

**Manchester Community Meeting**  
**Tuesday, March 20, 2007 - 6:30-9:00 pm**  
**Kitsap County Administration Building**  
**Commissioners Chambers**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**Present:** 23 citizens; Staff: Linda Bentley, Jim Bolger, Scott Diener, Katrina Knutson, Jim Rogers

**Future Meetings:** Bentley welcomed the group and asked if the group would like future meetings to be held at the Manchester Library, as suggested by a member of the Friends of the Library. Group suggested that the subcommittees could meet there, but they would prefer the group meetings continue at the County Administration Building. Bentley also said that most of the meetings from here on would be in the smaller task-oriented subcommittees, with perhaps a monthly meeting of the larger group to “check in” and discuss items of overall significance.

**Follow-up Items:** As a follow-up from the last meeting, Diener said there has been no action so far on the group’s request that they receive “official” sanction from the BOCC, e.g., like the Suquamish or Kingston Citizen Advisory Committees, as Commissioner Angel has been on vacation.

Diener explained why the County would not support an expansion of the LAMIRD boundary, based on requirements of state law and hearings board and court cases. Regarding the issue of a moratorium on development in the commercial core, which was brought up at the last meeting, Diener said staff did not believe the BOCC would approve such a moratorium as the reasons did not rise to the level of emergency. Group members asked for copies of past “successful” moratoria efforts and Lyle Burbidge volunteered to be the citizen contact for further research into moratorium requirements.

**Design Guidelines:** Carrilu Thompson, who, with others, has been working on design guidelines for Manchester based on Kingston design guidelines, proposed to staff and the group that the primary concern of Manchester residents at this time is the development of the commercial core and that adopting design guidelines should be “fast-tracked.” After discussion, the group agreed to commit to that, with the caveat from staff that it may mean work on the community plan, itself, may be slowed due to limited staff resources. The group then broke into subcommittees (task groups based on elements of the community plan) to review the portion of the draft design guidelines distributed by Thompson and give feedback. As work on the draft design guidelines continues, drafts will be sent electronically for comments and a “final” draft will be presented at a community open house for further comments before presentation to the Planning Commission. Staff and the community will continue to enlist as much community notice and participation as possible.

**Community Plan Update:** The Transportation subcommittee started work on their community plan element, but other subcommittees did not have time to do so. All subcommittees will continue to meet on their own to update their respective elements, with assistance from county staff as needed.

Summary prepared by Linda Bentley