



Appendix A.4

Housing Land Capacity and Adequate Provisions

Introduction

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires comprehensive plans to include a housing element that identifies “sufficient capacity of land” to accommodate all projected housing needs during the horizon period of the plan (RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c)). This includes explicit consideration of capacity for the following household needs and building types:

- Moderate, low, very low, and extremely low-income households;
- Permanent supportive housing;
- Emergency housing and emergency shelters; and
- Duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes (within an urban growth area boundary).

Counties and cities must conduct a Land Capacity Analysis (LCA) to measure and document capacity for new housing development on vacant, partially used, or under-utilized lands. This analysis considers the potential for land within a community's boundaries to accommodate new housing growth, given its current zoning and development regulations. Unlike a Buildable Lands Analysis, which looks backward at performance under the previous period's comprehensive plan, an LCA looks forward to the land uses and development types planned for the next planning period, as described in WAC 365-196-325. The purpose of an LCA is to evaluate what current development regulations allow, rather than what development has occurred.

Defining Household Income Segments

The land capacity requirements of the housing element in RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c) reference moderate, low, very low and extremely low-income households. RCW 36.70A.030 provides definitions for households by income level relative to “median household income adjusted for household size, for the county where the household is located, as reported by the United States department of housing and urban development.” The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) publishes this income standard, referred to as Median Family Income or Area Median Income (AMI), for each county on an annual basis.

Table Appendix A.4.1 below presents the definitions for each income level as stated in RCW 36.70A.030.

Table Appendix A.4-1: Income level definitions in RCW 36.70A.030	
Household income segment	Income relative to area median income (AMI)
Extremely low-income	0-30% of AMI
Very low-income	>30-50% of AMI
Low-income	>50-80% of AMI
Moderate income	>80-120% of AMI

In addition to these income segments, RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c) notes that land capacity analyses now need to take into consideration permanent supportive housing (PSH), emergency housing and emergency shelters. As noted in Establishing Housing Targets for your Community (Book 1):

- Since PSH is permanent housing, PSH needs are a subset of the total 0-30% AMI housing needs. While some households in PSH may have incomes higher than 30% AMI, the majority of these households are likely to be in the 0-30% AMI bracket as this is where disability incomes would fall, and RCW 36.70A.030 requires PSH participants to have “complex and disabling” conditions and service needs. Therefore, the 0-30% AMI housing needs are split into two categories: PSH and Non-PSH.
- Both emergency housing and emergency shelter include temporary accommodations. In implementation, there may be overlap between what could be considered emergency housing versus emergency shelter. For this reason, emergency housing and emergency shelter are considered a single category and referred to throughout this guidance as “emergency housing.”

Housing Allocations

The Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC) adopted housing targets through 2044. These targets are consistent with the GMA and VISION 2050, the regional plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council. The Kitsap County Board of Commissioners formally adopted these targets in January 2023. The population targets formed the basis for the development of housing allocations by income band, which are included in the comprehensive plan and reproduced in part below:

Table Appendix A.4-2: Permanent Housing Needs by Income Level (% of Area Median Income)									
	Total	0-30%		>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	>120%	Emergency Housing (Temporary)
		Non-PSH	PSH						
Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	5,116	356	0	422	1,062	915	594	1,767	1
Allocation (2020- 2044)	1,977	377	166	324	272	140	138	560	83

Poulsbo must plan for and accommodate 1,977 permanent housing units from the 2020 baseline through 2044, plus capacity for 83 emergency housing beds for persons experiencing homelessness. This report documents how Poulsbo provides capacity for permanent and emergency housing allocations by income bracket in accordance with published Commerce guidance.

Alternatives Summary

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) studies four land use and growth alternatives that include a no action and three action alternatives for the city and UGA. All three alternatives assume growth consistent with PSRC's Vision 2050 and Appendix B of the Kitsap CPPs:

- 1) **Alternative 1 – No Action, Current Adopted Plan:** This alternative assumes no changes to the future land use designations currently shown on the City's Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, and there will be no policy, zoning or regulation changes associated with this alternative. This alternative is required under SEPA.
- 2) **Alternative 2 – Adopted Plan + Missing Middle Housing Emphasis:** This strategy will focus on adding policies and development regulation amendments that would promote missing middle housing within the residential zoning districts. Examples of Missing Middle Housing that would be considered in zoning regulations are reduced minimum lot sizes; attached units (duplex, triplex, etc.) allowed in Residential Low zoning districts; infill; multiplex buildings; town or rowhouses; accessory dwelling units; and cottage/courtyard developments.
- 3) **Alternative 3 – Adopted Plan + Missing Middle Housing Emphasis:** This alternative would evaluate the C-3 Commercial zone for opportunities to increase residential development along an existing transit corridor, while also maintaining a vital employment area. There are opportunities for development within this area and future code amendments may include increased building height, reduced parking requirements, and other incentives. A substantial portion of the population and new jobs will be assigned to this alternative. Residential designations and densities (Residential Low, Residential Medium and Residential High) remain the same as Alternative 1 Current Adopted Plan and includes Alternative 2 Missing Middle Emphasis.
- 4) **Alternative 4 – Growth focused within SR 305 Corridor Center and increase to density in Residential Medium and Residential High zoning districts:** This alternative would include the SR 305 Corridor Center evaluation and add increased densities to the City's Residential Medium (RM) and Residential High (RH) zoning districts. RM density would increase from 6-10 units/acre to 6-14 units/acre; and RH would increase from 11-14 units/acre to 15-21 units/acre. Residential Low (4-5 unit/acre) remains the same as currently adopted.

Land Capacity Analysis

Poulsbo completed a land capacity analysis as part of the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. Capacity is provided below in terms of housing unit capacity by zone. Capacity was calculated in this fashion for all four alternatives developed for the EIS.

Table Appendix A.4-3: Housing Unit Capacity by Zone							
Zoning District	Housing Types	Zone Category	Affordability Level	Housing Unit Capacity Alternative 1	Housing Unit Capacity Alternative 2	Housing Unit Capacity Alternative 3	Housing Unit Capacity Alternative 4
Residential Low	Single-family detached	Low Density	>120% AMI	1,512	1,583	1,583	1,583
Residential Med	Townhomes/duplex/triplex	Moderate Density	>80-120% AMI	590	590	590	766
Residential High	Apartments	Low-Rise	0-80% AMI and PSH	476	476	476	630
C-1/Downtown	Apartments	Low-Rise	0-80% AMI and PSH	0	0	129	129
C-3/SR 305	Apartments	Mid-Rise	0-80% AMI and PSH	0	0	383	383
Assumptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Household Size – 2.51 for Single-Family Detached, 2.09 for MultifamilyAlternative 1 – No residential in commercial zones, updated pipeline projects, w/UGA includedAlternative 2 – 4% increase in housing units within the RL zone with adoption of “Missing Middle Housing” code amendmentsAlternative 3 – 60/40 mixed-use split, 1.5 FAR, 30 unit/acre for C-1/Downtown and 60/40 mixed-use split, 1.5 FAR, 35 unit/acre for C-3/SR 305Alternative 4 – Density increases to maximum 14 dwelling units per acre for RM and 22 dwelling units per acre for RH							

The rightmost column below in Table Appendix A.4-4 shows the surplus or (deficit) of capacity by zone category. This is done for all four alternatives.

Table Appendix A.4-4: Surplus or (Deficit) of Capacity by Zone Category				
	Housing Unit Capacity by Zone Category	Affordability Level	Allocation	Capacity Surplus or Deficit
Alternative 1				
Low Density	1,512	>120% AMI	560	952
Moderate Density	590	>80-120% AMI	278	312
Low Rise	476	0-80% AMI and PSH	1,139	-663
Alternative 2				
Low Density	1,425	>120% AMI	560	865
Moderate Density	453	>80-120% AMI	278	175
Low Rise	771	0-80% AMI and PSH	1,139	-368
Alternative 3				
Low Density	1,425	>120% AMI	560	865
Moderate Density	453	>80-120% AMI	278	175
Low Rise	1,282	0-80% AMI and PSH	1,139	143
Alternative 4				
Low Density	1,425	>120% AMI	560	865
Moderate Density	541	>80-120% AMI	278	563
Low Rise	1,525	0-80% AMI and PSH	1,139	386

Capacity for Emergency Housing Needs

Fully planning jurisdictions must do a quantitative LCA for emergency housing needs to show sufficient capacity for their allotted share of countywide emergency housing needs (RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c)). Poulsbo followed the Washington State Department of Commerce guidance for emergency housing.

Poulsbo queried vacant and underutilized land in the residential and commercial zones, where emergency housing is permitted. Consistent with the Land Capacity Analysis variables, the following deductions were made - 25% for critical areas, 20% for right-of-way dedication, and 20% for public facilities. This calculation determined the net developable acres. The only emergency housing/shelter in Kitsap County is located in Bremerton and has 75 beds on .5 acres. Given the location of the Bremerton facility, downtown and close to services and transit, an additional deduction was made assuming that a high percentage of vacant and underutilized land in Poulsbo is not located within reasonable access to services and transit. Then assuming 75 beds for .5 acres, it was determined that Poulsbo has the capacity for 525 emergency shelter beds. This is well above the 83 allocated.

Table Appendix A.4-5: Land Capacity for Emergency Housing Needs					
Gross Acres	Net Developable Acres	Deduction for Spacing Requirements (1/2 Mile per PMC)	Deduction for Location (Services and Transit)	Bremerton Example (75 beds per ½ acre)	Emergency Shelter Bed Capacity
497 acres	223 acres	56 acres remaining	14 acres remaining	7 acres remaining	525 beds

Role of ADUs

Given that a large proportion of land in Poulsbo is devoted to detached single family homes, there is potential to support housing needs by encouraging the production of attached and/or detached dwelling units on lots with single family homes. These types of housing have potential to be affordable to moderate and lower-income households.

In 2023, HB 1110 and HB 1337 directed all jurisdictions to make significant changes to ADU regulations, including allowing two ADUs per lot in all GMA urban growth areas, and reducing barriers to ADU development related to occupancy, sale, lot size, and parking. Poulsbo passed these requirements in Ordinance 2024-05. In addition to the requirements of HB 1337, the permitting process for an ADU was amended to require a building permit only.

Adequate Provisions Summary

The Washington State Department of Commerce has developed a checklist for jurisdictions to complete and include with the housing element on assessing barriers to housing. Prior to completing the following checklist staff conducted a code review and evaluated existing permitting process and resources and consulted with staff who more directly work with affordable housing providers and projects. The following tables include an assessment of barriers to low- and mid-rise housing, permanent supportive housing and emergency housing

Table Appendix A.4-6: Commerce Adequate Provisions Checklist**Moderate Density Housing Barrier Review Checklist**

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
Unclear development regulations	No		No action is necessary to address barriers, but Poulsbo will continue to monitor development regulations and address any issues with clarity that may arise.
Prohibiting some moderate density housing types, such as: Duplex, Triplex, Four/five/six-plex, Townhomes, Cottage housing, Live-work units, Manufactured home park	No. All residential zones allow middle housing (including duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, townhouses, manufactured home parks, and cottage housing). Live/Work units are permitted in 2 out of the 3 residential zones,	Ordinance 2024-03 permitted Unit Lot Subdivisions. Ordinance 2024-05 permitted duplexes on corner lots in the RL zone, in addition to additional attached units within PRDs.	No action is necessary to address barriers, but intended changes to the Comprehensive Plan as part of the Periodic Update would include additional density in the RM and RH residential zoning districts.
High minimum lot sizes	No.	Minimum lot size in residential zones can be reduced significantly with a Planned Residential Development per PMC 18.260.	No action is necessary, but Poulsbo is considering reductions in minimum lot size requirements in the residential zones.
Low maximum densities or low maximum FAR	Yes.	The City has minimum densities that could be higher to achieve maximum housing potential.	Intended changes to the Comprehensive Plan as part of the Periodic Update would include additional density in the RM and RH residential zoning districts.
Low maximum building heights	No.	PMC 18.310.010 allows exceptions to building height.	No action is necessary, but Poulsbo is considering amendments to the way in which height is measured, to allow additional living space AND encourage pitched rooflines.
Large setback requirements	No.	Ordinance 2024-05 removed lot depth requirements for residential zones. Setbacks in residential zones can be reduced significantly with a Planned Residential Development per PMC 18.260.	No action is necessary, but Poulsbo is considering reductions in setback requirements in the residential zones, and a change in permit type for PRDs without subdivision (from type III to type II).
High off-street parking requirements	Yes. While the city has passed minimal reductions in parking requirements, overall parking requirements are high. This can increase the cost of housing development and reduce the effective yields.	Per PMC 18.70.080, in the residential zones, the following is required: SF - 2 spaces/DU, ADU - 1/ADU MF - 1.5 spaces; provided, that studio apartments may provide 1 space. Guest parking shall be provided at 1 space/four units	Parking regulations should be examined to streamline these requirements and reduce parking requirements citywide. However, this would need to be done concurrently with increased transit service within city limits. Poulsbo could consider allowing developers to do a reduction of the minimum parking requirements with the developer paying for a traffic study.
High impervious coverage limits	Yes. Impervious coverage restrictions are based on the City's approach to managing stormwater runoff and minimizing the need for stormwater treatment. However, reducing maximum impervious cover can also	No developers have brought up this limit as a barrier.	Limited options are available. Poulsbo is required to be consistent with the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington and the NPDES permit.

	reduce the amount of developable area that can be used on a site.		
Lack of alignment between building codes and development codes	No.	This has not been a significant issue based on staff knowledge of project applications and was not raised as a concern by the local developer interviews.	No action is necessary
Other (lack of affordable housing incentives)	Yes.	Affordable housing developers have limited financial resources. Poulsbo can reduce the cost of affordable housing construction per unit by offering incentives to developers, such as height bonuses, density bonuses, tax breaks, or waivers for impact fees and parking requirements in the Downtown zones.	Poulsbo could consider: Provide bonus height or FAR in return for providing affordable housing units. Reduce parking requirements in return for affordable housing units. Adoption of the MFTE program.
Conditional use permit process	Yes.	CUP required for many senior care type of facilities and manufactured home parks in the RL zone.	Poulsbo is considering amendments to permit type for these uses - from a CUP (public hearing) to an ACUP (administrative).
Design review	No.	Poulsbo does not have a design review board, all design is reviewed administratively.	No action is necessary
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees ¹	No.	Poulsbo has a transparent process and fees for new development with their developer's checklist, along with an abundance of handouts and information on the website.	No action is necessary; however, Poulsbo is always looking for opportunities for process improvements.
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees	No.	Park impact fees per PMC 3.84 Transportation impact fees per PMC 3.86 Connection fees have some distinctions between single and multi-family projects, but do not provide substantively lower fees for multifamily.	No action is necessary, but there is the potential for streamlining and coordinating charges and fees.
Processing times and staffing challenges	No.	Permit processing does not appear to be a challenge as compared to other cities. Ongoing improvements have been made to permit systems to deliver decisions quickly	No action is necessary; however, Poulsbo is always looking for opportunities for process improvements.
SEPA process	No.	Current exemption thresholds under PMC 16.04 are low and potentially could be raised, but this would not impact a substantial number of projects.	No action is necessary, but Poulsbo is considering raising SEPA threshold levels in 2025.
Lack of large parcels for infill development	Yes.	Significant physical constraints on development reduce the amount of land area that can accommodate new growth. Remaining areas are limited in size and can make growth more challenging as infill and redevelopment projects are limited to more challenging sites.	Provide a clear and straightforward process for parcel aggregation or reconfiguration to facilitate infill development

		Parcel aggregation is often necessary.	
Environmental constraints	Yes. Poulsbo has significant wetlands, riparian areas, and steep slopes that affect the availability of developable lands.	The Critical Areas Ordinance and Shoreline Master Program requirements are mandated at the state level.	No action is necessary. Poulsbo already offers education about requirements to developers.
Low-Rise or Mid-Rise housing barrier review checklist			
Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
Unclear development regulations	No.	While there are ongoing concerns about maintaining clear language in development regulations, there are no immediate concerns.	No action is necessary to address barriers, but Poulsbo will continue to monitor development regulations and address any issues with clarity that may arise.
High minimum lot sizes	No.	There is no minimum lot size for multifamily developments in the RM and RH zoned. Minimum lot size in residential zones can be reduced significantly with a Planned Residential Development per PMC 18.260.	No action is necessary, but Poulsbo is considering reductions in minimum lot size requirements in the residential zones.
Low maximum densities or low maximum FAR	Yes.	The City has minimum densities that could be higher to achieve maximum housing potential.	Intended changes to the Comprehensive Plan as part of the Periodic Update would include additional density in the RM and RH residential zoning districts.
Low maximum building heights	No.	Ordinance 2024-09, 2024-10, and 2024-13 increased the building height allowed in 3 out of the 4 commercial zones. PMC 18.310.010 allows exceptions to building height.	No action is necessary, but Poulsbo is considering amendments to the way in which height is measured, to allow additional living space AND encourage pitched rooflines.
Large setback requirements	No.	Very minimal setbacks required in Commercial zones per PMC 18.80.040. Ordinance 2024-05 removed lot depth requirements for residential zones. Setbacks in residential zones can be reduced significantly with a Planned Residential Development per PMC 18.260.	No action is necessary, but Poulsbo is considering reductions in setback requirements in the residential zones, and a change in permit type for PRDs without subdivision (from type III to type II).
High off-street parking requirements	Yes. While the city has passed minimal reductions in parking requirements, overall parking requirements are high. This can increase the cost of housing development and reduce the effective yields.	Per PMC 18.70.080, in the residential zones, the following is required: SF - 2 spaces/DU ADU - 1/ADU MF - 1.5 spaces; provided, that studio apartments may provide 1 space. Guest parking shall be provided at 1 space/four units	Parking regulations should be examined to streamline these requirements and reduce parking requirements citywide. However, this would need to be done concurrently with increased transit service within city limits. Poulsbo could consider allowing developers to do a reduction of the minimum parking requirements with the developer paying for a traffic study.

High impervious coverage limits	Yes. Impervious coverage restrictions are based on the City's approach to managing stormwater runoff and minimizing the need for stormwater treatment. However, reducing maximum impervious cover can also reduce the amount of developable area that can be used on a site.	No developers have brought up this limit as a barrier.	Limited options are available. Poulsbo is required to be consistent with the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington and the NPDES permit.
Lack of alignment between building and development codes	No.	This has not been a significant issue based on staff knowledge of project applications and was not raised as a concern by the local developer interviews.	No action is necessary
Other (ground floor retail space)	No.	There is not strong demand for ground floor. This issue was brought up during the local developer interviews Ordinance 2024-17 amended the PMC to allow flexible first floor for all commercial zones.	No action is necessary
Conditional use permit process	Yes.	ACUP required for many senior care type of facilities and manufactured home parks in the residential and commercial zones.	Poulsbo is considering amendments to permit type for these uses - from a ACUP (public hearing) to Permitted outright.
Design review	No.	Poulsbo does not have a design review board, all design is reviewed administratively.	No action is necessary
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees	No.	Poulsbo has a transparent process and fees for new development with their developer's checklist, along with an abundance of handouts and information on the website.	No action is necessary; however, Poulsbo is always looking for opportunities for process improvements.
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees	No.	Park impact fees per PMC 3.84 Transportation impact fees per PMC 3.86 Connection fees have some distinctions between single and multi-family projects, but do not provide substantively lower fees for multifamily.	No action is necessary, but there is the potential for streamlining and coordinating charges and fees.
Process times and staffing challenges	No.	Permit processing does not appear to be a challenge as compared to other cities. Ongoing improvements have been made to permit systems to deliver decisions quickly	No action is necessary; however, Poulsbo is always looking for opportunities for process improvements.
SEPA process	No.	Current exemption thresholds under PMC 16.04 are low and potentially could be raised, but this would not impact a substantial number of projects.	No action is necessary, but Poulsbo is considering raising SEPA threshold levels in 2025.

Lack of large parcels for infill development	Yes.	Significant physical constraints on development reduce the amount of land area that can accommodate new growth. Remaining areas are limited in size and can make growth more challenging as infill and redevelopment projects are limited to more challenging sites. Parcel aggregation is often necessary.	Provide a clear and straightforward process for parcel aggregation or reconfiguration to facilitate infill development
Environmental constraints	Yes. Poulsbo has significant wetlands, riparian areas, and steep slopes that affect the availability of developable lands.	The Critical Areas Ordinance and Shoreline Master Program requirements are mandated at the state level.	No action is necessary. Poulsbo already offers education about requirements to developers.
Supplementary Barrier Review Checklist for PSH and Emergency Housing			
Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production? (yes or no)	Why or why not? Provide evidence.	Actions needed to address barrier.
Spacing requirements (for example, minimum distance from parks, schools or other emergency/PSH housing facilities) ²	Yes.	Per the PMC: No transitional housing unit may be located within 1/2 a mile of another transitional housing property. Transitional housing shall not be located within a 1/2 mile of emergency housing and emergency shelters. No continuously operating emergency shelter may be located within a 1/2 mile of a continuously operating emergency housing facility as measured by the nearest point on one such property to the nearest point on the other. Emergency shelters shall not be located within a 1/2 mile of permanent supportive housing or transitional housing,	Poulsbo should consider removing the spacing requirement.
Parking requirements	No.	Per PMC 18.70.080.A.7: Supportive housing: one per four regular beds (or units), plus one space for every full-time employee on the largest shift.	No action is necessary.
On-site recreation and open space requirements	No.	None required.	No action is necessary. However, Poulsbo should evaluate the requirements for PSH and emergency housing.
Restrictions on support spaces, such as office space, within a transitional or PSH building in a residential zone	No.	Home occupations under PMC 18.70.070.F limit the number of workers and require at least one resident to work in the space. Office uses are not specifically allowed in R districts outside of a neighborhood commercial use, which has code limitations.	No action is necessary. However, Poulsbo should consider adjusting the code to clarify that office and support uses accessory to permanent supportive housing may be allowed.

Arbitrary limits on number of occupants (in conflict with RCW 35A.21.314)	Yes.	The occupancy of an indoor emergency shelter shall be limited to no more than forty people.	Poulsbo should consider removing occupancy limits per state law.
Requirements for PSH or emergency housing that are different than the requirements imposed on housing developments generally (in conflict with RCW 36.130.020)	No.	Spacing and number of occupants is the only limitations set on the use, which is allowed per state law.	No action is necessary.
Other restrictions specific to emergency shelters, emergency housing, transitional housing and permanent supportive housing	No.	None.	No action is necessary, although Poulsbo may provide for streamlining of requirements and permitting.
Checklist for Local Option Tools for Addressing Affordable Housing Funding Gaps			
Local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps*	Implementation status		Plans for implementation
Housing and related services sales tax (RCW 82.14.530)	City Council passed a local tax pursuant to 82.14.530 on 7/15/21. It went into effect Jan 1 2022.		Ongoing.
Affordable housing property tax levy (RCW 84.52.105)	Poulsbo does not do this.		Poulsbo has no plan to do this at this time.
REET 2 (RCW 82.46.035) – GMA jurisdictions only and only available through 2025	Poulsbo does not do this.		Poulsbo has no plan to do this at this time.
Affordable Housing Sales Tax Credit (RCW 82.14.540) – was only available to jurisdictions through July 2020	Poulsbo does not do this.		The opportunity to do this has ended.
Lodging Tax (RCW 67.28.150 and RCW 67.28.160) to repay general obligation bonds or revenue bonds	Poulsbo does not do this.		Poulsbo has no plan to do this at this time.
Mental Illness and Drug Dependency Tax (RCW 82.14.460) – jurisdictions with a population over 30,000	Poulsbo does not do this.		Poulsbo is under 30,000 residents.
Donating surplus public lands for affordable housing projects (RCW 39.33.015)	Poulsbo has developed the Nordic Cottages project in collaboration with Housing Kitsap, on city owned property. Additional surplus land was allocated for affordable housing in 2020.		Nordic Cottages was intended to be a project that could be replicated on other city owned parcels.
Impact fee waivers for affordable housing projects (RCW 82.02.060)	Poulsbo does not do this.		Poulsbo Council declared its intent to adopt a utility connection fee waiver program as part of Resolution 2022-14 (passed July 7, 2022)
Application fee waivers or other benefits for affordable housing projects (RCW 36.70A.540)	Poulsbo does not do this.		Poulsbo Council declared its intent to adopt a utility connection fee waiver program as part of Resolution 2022-14 (passed July 7, 2022)
Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE) with affordable housing requirement (RCW 84.14)	Poulsbo does not do this.		Poulsbo will consider this in 2025.
General funds (including levy lid lifts to increase funds available)	Poulsbo does not do this.		Poulsbo has no plan to do this at this time.