculpture, artwork and site furniture are encouraged. Lighting for landscaped areas must comply with Chapter Six Lighting. Landscape materials should be in scale with the area.

1.

c). Parking Area Landscaping

The following also applies to outdoor storage areas and outdoor sales areas visible from a street right-of-way or adjacent property.

The intent of parking area landscaping is to develop a positive image for the commercial zone by providing an attractive appearance, reducing the summertime heat and glare build-up within and adjacent to parking areas, improving the views of parking areas for shoppers and area residents and lessening surface water run-off impacts.

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 23

a) An alternative to the required landscaping guidelines above may be submitted, provided that a better solution can be found to accommodate public benefit for one or more of the following items:

- Integrating interior surface parking area landscaping with required biofiltration swales
- Incorporating or protecting natural features, including wetlands, significant trees and vegetation, and slopes
- Preserving views
- Providing significant pedestrian-oriented spaces, such as a "pocket park" in excess of what is required under the Kitsap County Zoning Ordinance
- Creating an extension of or connection to a local park or regional bicycle/pedestrian trail system.

b) Provide landscaping to screen parking areas from adjacent or neighboring properties.

B. Retention of Significant Trees

Objectives

1. To retain substantial natural vegetation
2. To preserve and protect mature trees
3. To aid in the stabilization of soil by preventing erosion
4. To reduce storm water runoff and the costs associated with storm water runoff
5. To provide an important visual buffer and screen against traffic and noise
6. To conserve and enhance the unique character of the area and protect and increase property values

C. Approved Plant List

Objectives:

1. To encourage the use of hardy, attractive, and easily maintained plant material
2. To encourage at least two seasons of interest for trees and shrubs
3. To provide visual continuity by using plant materials from a specified plant list of a limited number of varieties and species, yet be open to new and interesting plant materials, so long as none of those are considered noxious plants in Kitsap County.
4. To encourage the use of trees and shrubs within the commercial zone as an important unifying element to strengthen the image and continuity of the streetscape.

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 23