






# City of Bremerton Manette Subarea Plan Visual Preference Survey


Picture	Eval. Average <i>1 poor, 5 great</i>	Where Is This Appropriate?			Positive Aspects of Example	What Could Make It Better?
		Core?	Ring?	Edge?		
	<b>3.8</b>	18%	71%	76%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fits into neighborhood with growing density.</li> <li>• Character.</li> <li>• Social interaction.</li> <li>• Good architectural fit.</li> <li>• Promotes “neighborhood” feel.</li> <li>• Matches spirit of Manette.</li> <li>• Fits the scale of existing homes.</li> <li>• Fits with scale and character of neighborhood.</li> <li>• Cottage clusters and houses fronting on green streets should be allowed.</li> <li>• Quaint, inviting. Feels vintage.</li> <li>• Covered entry.</li> <li>• Would be nice to have multi-family with common areas closer to schools.</li> <li>• Charming higher density way to do housing.</li> <li>• Cute.</li> <li>• Pleasant appearance.</li> <li>• Higher density without the high-density feel.</li> <li>• As long as the cottages are cute little craftsman-style. No box buildings!</li> <li>• Cottage housing. Small housing around open.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid extremely high density.</li> <li>• Face the street.</li> <li>• More actual gardening (less lawn but open up to other garden-green use).</li> <li>• Allow greater density for cottage clusters that have common green spaces and are in 800-1200s.</li> <li>• Leave it in Poulsbo.</li> <li>• Diversity of appearance.</li> <li>• Vary structure styles and colors, but limit pallet to earth tone colors.</li> <li>• Not all the same 50s look.</li> </ul>


Picture	Eval. Average <i>1 poor, 5 great</i>	Where Is This Appropriate?			Positive Aspects of Example	What Could Make It Better?
		Core?	Ring?	Edge?		
	2.2	47%	35%	18%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Architecture is interesting.</li> <li>• Townhomes, two-story.</li> <li>• Density.</li> <li>• Setback.</li> <li>• Two stories preserves views.</li> <li>• Townhomes that go through Design Review are good way to increase density (any development over three units).</li> <li>• Sort of reminiscent of brownstones.</li> <li>• At least it has setbacks. That is a good thing.</li> <li>• Green space in front.</li> <li>• Modern but not too overdone.</li> <li>• Don't hate it, but can't picture it for Manette.</li> <li>• None.</li> <li>• Townhouses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With open space.</li> <li>• Individual character.</li> <li>• Limit to existing heights (35"?)</li> <li>• Add second floor terraces/decks.</li> <li>• More Manette look: architectural mixed look.</li> <li>• Downtown.</li> <li>• Too tall.</li> <li>• Parking!</li> <li>• Too much impact on residential.</li> <li>• Too tall.</li> <li>• Buildings each limited to four units with adequate space.</li> <li>• Reduce height. Looks out of place in Manette.</li> <li>• Do not allow townhomes to front on a side yard next to housing. Only streets and common green spaces.</li> <li>• Less vertical.</li> <li>• Warmer materials.</li> <li>• Too modern for Manette.</li> <li>• Too modern!</li> <li>• Ugly. Too new. Looks like Bellevue (bad).</li> </ul>


Picture	Eval. Average <i>1 poor, 5 great</i>	Where Is This Appropriate?			Positive Aspects of Example	What Could Make It Better?
		Core?	Ring?	Edge?		
	1.2	12%	6%	0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not appropriate for this neighborhood.</li> <li>• Some aspects of architecture are okay.</li> <li>• Out of scale and ugly for Manette.</li> <li>• Nothing.</li> <li>• No redeeming quality. Thousands of these in Seattle.</li> <li>• Not affordable.</li> <li>• No way!</li> <li>• High density.</li> <li>• Too big.</li> <li>• None.</li> <li>• Walk-up.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too monolithic.</li> <li>• Need something with varying rooflines and a less uniform architectural front.</li> <li>• No Manette feel.</li> <li>• Too big; limit size of each building.</li> <li>• Ick!</li> <li>• Too massive.</li> <li>• Too tall.</li> <li>• Imposing.</li> <li>• Downtown (not on water!).</li> <li>• Reduce height. Looks massive. Out of place in Manette.</li> <li>• Break building into smaller buildings.</li> <li>• Not using this style.</li> <li>• Leave it in Seattle. This is killing fine old Seattle neighborhoods.</li> <li>• Far too congested for Manette.</li> <li>• Too downtown.</li> <li>• No salvation for this!</li> <li>• Too big, too square, too new.</li> </ul>

Picture	Eval. Average <i>1 poor, 5 great</i>	Where Is This Appropriate?			Positive Aspects of Example	What Could Make It Better?
		Core?	Ring?	Edge?		
	<b>2.3</b>	65%	24%	0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow for individual tastes.</li> <li>• Character; works well as a contrast to more eclectic and historic architecture.</li> <li>• Okay for intermittent use.</li> <li>• Nice for contrast, but not too much of it, though.</li> <li>• None.</li> <li>• Okay for specific businesses. Only in the core or maybe the ring.</li> <li>• Slightly industrial.</li> <li>• Garish, lacking in any taste.</li> <li>• In the right spot it would be good.</li> <li>• Tall and short next to each other.</li> <li>• Cute, eclectic.</li> <li>• Two-story residential/office.</li> <li>• ☹️</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to give care to materials used on the exterior.</li> <li>• Too small for the core; add height.</li> <li>• Contemporary; does not fit Manette's overall architecture.</li> <li>• Ugly.</li> <li>• Nothing; absolutely does not fit in with the neighborhood.</li> <li>• This is personal taste: I don't like the style of architecture—too modernistic. Better to have something that complements most of the housing stock in the area.</li> <li>• Covered pedestrian space/entry.</li> <li>• Can really get a good feel for this.</li> <li>• Too industrial, with limited use of space.</li> <li>• Not so boxy!</li> <li>• Too new.</li> </ul>

Picture	Eval. Average <i>1 poor, 5 great</i>	Where Is This Appropriate?			Positive Aspects of Example	What Could Make It Better?
		Core?	Ring?	Edge?		
	3.5	94%	12%	0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Variety of facades.</li> <li>• Looks like multiple buildings.</li> <li>• Like the variety of materials and rooflines.</li> <li>• Looks like current Manette.</li> <li>• Fits scale.</li> <li>• Quaint.</li> <li>• Appropriate scale.</li> <li>• Similar to current buildings.</li> <li>• Small space of businesses. Reasonable size.</li> <li>• Don't want Disney facades. See #6 for better architecture.</li> <li>• Feels like "big box". Too corporate.</li> <li>• Okay for existing commercial zoning as long as bordering neighbors agree.</li> <li>• Like the variety of buildings.</li> <li>• Diversity is good.</li> <li>• Lots of variation.</li> <li>• Small shops.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Density too low.</li> <li>• Need variety, but include residential.</li> <li>• Residential above.</li> <li>• Live above too "short."</li> <li>• Mix with current buildings.</li> <li>• More character (seems sterile looking).</li> <li>• More trees.</li> <li>• Need for Design Review.</li> <li>• No/little CMU block.</li> <li>• Looks too much like a Hollywood set.</li> <li>• Limited use of space.</li> <li>• Too corporate.</li> <li>• Not as modern.</li> <li>• Even more architectural variation.</li> <li>• Looks too new.</li> </ul>

Picture	Eval. Average <i>1 poor, 5 great</i>	Where Is This Appropriate?			Positive Aspects of Example	What Could Make It Better?
		Core?	Ring?	Edge?		
	<b>3.9</b>	94%	35%	0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Variety of heights.</li> <li>• Northwest feel.</li> <li>• Character: Northwest and Scandinavian.</li> <li>• Sidewalks.</li> <li>• Materials.</li> <li>• Scale.</li> <li>• Like the variety of rooflines and materials and potential for second story residential.</li> <li>• Nice materials.</li> <li>• Street trees.</li> <li>• Looks Northwest/Scandinavian.</li> <li>• Scale and style fit with community.</li> <li>• Nice feel.</li> <li>• A few trees lining the sidewalk.</li> <li>• Nice colors.</li> <li>• Scale of buildings in keeping with neighborhood.</li> <li>• Active streetscape with trees and wide sidewalks.</li> <li>• Good mix of materials.</li> <li>• Small shop, multi-use.</li> <li>• Okay for existing commercial zoning as long as bordering neighbors agree.</li> <li>• I like this aesthetic. It fits with the current neighborhoods.</li> <li>• Best.</li> <li>• Older. Like the room on sidewalks for outdoor seating.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Varied heights.</li> <li>• Massive look.</li> <li>• Variety of color.</li> <li>• Remove some height.</li> <li>• Limit to two stories.</li> <li>• No more than two stories.</li> <li>• Limit to two stories. Unclear from the picture if there are two or three.</li> </ul>

Picture	Eval. Average <i>1 poor, 5 great</i>	Where Is This Appropriate?			Positive Aspects of Example	What Could Make It Better?
		Core?	Ring?	Edge?		
	1.8	47%	6%	0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mixed-use.</li> <li>• Like #6 much better.</li> <li>• Multi-use.</li> <li>• Walk-up.</li> <li>• Massing is good for core only. Not good style for this area.</li> <li>• Harsh, heavy.</li> <li>• It is TERRIBLE.</li> <li>• Nothing.</li> <li>• Ugly and quickly outdated.</li> <li>• Multi-use.</li> <li>• ☹️</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Height too much. Scale is off.</li> <li>• Too massive.</li> <li>• Boring.</li> <li>• Possibly flat roofs to preserve view corridors; limit to two stories.</li> <li>• Pitch on roof too high.</li> <li>• Too massive.</li> <li>• Take off two stories.</li> <li>• Scale is too big.</li> <li>• Less floors and height.</li> <li>• Looks pre-fabricated design.</li> <li>• It belongs in soul-less Redmond, which used to be a good place.</li> <li>• A bulldozer.</li> <li>• Looks too new.</li> <li>• Too tall.</li> </ul>

Picture	Eval. Average <i>1 poor, 5 great</i>	Where Is This Appropriate?			Positive Aspects of Example	What Could Make It Better?
		Core?	Ring?	Edge?		
	1.6	35%	0%	0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upper terraces.</li> <li>• Not suitable for this neighborhood. Would overwhelm anything around it. Like terrace with greenery.</li> <li>• Walk-up.</li> <li>• Might work as an anchor for end of bridge.</li> <li>• Okay at significant corner.</li> <li>• Positive aspect is that it is NOT in Manette.</li> <li>• I see this by R&amp;K and Kristi's.</li> <li>• Maximizes the use of dense retail in small space.</li> <li>• It would look good in Bainbridge.</li> <li>• None! Yuk.</li> <li>• Maybe ONE building like this right off the bridge.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too massive and uniform. More variety.</li> <li>• Scale is wrong for Manette.</li> <li>• Very "massive" feeling.</li> <li>• Not Northwest look.</li> <li>• Too mall-like.</li> <li>• Much too harsh.</li> <li>• Much too large.</li> <li>• Less floors and height.</li> <li>• No hope.</li> <li>• Setbacks.</li> <li>• Less height, bulk, and scale.</li> <li>• Explosives.</li> <li>• No! No! No!</li> <li>• Looks too new.</li> <li>• Too tall; too big of building.</li> </ul>

**General Comments:**

- Manette is GREAT! It is not "sleepy" or "emerging"; it is highly desirable, affordable, and people are loyal to it, moving in and keeping up their properties. Densifying, Seattle-/Bellevue-style, has proven disastrous to those cities. Nothing got cheaper or better. Note that the *Seattle Times* calls Manette "the best neighborhood in Seattle." So do not ruin it. Thanks.
- Design guidelines are a feel-good, yet meaningless, facade allowing for profit-maximizing development.
- Should be a mix of architectural styles.
- Prefer meetings in Manette, 7 p.m.
- Single-family homes are appropriate in all zones. They preserve the small-town feel.