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BACKGROUND

Chapter 21 of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu (ROH), Land Use Ordinance (LUO), was originally adopted in 1986 by Ordinance No. 86-96, replacing the Comprehensive Zoning Code which had regulated land use and development on Oahu since its adoption in 1969. Between 1986 and 1999, the LUO was amended more than 40 times with major and minor additions and revisions. In 1999, the City and County of Honolulu (City) enacted the first comprehensive overhaul of the LUO through Ordinance 99-12, which resulted in the LUO format that we are familiar with today. Since the 1999 revision, the LUO has again been subject to numerous, incremental amendments, 40 in total through 2018, to clarify content, respond to changing conditions, address new needs and opportunities and improve regulatory processes.

PROJECT PURPOSE AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The City’s Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP) is undertaking the current “LUO Update Project” (“project” or “LUO Update”). The intention is to conduct a comprehensive review of the LUO and make recommendations that will make the LUO more internally consistent, user friendly and relevant to contemporary land use issues and challenges facing the City.

The purpose of the project is to ensure that the LUO embodies the following guiding principles:

- Conforms with all City, State, and Federal laws, including case law;
- Implements the policies of the City’s General Plan (GP), Development Plans (DPs), and Sustainable Community Plans (SCPs), as well as adopted neighborhood and community development and revitalization plans;
- Anticipates changes associated with climate change and sea level rise (SLR) and technological advances in the multi-modal transportation and building sectors;
- Reaffirms the City's commitment to an age-friendly and socially just city in its approach to facilitating housing and public space development;
- Preserves and protects important environmental, cultural, and historic resources, including agricultural lands;
- Respects current decision-making processes and existing permit approvals;
- Improves the clarity of development standards and definitions via improved text, formatting, organization, and graphic representations; and
- Reflects a regulatory philosophy that provides predictability in requirements and decision-making, as well as flexibility in responding to unique or atypical situations.
METHODOLOGY

The City hired R. M. Towill Corporation (RMTC) to undertake Phase 1 of the project, which includes outreach to stakeholders (City and State of Hawaii [State] government agencies, consulting firms, professional and non-governmental organizations, major landowners, and developers), coupled with an independent technical analysis to develop preliminary, recommendations for LUO revisions, culminating in the development of this Final LUO Update Phase I Recommendations Report (“report”).

Stakeholder outreach included invitations to more than 70 City and State government agencies, consulting firms, professional and non-governmental organizations, major landowners, and developers. More than 40 stakeholders provided comments in writing, through face-to-face interviews or through group listening sessions conducted for the project. The DPP also collected recommendations and conducted interviews with various City agencies and Councilmembers. In addition, five professional organizations, the American Planning Association (APA) - Hawaii Chapter, the American Institute of Architects (AIA) Honolulu, the Hawaii Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA), the Building Industry Association of Hawaii (BIA) and the National Association of Industrial and Office Properties (NAIOP) Hawaii, established working groups tasked with providing DPP input for the project.

In the fall of 2018, RMTC submitted a Stakeholder Data Compilation and Summary #2 Report (identified in the scope of work as Deliverable B.5) to the DPP which provided a status update of stakeholder outreach efforts, as well as a summary and compilation of stakeholder comments that were received during the months of March to November 2018. The Stakeholder Data Compilation and Summary #2 Report contains meeting minutes from listening sessions held on May 9th and 11th; meeting minutes from face-to-face and phone interviews; reports and memos from local chapters of APA, AIA, ASLA, BIA and NAIOP working groups; a summary of references that were provided by stakeholders; a qualitative summary of the comments received, organized by Article; and a “Master Table of Comments,” which is a comprehensive catalog of comments (near verbatim) that were received by stakeholders, organized by LUO Articles 1-10, with reference to the source of the comment and the topic. Essentially, it represents the “raw data,” prior to RMTC undertaking an independent technical analysis.

Recommendations in this report were then developed through an evaluation of stakeholder input combined with an independent technical analysis which involved contrasting the LUO and stakeholder input against best zoning and land use practices documented in professional literature and in zoning regulations from other municipalities in Hawaii and on the mainland. The technical analysis included creating a rigorous screening process, in which stakeholder comments were
organized by topic, consolidated and evaluated alongside various criteria to ensure that recommendations are relevant to the LUO, support the guiding principles of the LUO Update project, and are in agreement with best planning practices.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations in this report are organized by the following topics, presented alphabetically:

- Administration and Approval Process
- Affordability and Diversity of Housing
- Age-Friendly and Socially-Just City
- Climate Change, Adaptation and Resiliency
- Definitions
- Development Standards and Zoning Districts
- Green Infrastructure and Landscaping
- Nonconformities
- Signs
- Special Districts
- Special Uses
- Transportation Choices
- User-Friendly LUO

Some topics which are more complex are broken down further into sub-topics. For each topic and / or sub-topic, an overview of the issue is provided, including why it is important to Honolulu, and how it is currently addressed in the LUO and / or in City plans and policies. Also listed are recommendations and a list of supporting references.

NEXT STEPS

This report and the Stakeholder Data Compilation and Summary #2 Report are intended to document the extensive participatory process of this project and serve as a public reference document and key resource to be used by City agencies, civil servants, policy makers, elected officials, stakeholders who participated in its preparation, and the residents of Oahu (i.e. “users” of the LUO). The report and Stakeholder Data Compilation and Summary #2 Report reflect the diversity of input based on various perspectives and experiences that individuals and organizations have with the planning and regulation of land use on Oahu.

This report and Stakeholder Data Compilation and Summary #2 Report will serve as a resource during the subsequent future phases of the project, and the eventual rewriting and reorganization of the LUO. Future phases of the project involve drafting proposed amendments, which will eventually be submitted to the City Council for review and adoption. It should be noted that the recommendations in this report are put forth by RMTC and have not been endorsed or vetted by DPP. Additional research will be required in subsequent phases to ensure that proposed amendments to the LUO are legally sound. Future phases are based on available funding;
given competing funding interests, this project will move ahead incrementally with proposed amendments submitted to the City Council as they are completed. Outreach and communications with stakeholders will occur at every phase of the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AARP</td>
<td>American Association of Retired Persons</td>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
<td>FBC</td>
<td>Form-based Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADU</td>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Unit</td>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-1</td>
<td>Restricted Agricultural District</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG-2</td>
<td>General Agricultural District</td>
<td>HRS</td>
<td>Hawaii Revised Statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHR</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Requirement</td>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>American Institute of Architects</td>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>Limited Industrial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI</td>
<td>Area Median Income</td>
<td>I-2</td>
<td>Intensive Industrial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMX</td>
<td>Apartment Mixed Use District</td>
<td>I-3</td>
<td>Waterfront Industrial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA</td>
<td>American Planning Association</td>
<td>IMX-1</td>
<td>Industrial-Commercial Mixed Use District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLA</td>
<td>American Society of Landscape Architects</td>
<td>IPD-T</td>
<td>Interim Planned Development – Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;Bs</td>
<td>Bed and Breakfast</td>
<td>LPU</td>
<td>Land Use Ordinance, ROH Chapter 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>Building Industry Association</td>
<td>LUPD</td>
<td>Land Use Permits Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>Best Management Practices</td>
<td>LEO Update</td>
<td>LUO Update Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX-3</td>
<td>Community Business Mixed Use District</td>
<td>NAIOP</td>
<td>National Association of Industrial and Office Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX-4</td>
<td>Central Business Mixed Use District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>City and County of Honolulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>Conditional Use Permit</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBEDT</td>
<td>Department of Business, Economic, Development and Tourism, State</td>
<td>NFIP</td>
<td>National Flood Insurance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLU</td>
<td>Department of Land Utilization, City</td>
<td>NUC</td>
<td>Nonconforming Use Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Development Plan</td>
<td>OCCCSR</td>
<td>Office of Climate Change, Sustainability and Resiliency, City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPP</td>
<td>Department of Planning and Permitting, City</td>
<td>OP-CZM</td>
<td>Office of Planning, Coastal Zone Management Program, State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Department of Parks and Recreation, City</td>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>Restricted Preservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>Department of Transportation Services, City</td>
<td>P-2</td>
<td>General Preservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUP</td>
<td>Existing Use Permit</td>
<td>PD-H</td>
<td>Planned Development-Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>Military and Federal Preservation Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Portable Document Format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRD</td>
<td>Public Review Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>LVO Update Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUC</td>
<td>Primary Urban Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>Photovoltaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>LVO Update Phase I Recommendations Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMTC</td>
<td>R. M. Towill Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROH</td>
<td>Revised Ordinances of Honolulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>Sustainable Community Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Special District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLR</td>
<td>Sea Level Rise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>State of Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDR</td>
<td>Transfer of Development Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD</td>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVUs</td>
<td>Temporary Vacation Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDP</td>
<td>Urban Design Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZBA</td>
<td>Zoning Board of Appeals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND

Chapter 21 of the ROH, LUO, was originally adopted in 1986 by Ordinance No. 86-96, replacing the Comprehensive Zoning Code which had regulated land use and development on Oahu since its adoption in 1969. Between 1986 and 1999, the LUO was amended more than 40 times with major and minor additions and revisions. In 1999, the City enacted the first comprehensive overhaul of the LUO through Ordinance 99-12, which resulted in the LUO format that we are familiar with today. The 1999 LUO Update is the only comprehensive revision to the LUO since it was adopted in 1986.

The 1999 LUO Update recommendations are documented in a Report on the Proposed Streamlining Amendments to the Land Use Ordinance (“1998 LUO Report”) prepared in June 1998 by Kusao and Kurahashi, Inc. working with attorneys McCriston Miho Miller and Mukai. The goals of the 1998 LUO Report were to 1) simplify and reduce the time it takes to complete the application and review process; 2) reduce the number and the types of applications; and 3) refine the Department of Land Utilization’s (DLU) role in the permit process by eliminating unnecessary regulation enforced by the DLU. Generally, the proposed amendments:

- Established a two-tiered application processes: a “major” permit process that requires a public hearing and maximum processing time of 45-days to complete;
- Changed certain uses which previously required conditional use permits (CUPs) into permitted uses subject to conditions;
- Increased the number of items which qualify for a zoning adjustment, thereby allowing minor deviations from the LUO without requiring an applicant to go through a four to six month zoning variance process;
- Reduced the number of categories for off-street parking requirements;
- Increased the number of permitted uses, and uses with conditions, in the various zoning districts; and
- Reorganized the LUO into a more user-friendly format through substantial re-ordering of the specific Articles and Sections (Sec.).

The following proposed amendments from the 1998 LUO Report were adopted, and have still not been incorporated into the LUO:

- Elimination of the Planned Development-Housing (PD-H) application.
- Deletion of non-LUO requirements and regulations listed in the LUO, which are regulated by other governmental entities.
For example, Sec. 5.100(a), “Cemeteries and columbaria” requires a Board of Water Supply certificate of approval for a cemetery.

- Amendments to Sec. 4.110-1, “Nonconforming Use Certificates for Transient Vacation Units” and Sec. 4.110-2, “Bed and Breakfast Homes-Nonconforming use certificates” to include the following:
  - Commensurate increase in processing fees so that there is no loss in revenue for the City.
  - A late fee penalty will be established for late renewals.
- Eliminate Street Tree plans in the Community Business Mixed Use District (BMX-3), as listed in Sec. 3.120-2(c)(6), “Business mixed use district uses and development standards.”

Since the 1999 revision, the LVO has again been subject to additional, incremental amendments, 40 in total through 2018, to clarify content, respond to changing conditions, address new needs and opportunities and improve regulatory processes. LUO amendments are a necessary and standard practice to address errors and omissions in the LUO, resolve procedural inefficiencies that become apparent over time, and accommodate new conditions. However, ad hoc amendments can eventually result in inconsistencies, redundancies and conflicts in LUO language, standards and procedures, with the effect of creating inefficiencies in the interpretation and application of the regulations.

To remain relevant and effective, the LUO requires another comprehensive update to resolve outdated concepts and procedures and to simplify and restore the LUO in a way that cannot be accomplished effectively through incremental changes. More importantly, the LUO must be refreshed to serve the contemporary development needs of the community, to ensure that we are addressing current opportunities and challenges such as adaptation and resiliency to climate change and SLR, housing affordability, an aging population, walkable communities, new models of health care and alternative modes of transportation, and to ensure that we are staying ahead of emerging and potential new trends and technologies, such as the sharing economy (in transportation, housing and workplaces), urban agriculture and food hubs, and autonomous vehicles.

**PURPOSE**

The DPP is undertaking the current project with the intent to make the LUO more internally consistent, user friendly and relevant to contemporary land use issues, opportunities and challenges facing the City.

The purpose of the project is to ensure that the LUO embodies the following guiding principles:

- Conforms with all City, State, and Federal laws, including case law;
• Implements the policies of the City's GP, DPs, and SCPs, as well as adopted neighborhood and community development and revitalization plans;
• Anticipates changes associated with climate change and SLR and technological advances in the multi-modal transportation and building sectors;
• Reaffirms the City's commitment to an age-friendly and socially just city in its approach to facilitating housing and public space development;
• Preserves and protects important environmental, cultural, and historic resources, including agricultural lands;
• Respects current decision-making processes and existing permit approvals;
• Improves the clarity of development standards and definitions via improved text, formatting, organization, and graphic representations; and
• Reflects a regulatory philosophy that provides predictability in requirements and decision-making, as well as flexibility in responding to unique or atypical situations.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations are an outcome of the City’s overarching goals, stakeholder comments, and the technical analysis process. The recommendations are organized by LUY-related topics and sub-topics that address existing LUY issues (e.g. Administration and Approval Process, Definitions, Format and Organization), as well as look forward to ensure the LUY addresses future issues (e.g. Affordability and Diversity of Housing, Climate Change, Adaptation and Resiliency). Main topics are organized alphabetically; however, sub-topics are organized intuitively.
RECOMMENDATIONS

TOPICS

Recommendations are organized by the following topics and are presented alphabetically in the report. Some topics which are more complex are broken down further into sub-topics, which are organized intuitively. Each topic is coded with a unique color to simplify navigation through the report.

- **ADMINISTRATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS**
  - Permit Types
  - Review Times
- **AFFORDABILITY AND DIVERSITY OF HOUSING**
- **AGE-FRIENDLY AND SOCIALLY-JUST CITY**
- **CLIMATE CHANGE, ADAPTATION AND RESILIENCY**
  - Flood Hazards
  - Renewable Energy
  - Resiliency Ordinance
  - Transfer of Development Rights and Managed Retreat
- **DEFINITIONS**
- **DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND ZONING DISTRICTS**
  - All Zoning Districts
  - Agricultural Districts
  - Apartment and Apartment Mixed Use Districts
  - Business and Business Mixed Use Districts
  - Industrial Districts and Industrial-Commercial Mixed Use Districts
  - Preservation Districts
  - Residential Districts
  - Master Use Table
- **GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND LANDSCAPING**
  - Green Infrastructure
  - Landscape Standards
  - Tree Standards
  - Parking
- **NONCONFORMITIES**
  - Vacation Rentals
- **SIGNS**
- **SPECIAL DISTRICTS**
- **SPECIAL USES**
- **TRANSPORTATION CHOICES**
  - Off-street Parking and Loading Requirements
  - Multimodal Transportation and Transit-Oriented Development
  - Complete Streets and Pedestrian Experience
  - Future Technology
- **USER-FRIENDLY LUO**
  - Format and Organization
  - Language
  - Graphics
  - Digital
For each topic and/or sub-topic, a brief overview of the issue is provided, including why the topic and/or sub-topic is important to Honolulu and how it is currently addressed in the LUO and/or in City plans and policies. The recommendations listed are a result of stakeholder input combined with an independent technical analysis, which involved a review of best zoning and land use practices cited in professional literature and zoning regulations from other municipalities. The references listed, reflect in part the resources utilized in the independent technical analysis to develop the recommendations. Hyperlinked references are provided where available.

Many of the topics are interrelated as is occasionally acknowledged in the topic overview; therefore the listed recommendations in one topic may be pertinent to another. However, recommendations generally were only listed once, for sake of brevity.

It should be noted that the recommendations in this report are put forth by RMTC and have not been endorsed or vetted by DPP. Additional research, analysis and rationale will be required in subsequent phases of the project and during the drafting of the proposed LUO amendments, to ensure that the implementation of amendments are legally sound and the administration of the new LUO will not create internal conflicts.
The purpose of the LUO is to regulate land use in a manner that encourages orderly development in accordance with adopted land use policies to promote and protect public health, safety, and welfare. As such, the LUO is not a static document, but must be dynamic and adaptable to respond to changes in society and to emerging and foreseeable challenges that affect our quality of life and the resources that we value. The DPP is responsible for the City’s long-range planning, community planning efforts, administration and enforcement of ordinances and regulations governing the development and use of land, various codes pertaining to the construction of buildings, and City standards and regulations pertaining to infrastructure requirements.

Within the DPP, the Land Use Permits Division (LUPD) is primarily responsible for interpreting and administering the set of regulations pertaining to zoning and land uses within the City. To perform this function, the LUPD uses an array of discretionary land use permits codified in the LUO. Ministerial permits, such as building permits, are processed by the DPP’s, Building Division; however, the LUPD’s expertise and concurrence is often required prior to approval. All of the permits listed in the LUO are discretionary permits, and include, but are not limited to Zoning Adjustments, Zone Changes, Waivers, Existing Use Permits, Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) – minor and major, Special District Permits (SD) – minor and major, Plan Review Uses (PRUs), and PD-H.

Each year, the LUPD processes hundreds of land use permits. Additionally, review and approval from the Planning Commission and the City Council is also required for certain permit applications. The Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) was authorized by Sec. 6-1516 and 6-1517 of the Revised Charter of the City and County of Honolulu 1973 (2000 Edition and 2017 Edition), as a check on the DPP Director’s discretionary authority. The ZBA hears and determines appeals from the actions of the DPP Director in the administration of the LUO, including variances therefrom, subdivision ordinances and any rules and regulations adopted pursuant to either, including approvals and denials of land use permit applications.

The LUO has been amended by various ordinances over the years to adapt to the changing needs of Oahu and its residents. Amendments may be initiated by either the City Council or by the DPP. The LUO requires updates to various existing administrative and permit application procedures, to provide greater convenience, flexibility, and clarity, in an effort to encourage new development that enhances the City’s character and is compatible with existing neighborhoods.
PERMIT TYPES

ABOUT THE ISSUE
The LUO should serve to clearly inform the general public about the purpose of the various permit types and associated processing and approval requirements. There exist uncertainties in the processing procedures and review criteria for certain discretionary permits which cause confusion due to insufficient and / or vague information. These uncertainties accumulate in time-consuming, inefficient and costly review for both the applicant and DPP. To create a more streamlined permitting process, clarity in the permit application processing procedures and review criteria are needed. Additionally, flexibility and leniency in certain discretionary permits is needed through the expansion of permissible minor permits and / or the establishment of exemptions / exceptions from certain criteria.

RECOMMENDATIONS
General:
- Ensure that every permit type has review criteria for approval and update the existing criteria.
- Consider allowing minor modifications to minor permits.

Conditional Use Permit:
- Consider regulating certain uses under a CUP (minor) instead of CUP (major). For example, certain uses such as “Group living facilities” should be exempt from a Neighborhood Board presentation and / or a public hearing, dependent on the type of facility and the need for confidentiality of the residents; therefore, these uses might be better regulated under a CUP (major).

Zoning Adjustment and Waiver:
- In Sec. 21-2.140-1, “Specific circumstances,” clarify the language under specific circumstances, and add a circumstance to include an adjustment for the minimum lot area for one and two-family detached dwellings and other uses.
- Consider allowing minor “dimensional variances” to be regulated under a Zoning Adjustment or Waiver. The purpose of a Zoning Adjustment and Waiver is to allow certain developments that deviate from the strict literal interpretation or application of the LUO standards, to provide flexibility for unusual situations.

Temporary Uses:
- In Sec. 21-1.60, “Temporary uses,” define the processing procedures and review criteria, and relocate the entire section to Article 2.
>> REVIEW TIMES

ABOUT THE ISSUE
Lengthy permitting processes result in delays and add expenses to construction costs and have an adverse effect on general economic conditions. Almost all the discretionary permits have specific review deadlines. Generally, a decision on a completed application is generated within 45 days for a minor permit and 90 days for a major permit. However, to ensure smoother flow and timely development review processes, there needs to be consistent permits review processing and approval criteria for application review and approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Recommendations related to permit application processing times include the following:

- Establish a clear timeline and expedite the application processing time for minor modifications.
- The timeline for Planned Development Permits should be the same as major permits.

REFERENCES
The provision of affordable housing is essential in every community. It is important to provide affordable homes for individuals from all walks of life. Housing affordability is also an important component of creating a socially just and age-friendly City, as rising rent and house prices threaten individuals’ ability to afford other basic human needs such as nutrition and healthcare. The need for affordable housing is critical in Hawaii, as we have the highest rate of homelessness. This is in part due to the phenomenon of Hawaii’s single family home prices and rents being the highest in the nation, coupled with 75 percent of extremely low-income households paying more than half of their income in rent (Hawaii Appleseed, 2017). According to the U.S. Census Bureau, housing is considered affordable when housing costs are 30 percent or less of a household’s income (Hawaii Appleseed, 2014).

Common strategies and mechanisms often used by policymakers to increase the production of affordable housing include incentivizing development of units through the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program; implementing inclusionary zoning policies; (re)developing housing units on relatively inexpensive land on the urban fringe; and increasing the allowable density in the urban core. Many of these strategies and mechanisms have already been implemented by State or City departments.

The provisions in the LOU that encourage the production of affordable housing largely center on increasing the allowable density and encouraging diverse housing types (in certain zoning districts), including but not limited to the following:

- **Sec. 21-2.80, “Conditional zoning – Agreements”** – which allows the City to impose conditions on applicants for a Zone Change, subject to City Council Resolution 09-241 CD1 and the City’s *Affordable Housing Rules for Unilateral Agreements*, adopted February 12, 2010.

- **Sec. 21-5.720, “Accessory dwelling units”** – permits accessory dwelling units (ADUs) – or smaller homes that are built adjacent to a principle home, in the Country and Residential Districts, for the purpose of increasing the number of affordable rental units to alleviate the housing shortage.

- **Sec. 21-8.20, “Housing – Ohana dwellings”** – encourages the development of ohana dwellings in Residential, Country or Agricultural Districts; ohana dwellings are meant to accommodate extended family living, without substantially altering existing neighborhood character.

- **Sec. 21-9.100-5(b)(1)(D), “Interim planned development – transit (IPD-T) projects – Standards for review”** – encourages the development of affordable for-sale and rental housing and public housing projects
for Interim Planned Development – Transit (IPD-T) projects, or projects within a one-half mile radius of a future rail station, as identified in the Honolulu Rail Transit Project’s Environmental Impact Statement (2010), in exchange for increased development potential.

- Sec. 21-9.100-8(a)(1)(E)(iii), “General requirements and development standards – Site Development and Design Standards – Density and height” – encourages the development of affordable for-sale and rental housing within the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) SD in exchange for height or density bonuses. Related, in Sec. 21-9.100-10(d)(6), “Planned development – Transit (PD-T) projects – Application Requirements,” public amenities and “community benefits” are encouraged, including affordable housing, for Planned development–Transit projects.

While the LUO currently allows for diverse housing types and innovative residential development, such as the aforementioned ADUs, ohana dwellings, IPD-T projects, TOD projects, as well as farm dwellings, joint development, cluster development, zero lot line development, PD-H development, and the development of up to eight dwelling units on single lot in a Country or Residential Districts, the LUO could further encourage and allow innovative housing types, in an effort to address the affordable housing crisis.

Currently, there are several City and State regulations and initiatives that mandate and / or incentivize the development of affordable for-sale and rental units in Honolulu, as discussed below.

In 2006, the Hawaii Revised Statues (HRS), Chapter 201H was enacted, which allows certain affordable housing projects to be exempt from development standards, such as parking, maximum height and density requirements. The DPP processes 201H permit applications, pursuant to HRS, Chapter 201H and Title 20 Administrative Rules of DPP, Chapter 25, “Part 5 – 201H Housing Program Rules”, on behalf of the Hawaii Housing Finance and Development Corporation. These affordable housing projects need to provide at least 30 units; provide a varying percentage of affordable units for households whose incomes are 120 percent or less of Honolulu’s area median income (AMI), as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD); and need to remain affordable for a minimum period of 30 years.

On February 16, 2017, Mayor Kirk Caldwell delivered his fifth annual State of the City Address, in which he mentioned that Honolulu needs 24,000 new housing units, and 75 percent of those units (18,000) should be affordable rental units for households earning 80 percent or below of the AMI.

In April 2018, Ordinance 18-10 was passed, which established an affordable housing requirement (AHR) that requires
development projects with 10 units or more to provide a varying percentage of affordable for-sale units for households earning 120 percent or less of the AMI and affordable rental units for households earning 80 percent or less of the AMI. The DPP is in the process of adopting rules to implement Ordinance 18-10; draft rules, dated October 19, 2018 are on DPP’s website.

In July 2018, the Department of Business, Economic, Development and Tourism’s Office of Planning (DBEDT-OP) published an Affordable Rental Housing Report and Ten-Year Plan (“Ten-Year Plan”), in accordance with Act 127 signed by Governor David Y. Ige on June 29, 2016, which established a goal of developing 22,500 affordable rental units statewide by December 31, 2026. The DBEDT-OP’s Ten-Year Plan further specified the housing production goals for distinct HUD income groups. The goal for Honolulu is to develop 9,002 new affordable rental units, with 3,900 of those units targeted for households earning 50 percent or less than the AMI.

For reference and perspective, according to HUD’s 2018 income limits for Honolulu, a one-person household earning $65,350 and a two-person household earning $74,650 is considered a “low-income” household, earning 80 percent of the AMI. In contrast, a one-person household earning $40,850 and a two-person household earning $46,650 is considered a “very low income household”, earning 50 percent of the AMI (HUD, 2018). It is clear that there are not enough affordable housing units for “very low income” households in Hawaii. Furthermore, for every 100 “extremely low-income” household, earning less than 30 percent of the AMI, there are only 29 affordable units (Hawaii Appleseed, 2014). While the aforementioned City and State regulations and initiatives aim to mandate and / or incentivize the development of affordable for-sale and rental units in Honolulu, the LUO could further incentivize the development of affordable for-sale and rental units in for households earning 50 percent or less than the AMI, in an effort to address the affordable housing crisis.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations to encourage the production of affordable and diverse housing include the following:

- Consider adjusting certain development standards (maximum height, maximum density, yard setbacks and off-street parking requirements) in certain zoning districts to facilitate the (re)development of underutilized lots, thereby directly and indirectly increasing the supply of affordable, infill housing within Honolulu’s urban core. This might be possible via a Zoning Adjustment or Waiver process.
- Expand and further encourage the development of ADUs by allowing ADUs in zoning districts other than Country and Residential Districts; adjusting and clarifying the existing development standards and
regulations for ADU development. For example, consider increasing the maximum size of ADUs to 600 sf on lots with an area of 3,500 to 4,999 sf, and 1,000 sf on lots with an area of 5,000 sf or more, as listed in Sec. 21-5.720(c)(1), “Accessory dwelling units.” This might be possible via a Zoning Adjustment or Waiver process.

- Consider creating affordable housing / mixed income housing as a “use” in Table 21-3, “Master Use Table,” which could be allowed with a CUP (minor) in certain zoning districts.
- Encourage the development of innovative and diverse housing types, such as micro-units, cottage clusters and small lot development.
- Amend Ordinance 18-10 or provide additional provisions in the LUO to incentivize the development of for-sale and rental units for households earning 50 percent and below the AMI.
- For the TOD SD, provide more detailed definition and examples of “community benefits,” as listed in Sec. 21-9.100-8(a)(1)(E).

Add a note in Sec. 21-5.720, “Accessory dwelling units” that the application processing procedures for ADUs are similar to ohana dwellings, and / or consider relocating Sec. 21-5.720, “Accessory dwelling units” to Article 8.

REFERENCES

Units: Expanding Affordable Housing Options in Hawaii.

An age-friendly and socially just city is pedestrian-friendly and provides easy access to housing, transportation, goods and services, to individuals of all ages and abilities.

Hawaii’s mature population (65 years and over), is expected to increase by 3.3 percent annually until 2030. The expected projection in 2030 for Hawaii’s mature population is 22.6 percent over the total population up from 17.1 percent in 2016, and is likely to increase to 23.8 percent by 2045 (DBEDT, 2018). The City has been taken initiatives in ensuring that Oahu accommodates its aging population. In 2013, the City was accepted into the World Health Organization’s (WHO) Global Network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities and the American Association of Retired Persons’ (AARP) National Network of Age-Friendly Communities. In 2015, the City published *Making Honolulu an Age-Friendly City: An Action Plan* with several working groups, as an initiative to becoming age-friendly and address issues related to Oahu’s progressively aging population (City, 2015). In 2016, the City’s *Honolulu’s Complete Streets Design Manual* was published, and includes recommendations on how to create age-friendly streetscapes.

The LUO currently acknowledges Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and provides exceptions for development on nonconforming uses and structures that include work required to comply with ADA requirements.

Additionally, the LUO currently allows “Group Living Facilities” in certain zoning districts, subject to the approval of a CUP (major). The LUO could be updated to further encourage development that is accessible, convenient, safe and comfortable for all ages and abilities. For example, the LUO could further encourage integrated uses and mixed use development and pedestrian-friendly streets that may make it less challenging for mature adults and people with disabilities to live or remain within their desired community as their needs change.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The recommendations related to the creation of an age-friendly and socially just city include the following:

- Redefining several definitions in Article 10 to reflect the changes in the healthcare industry.
- Allow greater flexibility in the development of certain types of “Group living facilities.” For example, remove the 1,000-foot buffer (as listed in Sec. 21-5.290, “Group living facilities.”) for student housing near a University or elderly housing near a hospital, if it is determined that the facility will not have an adverse impact on the permitted uses in the area.
REFERENCES

In 2017, the *Hawaii Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Adaptation Report* was published to provide a basis for recommendations on reducing exposure and increasing adaptability to the impacts of SLR resulting from human-generated global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Research within the report notes that the intensity and frequency of natural disasters have increased and will continue to do so, and further provides technical projections of areas along the coast that are vulnerable to SLR based on the latest available science. The report includes recommendations to address risks associated with climate change.

Subsequently, Directive No. 18-01, “City and County of Honolulu Actions to Address Climate Change and Sea Level Rise” was issued on July 16, 2018 by Mayor Kirk Caldwell. It advises that climate change be treated as an “urgent matter” and to develop land use policies, building codes, and hazard mitigation actions to prevent the adverse impacts caused by climate change and SLR in accordance with the findings and recommendations of the City Climate Change Commission 2018 Sea Level Rise Guidance and accompanying Climate Change Brief and the 2017 State report.

The Office of Climate Change, Sustainability and Resiliency (OCCSR), established by City Charter in 2016, is responsible for leading the City’s effort to formalize a Climate Action Plan, which is currently being prepared.

As a part of its long-range planning effort, DPP has integrated a call for the analysis of and planning for the impacts of climate change and SLR into all DPs and SCPs updated within the last five years. DPs and SCPs currently in the process of being updated will also incorporate these themes.

Honolulu’s coastal areas will be most vulnerable to the effects of climate change and SLR. HRS, Chapter 205A, “Coastal Zone Management Act” was enacted to manage and protect the State’s coastal areas and resources. The law established the shoreline setbacks and the Special Management Area (SMA) and authorized counties to develop and administer permitting systems to control development within these areas to meet the purposes of HRS Chapter 205A. CCH asserts this authority through ROH, Chapter 23, “Shoreline Setbacks” and Chapter 25, “Special Management Area”. Chapter 23 defines requirements for activities within the shoreline setback area, which is designated as 40 feet from the certified shoreline. Activities within the shoreline setback area require approval of a Shoreline Setback Variance by DPP. The SMA is a regulated zone extending inland from the shoreline to a landward boundary delineated by CCH that varies from a few dozen feet to more than a mile. Activities within the SMA require approval of a SMA permit by DPP. It is within these two chapters of ROH that SLR would be governed directly.
The concept of climate change is not explicitly incorporated in the LUO. However, there are existing issues related to climate change, such as flood hazards and renewable energy that can be expanded upon within the LUO to include climate change and resiliency-related concepts. It is recommended that DPP follow the efforts of the State, City administration, and OCCSR as they form an official policy regarding land use regulation in the context of climate change.

While the Climate Action Plan is being formalized, the following section includes recommendations and best practices that could be incorporated into the LUO in the short-term. Because climate change data is always evolving, recommendations are intended to allow DPP’s flexibility while also addressing climate change impacts that the island is experiencing in the present.

Notably, smart growth and compact city models are well-documented and regarded as development strategies that contribute to making neighborhoods more resilient to current and projected climate change impacts. Features of smart growth include allowing a mix of uses in zoning districts such as downtowns and around transit centers to encourage a pedestrian-friendly environment and multi-modal transportation, higher density, complete streets design standards, landscaping and shade tree standards, cool paving and roof standards, low impact development strategies, and more. Smart growth development patterns, which focus on development in the urban core, would also allow for preservation of agriculture lands, which further contributes to Oahu’s resiliency. For the purposes of this report, these subjects will be addressed in their respective topic areas to prevent redundancies, and will be understood as strategies that contribute to overall resiliency of the City.

>> FLOOD HAZARDS

ABOUT THE ISSUE
The 2017 Hawaii Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Adaptation Report finds that for Oahu, with no mitigative actions, 3.2 feet of SLR and its associated erosion, flooding, and waves will have significant impacts to the island’s land, building and land values, residents, structures, and major roadways. ROH, Chapter 21A, “Flood Hazards”, regulates development within flood hazard areas and allows the City to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the agency charged with administering the NFIP, uses historic flood data to determine where minimum regulations must be imposed. While flood hazards are not directly governed through the LUO, there is an opportunity and need to better address flood hazard and SLR directly.
**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The LUO does not currently reference SLR, nor does it frame flood hazards in the context of climate change. Therefore the following recommendations regarding language could help address this gap:

- Incorporate references to SLR and flood elevation/protection into specific articles, as was incorporated into the Kauai County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, phase 1 update (December 3, 2012).

**REFERENCES**

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2017, January). *Smart Growth Fixes for Climate Adaptation and Resilience (EPA 231-R-17-001).*

**>> RENEWABLE ENERGY**

**ABOUT THE ISSUE**

In 2015, Hawaii became the first state to require 100 percent renewable power supply by year 2045 (Act 97, SLH 2015, “Relating to Renewable Standards”). Meanwhile, commercial and residential renewable energy systems have become a more mainstream method of generating electricity. According to Hawaiian Electric Company, as of December 31, 2018, there were a total of 53,123 solar photovoltaic (PV) systems installed across the island, 96 percent of which were on residential properties and 4 percent of which were on commercial properties.

Given state and county goals for renewable energy and the momentum to develop utility-scale renewable energy projects and user-based installations (such as rooftop solar PV panels and batteries), as well as recent efforts to plan and provide for a future of electric vehicles, the LUO should promote or remove constraints to the provision of renewable energy.

While the LUO does not regulate building or energy code requirements and therefore cannot mandate “solar-ready” buildings (which have been adopted into the building codes of numerous other municipalities), there is certainly room for the LUO to incentivize the use of such construction standards as an aim to lower costs, contribute to overall sustainability, and meet State and City renewable energy goals.
RECOMMENDATIONS

- Refine the definition, clarify the use, and revise the development standards of “solar collectors.”
- Expand the definition of “wind machines.”
- Encourage users to incorporate “solar-ready” building standards.
- Change permitting requirements for utility-scale PV.
- Incorporate language for consideration and requirements for off-street electric vehicle parking.
- Incentivize the installation of green roofs and green infrastructure.
- Establish a consistent height extension above the height limit (for example, 12 feet), for energy-savings devices located on rooftops.

REFERENCES

DEFINITIONS

It is important for users of the LUO to have a clear understanding of the terminology/terms and land use concepts that are used in the LUO. The purpose of a definition is to express the essential nature of that particular term; however, many terms have nuanced definitions based on context and mean different things to different people. In an effort to minimize misinterpretation and misassumptions, it is therefore vital to define as many unique terminology as possible, especially those that are used in unconventional ways. Consequently, accurate definitions are critical to the integrity and usability of the LUO.

Currently, the majority of the definitions in the LUO are provided in Article 10; however, definitions are also interspersed in other articles. Some terms that are currently defined in Article 10 need to be further clarified and/or expanded with additional explanation or examples, due to the convoluted nature of the term/concept or because they need to be updated due to current practices and technology. Some terms are used in the LUO, but are currently not defined. Additionally, terms are occasionally used inconsistently throughout the LUO, which causes confusion. Depending on the proposed amendments to the LUO, additional definitions for new terms may need to be included. Lastly, suggestions are made regarding formatting.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations concerning the update of definitions in the LUO include the following:

- Relocate terms to Article 10, that are currently defined elsewhere in the LUO. For example, all the definitions and general sign standards, as listed in Sec. 21-7.20, “Definitions and general sign standards.”
- Provide additional clarification and/or expand the definitions for terms that are currently defined in Article 10. For example, terms such as “Active agricultural use,” “Amusement facilities, outdoor,” “Bed and breakfast home,” “Duplex unit,” “Floor area ratio (FAR),” and “Grading” could be refined with additional information.
- Provide new definitions for terms that are used throughout the LUO, but that are currently not defined. For example, terms such as “Affordable housing,” “Building envelope,” “Commercial weddings,” “Corner lots,” “Mural,” and “Open space bonus” need to be defined.
- Provide new definitions for terms that are not used in the LUO, but may be, subject to future adopted amendments. For example, “Full-service hotel,” “Limited-service hotel,” “Wet bars,” “Photovoltaic,” “Sea-level rise,” “Solar-ready,” and “Stormwater management” need to be defined.
DEFINITIONS

- Ensure the consistent use of defined and undefined terms throughout the LUO. For example, “Buildable area” and “Buildable area boundary line” should be used consistently.
- Consider formatting changes within Article 10. For example, remove all page references, so to avoid inconsistencies.
- Provide figures for certain defined terms. For example, a figure showing the 5,000 sf boundary on a “Farm dwelling,” as listed in Sec. 21-5.250(b), “Farm dwellings.”
- Incorporate or reference DPP’s interpretation on certain terms, when available.
To carry out the purposes and provisions of the LUO, 26 zoning districts are established in Sec. 21-3.10, “Zoning District Classifications and Map Designations”. Zoning districts are specified into broader classifications based on geographical district: “Preservation”, “Agricultural”, “Country”, “Residential”, “Apartment”, “Apartment Mixed Use”, “Resort”, “Business”, “Business Mixed Use”, “Industrial”, and “Industrial Mixed Use”. Additionally, four zoning classifications within the Waikiki Special District are established in Sec. 21-3.20, “Zoning Precinct Classifications and Map Designations”. Twenty-four Zoning Maps that reflect the zoning designation of each parcel on Oahu are provided in the LUO, Appendix 21-C, “Zoning Maps”. Zoning districts dictate the uses and development standards allowed on a parcel of land. Certain uses allowed within a zoning district are enumerated in Table 21-3, “Master Use Table”. The table organizes uses based certain categories, such as agriculture, animals, commerce and business, dwellings and lodgings, industrial, outdoor recreations, social and civic service, transportation and parking, utilities and communications, and miscellaneous.

Dimensional standards are further established in Sec. 21-4, “General Development Standards” to guide the physical development that occurs on each parcel. General development standards include yards and street setbacks, height limits, landscaping and screening, buffering, noise regulations, outdoor lighting. Development standards are generally articulated for each zoning district, but at times may conflict with Sec. 21-8, “Optional Development Regulations” and Sec. 21-9, “Special District Regulations”, whose development standards take precedence.

Where development is planned to be directed based on the City’s long range development plans, it is recommended that a comprehensive rezoning effort move towards the provision of more mixed use districts for the purposes of fostering more pedestrian-friendly environment whereby commercial uses are conveniently placed in close proximity to residents; facilitating modal choice thereby reducing GHG emissions and addressing climate change adaptation; and, facilitating affordable housing. A rezoning effort should also support the redevelopment of existing lots that are underutilized or deteriorating, and accommodate for infill development. Where the City’s long range plans are directed to preserve natural resources and agricultural land, any revisions to the LUO should reflect these policies.

DPP may also wish to consider revisiting of zoning maps to complement the LUO Update. Additionally, DPP may consider if zone changes are necessary to promulgate the recommendations of the development / sustainable communities plans or which certain areas of the city be rezoned to allow higher density to accommodate population
growth. DPP could begin where the State Land Use classification is already “Urban”.

An inherent outcome of the LUO Update process is the potential to create nonconformities of existing uses and structures through the modification of existing or introduction of new permitted uses and development standards. Any revisions to development standards and zoning districts should therefore be considered with this in mind and also be covered in Sec. 21-4.110, “Nonconformities”.

>> ALL ZONING DISTRICTS

ABOUT THE ISSUE
Outdated or unclear development standards and application requirements that apply to individual or multiple zoning districts should be revised to modernize and streamline the LUO. As the City’s goals and policies have evolved over time, general development standards that reflect such policy evolutions and apply to all or certain zoning districts should be incorporated into the LUO.

RECOMMENDATIONS

• Expand the boundaries of the Mixed Use districts.
• Include new permitted uses and revise existing permitted uses in Table 21-3, “Master Use Table”.
• Consider “up-zoning” neighborhoods in the Primary Urban Center (PUC) to increase allowable density and facilitate the development of residential units.
• Revise height limits for modern equipment, for example industrial equipment, broadcasting antennas, high-speed elevators, harbor cranes, etc.
• Identify methods for determining the building height envelope that account for flat or pitched roofs.
• Revise the floor area ratio (FAR) calculation to account for open space on upper levels and exclude enclosed mechanical spaces.
• Revise general development standards to be consistent with current goals and policies.
• Develop guidance documents with graphic representations for development standards for all zoning districts.
• Ensure that any amendments to development standards do not conflict with ROH, Chapter 16, “Building Code” and consider engaging the DPP, Building Division in review of proposed recommendations.

>> AGRICULTURAL DISTRICTS

ABOUT THE ISSUE
The purpose of the Agricultural Districts is to allow for agricultural operations and accessory agribusiness activities.
Uses include crop production, aquaculture, forestry and other agriculture-related uses. The purpose of the Restricted Agricultural District (AG-1) is to conserve and protect agricultural operations for the production of food, feed, forage, fiber crops and horticultural plants. The purpose of the General Agricultural District (AG-2) is to conserve and protect agricultural uses on smaller parcels.

Various complexities and challenges about Agricultural Districts persist. HRS, Section 11-165, “Right to Farm Act” stipulates that a farming operation may not be declared a nuisance for any reason if the farming operation is conducted consistently with standard, generally accepted agricultural and management practices. At the same time, concerns about the protection of natural resources from pollution and matters of health and safety, such as the pollution of groundwater, continue to be a matter of public concern. Concern also remains about the use of productive agricultural land for non-agriculture uses, such as the construction of gentleman’s homes. However, agricultural workforce housing is needed. Furthermore, in order to preserve agricultural lands for future diversified agricultural uses, additional interim uses, like agrotourism or ecotourism, may be reconsidered for the economic sustainability of the land.

To continue preserving productive agricultural lands for agricultural uses while supporting the economic viability of these uses, protecting the environment, and discouraging the development for large gentlemen estates, development standards, application requirements, and definitions should be clarified and updated.

RECOMMENDATIONS
- Consider clarifying development standards to preserve agricultural lands for agricultural uses and discourage gentlemen estates.
- Increase minimum lot sizes to minimize non-agricultural dwelling use. Or, consider a method of calculating allowable subdivision of agriculture lands as is done on Kauai (Kauai Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, Sec. 8-8.13(b), “Limitations on Subdivisions of Parcels in Agriculture Districts”) and Maui (Maui County Code of Ordinances, Sec. 19-30A.030., “District Standards”)
- Include new uses and revise existing uses and definitions that are permitted in the Table 21-3, “Master Use Table” and Sec. 21-10, “Definitions”.
- Consider various revisions to “farm dwellings”, for example requiring a CUP minor permit or defining / limiting the allowable floor area.
- Include DPP interpretation on which accessory uses are permitted on Agriculturally-zoned districts.
- Consider requiring a farm plan, as is done in Maui County.
DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND ZONING DISTRICTS

- Research and examine the relationship between the “Right to Farm” concept and prioritizing health and safety on Residential Districts located adjacent to Agricultural Districts.

ABOUT THE ISSUE
The purpose of the Apartment Districts is to allow for a range of apartment densities, and provide for a variety of living environments. Apartment Districts range from Low-density (A-1), medium-density (A-2), and high-density (A-3). Uses in the Apartment Districts include multifamily dwellings, apartments and high-rise apartments. The purpose of the Apartment Mixed Use Districts (AMX) is to allow some commercial uses in apartment neighborhoods. AMX Districts range from low-density (AMX-1), medium-density (AMX-2), and high-density (AMX-3).

Due to the increasing demand for housing, there is a need to increase maximum density and allow flexibility on general development standards for Apartment and Apartment Mixed Use Districts to support not only new development, but redevelopment of existing lots that are currently underutilized.

RECOMMENDATIONS
- Consider increasing the FAR in Apartment and Apartment Mixed Use Districts by the amount of commercial use permitted or more.
- Clarify “height” versus “plate line.”
- Consider expanding commercial uses in the Apartment Mixed Use Districts to allow greater flexibility in use types.
- Consider reducing minimum lot sizes and dimensions for Apartment and Apartment Mixed Use Districts to encourage more redevelopment and production of housing.
• Consider reducing minimum parking requirements to facilitate the construction of affordable housing.
• For clarity, rephrase Sec. 3.80-1(c)(1) “Apartment district uses and development standards - Additional Development Standards” by deleting the word “necessary”.

>> BUSINESS AND BUSINESS MIXED USE DISTRICTS

ABOUT THE ISSUE
The purpose of the Business Districts is to set aside areas for commercial and business activities to meet and support the economic growth. Business Districts ranges from small Neighborhood Business District (B-1) to Community Business District (B-2) that serves several neighborhoods. The purpose of the Business Mixed Use Districts is to include both residential uses and commercial uses. The intensity of use ranges from Community Business Mixed Use District (BMX-3) to Central Business Mixed Use District (BMX-4) that provides the highest land use intensity for commerce, business and housing.

The LUO could be updated to consider diversifying business uses and increasing residential uses within the Business Districts or, at least, facilitating the location of commercial uses in convenient proximity to residential uses. Any updates would require appropriate development standards to support such flexible and varied uses.

RECOMMENDATIONS
• Consider allowing convenience stores and light manufacturing as a permitted use in Business Districts.
• Consider reducing minimum lot size and lot dimensions for Business Mixed Use Districts to encourage redevelopment of smaller lots that are currently underutilized.
• Consider reducing the requirements for side and rear yards for residential dwelling uses in the BMX-3 district.
• Clarify and revise sentences under Sec. 21-3.120-2, “Business mixed use district uses and development standards” and Sec. 21-3.120-1, “BMX-4 business mixed use special height controls”.

>> INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS AND INDUSTRIAL-COMMERCIAL MIXED USE DISTRICTS

ABOUT THE ISSUE
The purpose of the Industrial Districts is to provide areas for industrial uses that will support the economic welfare of the City residents, without the competition from non-industrial uses. The land use intensity ranges from Limited Industrial District (I-1) which serves rural and suburban communities,
Intensive Industrial District (I-2) for a wide range of industrial uses that support the City, and the Waterfront Industrial District (I-3) for industrial uses that support port functions. The purpose of Industrial-Commercial Mixed Use District (IMX-1) is to allow mixed use of industrial and other uses.

Land and resources are limited on the Hawaiian Islands, and industrial real estate vacancy rates remain low at 2.03 percent at the end of 2018 (Colliers International Hawaii, 2019). In order to support the City’s growing population and needs, there should be consideration to expand the types of allowable industrial uses in Industrial Districts, while also protecting industrial uses so that IMX-1 districts do not become overrun with commercial uses.

RECOMMENDATIONS
- Consider rezoning the Airport area to the IMX-1 District.
- Clarify maximum FAR as outlined in Sec. 21-3.140-1(c), “Industrial-commercial mixed use district uses and development standards).” Consider an alternative method of calculating FAR so that users do not have to track commercial uses.
- Reconsider maximum heights in all Industrial districts, especially to facilitate more vertical, multi-story manufacturing.
- Encourage the use of maker spaces, especially as temporary or interim users in Industrial districts.
- Consider allowing indoor /controlled environmental agricultural and aquaculture as uses in some or all Industrial districts to facilitate food production on limited land.

>>PRESERVATION DISTRICTS

ABOUT THE ISSUE
The purpose of the Preservation Districts is to preserve and manage major open space, recreational lands, and lands with valuable natural or scenic resources. This type of land includes...
the Restricted Preservation District (P-1) for state-designated conservation districts; Military and Federal Preservation Districts (F-1); and the General Preservation District (P-2) for land that is not in the P-1 or F-1 District, land that is designated urban by the state for public use, and other land that is topographically unsuitable for public uses.

A specific issue occurs when federal lands are later privatized and converted to fee simple land and thus converted from F-1 to P-2 land where redevelopment of the land for potential residential or commercial uses becomes a hindrance. The LUO could be revised to foresee such issues.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Reconsider an alternative to rezoning land from the Military and Federal Preservation District to the General Preservation District.
- Allow “Plant Nurseries” in the General Preservation District and Country District, when approved by a CUP (major).

>> RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS

ABOUT THE ISSUE

The purpose of the Residential Districts is to allow a range of densities, with detached residences and other housing types as the primary use. As the needs of the population have changed over time, it is important to revisit the potential for new types of Residential Districts and housing types, as also discussed in “Affordability and Diversity of Housing.” Furthermore, the issue of monster homes continues to be a contentious topic in the City. In this respect, it is recommended that Bill 80 (2018) be allowed to take its legislative course at the Honolulu City Council.

From a technical perspective, there exists confusion amongst users on multiple issues including the following: the types of homes that are or are not permitted within the LUO; development standards, especially in regards to roofs; and definitions. Additionally, the intent of certain types of development options are oftentimes misunderstood. The LUO should be revised to clarify technicalities that cause confusion for users.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Limit floor area based on lot size.
- Revisit height standards.
- Incorporate revisions to existing Table 21-3.2, “Residential District Development Standards” such as adding a note prohibiting parking within required side yards. Additionally, revise the table according to Bill 80 (2018).
- Revisit alternative housing sites and types, such as Zero Lot Line developments and rowhouses.
• Clarify housing types overall. This could be done through the provision of a supplemental guide or providing updated graphics and illustrations.
• Expand use of boarding facilities and group living facilities for student housing.
• Reconsider yard requirements.

>>MASTER USE TABLE

ABOUT THE ISSUE
For frequent users of the LUO, Table 21-3, “Master Use Table” is oftentimes one of the most highly-used resources. The table lists which uses are permitted in which districts and under which type of permit. Because it is so frequently used, revisions to the table to make it more user-friendly are recommended. It is also important that, with the update to the various uses for each district, all updates to the table shall be consistent with all sections within the LUO.

RECOMMENDATIONS
• Update the list of permitted uses based on the proposed amendments to the LUO.
• Ensure that all the listed uses are defined in Article 10.
• Add a paragraph on how Table 21-3, “Master Use Table” is used and / or read.
• Make a visible note that “public uses” are allowed in all the zoning districts.
• Change the orientation of Table 21-3, “Master Use Table” to be more readable and user-friendly.
• Consider adding a note, informing LUO-users that they can download a Portable Document Format (PDF) of the LUO from DPP’s website and perform a search to navigate through the Table 21-3, “Master Use Table”.
• Consider including “permitted use” tables for each zoning district in Article 3, apart from the existing Table 21-3, “Master Use Table,” to facilitate navigability.
GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

ABOUT THE ISSUE
Water, whether freshwater or coastal waters, is a precious resource that sustains potable water supplies, ocean recreation for surfing, swimming, and spearfishing, habitat for fish and other aquatic species, and other invaluable benefits to the residents of Oahu. However, conventional development practices endanger freshwater and coastal water quality by impervious development that generates stormwater runoff that pollutes coastal waters and prevents groundwater recharge of local aquifers.

Alternatively, green infrastructure protects Oahu’s water resources with landscape-based stormwater controls including bioretention / raingarden facilities, green roofs and walls, trees, permeable paving, structural soils, rainwater harvesting, and other strategies. Other benefits of green infrastructure include the mitigation of the urban heat island effect, reduction of heating and cooling costs, reduction of pollution, provision of habitat for birds and insects, increase of property values, improvement of health and wellbeing, and improvement of the overall neighborhood and streetscape experience.

In the short term, however, the installation or construction of such measures costs money and could increase the cost of housing or commercial development. The issue of maintenance also persists for both street trees and landscaping on private property.
construction BMPs) in order to protect water quality and reduce demands on sewer infrastructure. The LUO should further require and/or encourage the implementation of green infrastructure by adding and revising existing language for zoning districts, development standards, and other areas in support of the City’s goal to protect Oahu’s water resources.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Include a minimum percentage of pervious lot area or maximum impervious surface ratio for Residential Districts and other zoning districts that do not meet or are subject to the City’s 2017 Water Quality Rules.
- Consider developing a separate “Standards for Landscaping” supporting document that includes a green infrastructure/permeability improvement checklist to help users identify and achieve the required percentage of pervious lot area.
- Consider incentives to implement green infrastructure, for example density/height bonuses, expedited permitting, or reduced off-street parking requirements.

**REFERENCES**


**LANDSCAPE STANDARDS**

**ABOUT THE ISSUE**

Landscapes of all scales, from open spaces and parks to streetscapes and parking lots, collectively create an interconnected ecological network comprised of trees, shrubs, groundcovers, soil, and microbes that support the cycling of nutrients, management of rainwater/stormwater, decrease in the urban heat island effect, reduction of air pollution, and habitat for birds and insects. Landscapes also provide important community benefits, including aesthetically pleasing neighborhoods; buffers between incompatible uses; screening for privacy; protection from environmental elements such as sun, wind, and noise; energy efficiency, and mental health and wellbeing.

The LUO currently treats landscape as a static object, instead of identifying adequate guidelines to support healthy living.
landscapes that provide long-term environmental and community benefits. While, the issue of maintenance persists for both landscaping and trees in the public right-of-way and on private property, there exists an opportunity to establish more aggressive development standards in the LUO before trees and landscaping are established. The LUO should add to and revise landscape standards to encourage the development of healthy living landscape systems. Additionally, DPP could consider requiring the signature of a landscape professional to ensure that proposed landscape plans are done to DPP’s standard.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Consider adding language in Sec. 21-4.70, “Landscaping and screening” that requires all landscapes to meet the standards identified in a separate “Standards for Landscaping” supporting document. Consider revising DPP’s Standards and Procedures for the Planting of Street Trees (July 1999) in cooperation with the City, Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to a separate supporting document for “Standards for Landscaping” that would apply not only to street trees, but private property. The “Standards for Landscaping” supporting document should include general landscaping standards for soil quality / depth, plant selection, preservation, trees, shrubs and perennials, ground covers, mulch, drought tolerant / native plant species, irrigation and parking areas. It should provide clear requirements to obtain approval to eliminate discretionary approval. The supporting document should be referenced in the LUO, but be maintained as a separate document for flexibility.

- Consider requiring the signature of a landscape professional (licensed landscape architect, certified professional horticulturalist, certified arborist or certified landscape designer).

REFERENCES


GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND LANDSCAPING

>> TREE STANDARDS

ABOUT THE ISSUE
Trees are critical components in improving the quality of life for residents of Oahu by preserving community character, improving environmental health, and providing economic benefits. The Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Forestry and Wildlife estimated that Honolulu’s street trees provide approximately $3.9 million per year in total benefits by mitigating stormwater runoff, lowering summer air temperatures, reducing air pollution energy costs, reducing atmospheric carbon dioxide, enhancing property values, providing wildlife habitat, improving health and wellbeing, improving learning and concentration, and providing aesthetic benefits. In March 2018, Mayor Kirk Caldwell affirmed the importance of trees with a proclamation to support the Trees for Honolulu’s Future’s goal of increasing Oahu’s tree canopy from 20 to 35 percent by the year 2035. Mayor Kirk Caldwell also set a goal to plant 100,000 new trees by 2025.

The LUO Update presents the opportunity to add and revise language regarding trees to ensure appropriate soil specifications, spacing, dimensions for planting areas, and other standards to support healthy trees and root systems.

RECOMMENDATIONS
- Consider a requirement in Residential districts for 1 shade tree for every 30 feet of street frontage.
- Revise the dimensions for the landscaping strip to include a range of dimensions (for example, from 36 to 60 inches) to encourage the growth of medium or large-canopied trees to adequately screen parking structures in Sec. 21-4.70(c), “Landscaping and screening”.
- Revise the minimum spacing for trees planted in the landscaping strip between a parking structure and abutting property line to include a range of distances depending on the mature dimensions of the tree canopy (for example, from 25 to 50 feet) (Sec. 21-4.70(c)(2), “Landscaping and screening”).
- Encourage the preservation of healthy existing trees.
- Consider requiring that open spaces used for open space bonuses specify a minimum number of trees per square foot of open space area, similar to requirements for parking lots. Incentivize the use of large canopy trees through incentives such as expedited permitting. DPP – large canopy trees are better but need to make the deal sweeter and more enticing so developers would rather put in two large trees for example than 20 smaller trees.
GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND LANDSCAPING

REFERENCES

>> PARKING

ABOUT THE ISSUE
Parking lots generate stormwater runoff from impervious cover and contribute to the urban heat island effect. The LUO should address pollution issues associated with parking lots by encouraging the integration of landscape-based stormwater controls and revising development standards to adequately support healthy, large-canopied trees.
RECOMMENDATIONS

- For the perimeter of the parking lot (Sec. 21-4.70(a), “Landscaping and screening”), revise development standards and consider replacing inflexible language for landscaping (for example, hedge height and siting) with flexible language that encourages the integration of landscape-based stormwater control.
- For the interior of the parking lot (Sec. 21-4.70(b), “Landscaping and screening”), consider development standards such as increasing the minimum size of tree wells (for example, to be no less than 36 square feet) to support healthy, large canopied trees.
- Consider requiring that a standard percentage of the interior parking area to be landscaped with plantings, or requiring a minimum percentage (for example, 25 percent) of the parking area to receive shade from trees within fifteen years after planting, similar to the Maui County Planting Plan (March 2016).
- Reduce the number of parking stalls that require shade trees in Sec. 21-4.70(b), “Landscaping and screening” based on the area of the parking lot.
- Encourage the reduction of excessive impervious cover by reducing off-street parking requirements in Sec. 21-6, “Off-street Parking and Loading”.
- Revise “all weather surfaces” to include permeable materials to reduce runoff and localized flooding and to increase groundwater recharge, ultimately contributing to overall resilience to climate change effects.

REFERENCES

A nonconforming use is defined as “any use of a structure or a zoning lot which was previously lawful but which does not conform to the applicable use regulations of the district in which it is located, either on October 22, 1986 or as a result of any subsequent amendment to this chapter, or a zoning map amendment,” as listed in Sec. 21-10.1, “Definitions”. The LUO acknowledges and accommodates for a variety of nonconformities within the built environment. There are nonconforming lots, structures, uses, dwelling units, commercial use density, parking and loading and signs. The purpose of the constraints placed on nonconformities is to encourage conformity to the LUO over time.

As previously mentioned, proposed amendments to the LUO, may potentially further exacerbate nonconformities and / or create new nonconformities in the built environment.

**Vacation Rentals**

Recently, the use of residential dwelling units for illegal short-term vacation rentals, such as transient vacation units (TVUs) or Bed and Breakfast homes (B&B) is one type of nonconforming use that has been a contentious issue on Oahu. Vacation rentals have proliferated on Oahu due to digital hosting platforms that provide service to arrange lodging accommodations. It is estimated that there are 6,000 to 8,000 illegal vacation rentals on Oahu (Pang, 2019).

Generally, the accommodation of visitors is relatively beneficial for Hawaii’s economy; however, vacation rentals often have undesirable impacts on residential neighborhoods and remove housing units from the rental market, which in turn has arguably driven up housing costs and contributed to the City’s affordable housing crisis. As a result, the City is currently sponsoring a total of seven bills that will regulate vacation rentals, all of which have been postponed by the City Council Planning Committee; two of those bills are discussed below.

Currently, Bill 89 (2018) would require TVUs and B&Bs to obtain a registration number; rentals in Honolulu would be capped at approximately 4,000, with no more than 1 percent of all vacation rentals in each district; rentals would be taxed under a separate real property tax category; and fines would be imposed for illegal rentals. In contrast, the current version of Bill 85 (2018) would require all hosting platforms to provide pertinent information on TVUs and B&Bs; would render it illegal to operate and rent a vacation rental without first obtaining a nonconforming use certificate (NUC) registration number from the City; and would allow a neighbor to seek legal action against an illegal vacation rental.

**Recommendations**

Recommendations regarding the mitigation of nonconformities include the following:
• Fully examine the intended and unintended consequences of future proposed amendments, to ensure that the potential exacerbation of existing and creation of future nonconformities does not outweigh the proposed amendments’ benefits.

• Amend Sec. 21-5.640, “Time sharing and transient vacation units;” Sec. 21-4.110-1, “Nonconforming use certificates for transient vacation units,” and Sec. 21-4.110-2, “Bed and breakfast homes—Nonconforming use certificates,” as necessary, pending the passing of the aforementioned bills.

• Support the requirement for the NUC and / or registration numbers to be included in advertisements for vacation rentals.

• Seek guidance from an attorney regarding the City’s ability to phase out illegal vacation rentals with existing nonconforming user certificates, as opposed to maintain a nonconforming use.
Signage impacts our communities in a wide variety of ways. Signs provide necessary and beneficial functions of wayfinding and orientation, provide important information for public health and safety, contribute to the success of our City’s businesses, and can become cherished landmarks in their own right. However, left unregulated, signs can have an adverse effect on the cityscape through over-proliferation, excessive size, or designs that clash with desired community norms. It is important to find the balance between fostering the functions of signage and protecting the natural beauty of the island’s environment from the visual impacts of certain types of signs. Enforcement of sign regulations can prove difficult. Under HRS, Chapter 225, Part IV, “Outdoor Advertising,” Hawaii is currently one of four states that prohibits billboards. Counties are further given authority to adopt ordinances regulating outdoor advertising, which the City does under Sec. 21-7, “Sign Regulations”.

Sec. 21-7, “Sign Regulations” should be improved, primarily through clarifying existing language and incorporating existing DPP’s interpretations on the subject matter.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations include the following:

- Incorporate DPP’s interpretations through expanding the existing definitions in Sec. 2-7.20, “Definitions and general design standards”, incorporating language into other respective sections within the article, or creating a supplemental guide.
- Clarify the difference between signage and art, such as murals or perforated screens with applied print/imagery or illuminated art.
- Review which signs should be prohibited under Sec. 21-7.30, “Prohibited Signs”. For example, “moving signs”.
- Consider HCDA’s Mauka Area Rules for signs in Kakaako for examples of suitable signage in commercial zoning districts.
- Further research how to create a mechanism to specify / recognize “historic signs”.
- Clarify that video screens are flashing signs that are not permitted and not permitted as a window display.
- Reiterate the City’s commitment to keeping flashing signs from proliferating. But specify when public agencies can use electronic changeable signs to convey rapidly changing important information like bus and train arrival times.

REFERENCES

Special districts (SDs) are similar to overlay zones in that they can help municipalities to respond to specific conditions. Development in a SD typically requires adherence to additional zoning regulations and may provide incentives and / or relief for certain types of development. As stated in Sec. 21-9.20, “Special districts – Purpose,” the purpose of the SDs is to “provide a means by which certain areas in the community in need of restoration, preservation, redevelopment or rejuvenation may be designated as SDs to guide development to protect and / or enhance the physical and visual aspects of an area for the benefit of the community as a whole.” There are currently eight SDs on Oahu, including the Hawaii Capital SD, Diamond Head SD, Punchbowl SD, Chinatown SD, Haleiwa SD, Thomas Square/Academy of Arts SD, TOD SD and Waikiki SD. Each SD has unique design objectives and controls codified in the LUO to regulate heights, landscaping, parking, building form and materials, and other conditions, which may supplement or modify underlying zoning district regulations. In addition, DPP publishes stand-alone SD Design Guideline documents which provide additional information and graphics to further guide and illustrate how development should conform to the SD design objectives and controls. These SD Design Guideline documents closely mirror the “Design Controls” and “Architectural Appearance and Character” regulations listed in the LUO, but are not statutory and are not always consistent with the regulations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations regarding changes to the SDs include the following:

- Continue to establish and expand the TOD SD boundaries, neighborhood plans and design guidelines, for all 19 stations under the City’s jurisdiction.
- Consolidate, remove and / or reference redundant SD design guidelines that are in sections of the LUO other
than Article 9, to reduce confusion and unnecessary cross-references.

- Update the SD design guidelines and controls in Article 9, such as colors, materials, lighting and landscaping standards etc., to ensure consistency within the LUO as well as with the SD Design Guideline documents.
- Update the SD Design Guideline documents to remain relevant to the community’s contemporary issues, conditions and visions.
Uses identified in Sec. 21-3, “Establishment of Zoning Districts and Zoning District Regulations” as “Ac” or “P/c” are permitted subject to standards in Sec. 21-5, “Special Uses.” Special uses are defined and, as appropriate, are subject to specific development standards. Oftentimes, these special definitions and controls cause confusion amongst users. DPP receives numerous inquiries from landowners regarding what types of development and improvements are permitted on their land, based on their zoning district. In addition to defining these uses in Article 10, “Definitions” and providing standards in Article 5, “Special Uses,” DPP has interpretations regarding various special uses, which often take the form of correspondence with landowners or an internal memorandum. However, DPP’s interpretations are not yet available to the public. The frequency of inquiries on a particular topic provides a good indicator of an area where the LEOU can be clarified and improved. In an effort to save time for DPP and confusion on the part of the user, incorporation of interpretations into the LEOU and clarification is needed.

The following recommendations regarding Special Uses are put forth:

- Incorporate existing DPP interpretations into the LEOU, especially as they pertain to home occupations, personal services, meeting facilities, and manufacturing.

- Consider expanding certain special uses in specified zoning districts, for example, expanding agricultural uses such as aquaculture or crop production, utility-scale solar energy facilities, photovoltaic carports, composting – major and minor, etc.

- Consider revisions to certain uses that stakeholders suggested cause the most confusion, including agribusiness, other agriculture-related uses, home occupations, and more.

- Identify and clarify or define terms that are not currently defined. Ensure that these terms were not purposely removed, and if they were previously removed, revisit why.

- Consider minor language changes.

- Consider revising general development standards for certain uses, such as required setbacks for commercial parking lots and garages or allowing fencing for golf courses.

- Re-consider floor area limits for certain uses, such as “convenience stores” in Business districts, “food manufacturing and processing facilities”, or “home improvements centers”.

- Include hours of operation for certain uses such as base yards, car washing establishments, and food manufacturing and processing facilities.
REFERENCES
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OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING REQUIREMENTS

ABOUT THE ISSUE
Research suggests that typical off-street parking requirements result in inequitable allocation of land resources that subsidizes automobile use, increases traffic congestion and carbon emissions, contributes to air and water pollution, encourages sprawl, and raises housing costs (Shoup, 2011). Locally, current off-street parking requirements induce driving demand and result in neighborhood environments that are car-centric and less friendly to walk in.

From a technical perspective, certain stakeholders expressed confusion with the current calculation method, development standards, and rules that are scattered within the LUO itself and among various regulatory documents. And, while current requirements do meet the demand within certain districts and uses, in districts such as agricultural districts or urban areas well-served by transit, the current and future demand for off-street parking may not correspond with existing requirements. Developers may be obligated to provide off-street parking when, in some cases, the market could demand less parking than what is required.

While minimum off-street parking requirements have shaped our present urban environment, there exists an opportunity to address these requirements head-on given the amount of new construction and redevelopment occurring on Oahu. Recently adopted TOD SD parking standards have provided a good stepping stone in lowering these requirements when there is a lower market demand for off-street parking. Until the Rail is operational, however, existing off-street parking demand will continue to result in the construction of parking structures that adhere to existing off-street parking requirements. It will be important to consider how to repurpose such structures, for example into housing, once their use as off-street parking is no longer necessitated.

Furthermore, as multimodal transportation mode share grows and the State and City work to meet goals to reduce GHG emissions, the demand for parking is expected to decrease over time resulting in changing land use opportunities, though good data to corroborate this assumption is still needed. The LUO should be revised to accommodate these trends.

RECOMMENDATIONS
The following changes to off-street parking and loading requirements are recommended for consideration:

- Expand the intent of Sec. 21-6, “Off-street Parking and Loading” to convey State and City environmental and energy conservation goals, Complete Streets vision, and other land use objectives.
- Clarify method of determining off-street parking requirement by giving an example calculation and
incorporating every use listed in Table 21-3, “Master Use Table” into the existing tables in Sec. 21-6, “Off-street Parking and Loading”.

- Re-evaluate minimum off-street parking and loading requirements for certain uses, such as agricultural and schools, where demand may not correspond to existing requirements. Suggest additional research on current market and future trends.
- Study eliminating off-street parking minimum requirements entirely. Or, at minimum, research lowering the minimum off-street parking requirements for all uses or in certain zoning districts, especially when certain conditions are fulfilled (for example, if carshare or electric vehicle charging station is installed).
- Consider implementing off-street parking maximum requirements. Implementation could be incremental, and first occur in TOD SD.
- Consider creating supplemental parking design standards for surface and structure parking facilities and for siting loading access points.
- Incorporate language that encourages off-street parking be sited at the rear of a lot for commercial uses, and encourage in BMX-3, BMX-4, and Resort Districts only. Use language from the TOD Special District Guidelines (2018).
- Considering incentivizing future-proofing of parking structures to accommodate future conversion to other uses such as residential or retail.
- Consider revising the distance of the entrance to an off-site parking facility from the nearest principal entrance, which currently cannot exceed 400 feet according to Sec. 21-5.480, “Off-site vehicular and bicycle parking facilities”. Consider revising to 0.5 miles, and meet ADA requirements.
- Consider arrangement of off-street parking spaces.
- Further incentivize shared off-street parking spaces between uses that have a variation in period of daily demand.
- Consider adjusting dimensions of off-street parking spaces.
- Refine language regarding traffic ingress and egress, and consider requiring a Traffic Impact Assessment Report or Traffic Management Plan for certain uses such as car washing establishments and drive-through facilities.
- Consider increasing off-street loading requirements and dimensions to accommodate an increased use of care-share type services and more deliveries.
TRANSPORTATION CHOICES
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>> MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION AND TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

Over time, Honolulu has developed into an auto-oriented city, with about 64.7 percent of the travelling public in Honolulu County commuting alone by car (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). Approximately 8.1 percent commute by public transportation using the City’s TheBus system and 9.1 percent commute by taking other means, including cycling and walking (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013).

Recent efforts in Honolulu to increase modal choice present a potential change to this commuting pattern. For example, in 2017, Honolulu’s first bikeshare system, Biki, was launched. The biggest project, however, is the Honolulu Rail Transit system (“Rail”), which will eventually extend from West Oahu to Ala Moana Center and is expected to be fully operational by 2025. In 2008, the City established its TOD program, which facilitated the creation of TOD special districts within approximately 2,000 feet around each rail station. For each of the City’s neighborhood TOD plans, DPP recommends more intense uses immediately adjacent to the Rail station, with progressively lower density development spreading outward. TOD plans foster the design of neighborhoods that encourage...
the use of other modes of transportation, including Rail, TheBus, cycling, and walking.

Offering increased and attractive multimodal choice options and fostering the creation of an environment that is safe and friendly to other modes of transportation will be key in reducing automobile usage – especially single-occupancy vehicle trips – island-wide, thereby achieving State and City goals to reduce GHG emissions. There is room within the LUO to further foster diversity of transportation so that driving is not the most preferable way of moving around the City.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following recommendations are proposed for incorporation into Sec. 21-6, “Off-street Parking and Loading” in an effort to foster multimodal transportation and to support TOD:

- Study and allow reduced minimum parking requirements in areas with mass transit.
- Allow for reduced minimum parking requirements for residential and commercial uses with Transportation Demand Management programs, such as pooled parking.
- Consider car share parking requirements.
- Consider other building design features in exchange for reduced parking minimums. Examples of design features include porte cocheres or designated drop-off areas.
- Allow for reduced minimum parking requirements for bike parking in various forms.
• Incentivize long-term bike parking for non-residential uses. Utilize data from local stakeholders on what features would encourage cycling, such as locker rooms, showers, or changing rooms.

REFERENCES
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>> COMPLETE STREETS AND PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCE

Complete Streets is a design approach that aims to develop integrated, connected networks of streets that are safe and accessible for all, regardless of age, ability, income, ethnicity, or chosen mode of travel. This approach supports healthy and sustainable communities through promoting physical activity, reducing vehicle GHG emissions, increasing pedestrian and bicycle safety, and improving the aesthetic beauty of neighborhoods. Locally, the Honolulu Complete Streets Ordinance 12-15 was passed by the Honolulu City Council and signed into law in 2012. ROH, Chapter 14, Article 33, “Complete Streets” regulates the implementation of Complete Streets. The subsequent *City and County of Honolulu Complete Streets Design Manual*, finalized in 2016, sets forth standards to guide the design of roads with Complete Streets principles. While the LUO does not regulate street design, its general development standards and certain discretionary permits can influence the implementation of certain Complete Streets design elements and pedestrian experience overall.

Photo: Complete Streets design features, such as a parklet and outdoor dining area, enhance the pedestrian environment in Kakaako.
RECOMMENDATIONS
The following recommendations on incorporating Complete Streets design principles into the LEO include:

- Identify where the LEO conflicts with the City and County of Honolulu Complete Streets Design Manual. Where it does, include in the Waiver process.
- Include language that encourages Complete Streets design elements, such as street trees, street furniture, appropriate walkway widths for pedestrian volumes, and building orientation that fronts the street.
- Review development standards for required yards and setbacks in Sec. 21-4.30, “Yards and street setbacks” to foster improved pedestrian experience. Consider, for example, increasing the allowable eave projection into required yard and height setbacks than currently allowed to encourage roof eaves or sunshade devices or allowing a percentage of the front yard for outdoor dining.

REFERENCES

>> FUTURE TECHNOLOGY

ABOUT THE ISSUE
While it could be decades away, it is important to consider future technology that could have significant impacts on our communities. Specifically, autonomous vehicles (AVs) are touted as potentially having positive impacts on the movement of people, such as preventing accidents caused by driver error and increasing mobility options for people with disabilities, seniors and children. AVs also have the potential to free up land currently used for parking. However, the adverse impacts are also unknown, and may include an increase in congestion, discourage walking as a mode of transportation and loss of jobs for those working in the transportation field. On the short-term, AVs are already affecting the movement of goods, as smaller-scale air AVs, or drones, are being used to provide door-to-door delivery of goods. While the larger-scale use of AV technology is years away, because AV are already being utilized to deliver goods in other municipalities, it is recommended that DPP consider it earlier rather than later.

RECOMMENDATIONS
- Address loading and unloading requirements for autonomous deliveries, both ground and air. For example, designate pick-up and drop-off zones for passengers and goods. Ensure that AV loading and
unloading does not conflict with other modes of transportation.

- Consider addressing future parking requirements, including vehicle storage facilities.

REFERENCES

The LUO is a hefty document, totaling 411 pages, from cover to cover. It can be intimidating for users to navigate the LUO, especially if one is not familiar with zoning ordinances or fluent in legalese. The following sub-topics expound on the various ways the LUO can be made into a user-friendly document. Recommendations include developing a consistent format and well-thought-out organization; paying special attention to the type of language used in the LUO; maximizing the use of graphics; and utilizing the latest technology to create a digital LUO.

FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION

ABOUT THE ISSUE

The format and organization of any document refers to its overall appearance and encompasses a multitude of minutiae, including the size of the margins; indentation of the first line of the paragraph; font type and size; placement of page numbers on a page; consistent spelling and capitalization; as well as how information and concepts within the document are arranged and presented. It is important to maintain a consistent format, organization and aesthetic throughout the LUO, primarily to increase its navigability, readability and ease of use. A consistent format and well-thought-out organization will allow the user to get familiarized with the contents of the LUO and be able to swiftly identify pertinent information, with minimal distraction and unnecessary confusion.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations focus on increasing the navigability and readability the LUO, and include the following:

- Include a header and/or footer, which indicate the LUO article number. For example, for Article 1, the header could read “Chapter 21 of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu, Land Use Ordinance,” and the footer could read “Article 1, General Provisions.”
- Use a consistent numeric notation system and phrasing for sections and headings in the Table of Contents (TOC), at the head of each Article and in the body of the text in the LUO. However, there are some typographical errors, which are not a reflection of formatting or organizational deficiencies.
- Include the proper names of other ROH Chapters when referenced in the LUO.
- Ensure consistent use of punctuation, indentation and font types and sizes.
- Ensure page numbers are accurate.

Recommendations regarding the reorganization of sections within the LUO are included in the “Revised LUO Table of Contents” section of this report.
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LANGUAGE

ABOUT THE ISSUE
Semantics is the main component of language that is relevant to the LUO Update project, as it involves sentence structure and word choice. Sentence structure, the order in which information is arranged, and word choice, are important in any type of writing. Well-selected words are necessary to get a message across in a clear, concise and specific manner. Sentence structure involves the arrangement of subject (noun) and action (verb); the sentence length; and the use of a passive or active, i.e. direct or indirect, tone of voice. The use of familiar words and simple sentences maximizes reader comprehension and will enable all LUO-users to readily find and understand the information that they need to meet their needs in an expedient manner.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Recommendations on how to improve the language, sentence structure and diction in the LUO, include the following:

- Minimize lengthy sentences and avoid wordy phrases to increase reading comprehension.
- Link the subject and verb in a sentence closely together and write declaratory sentences with an “active” instead of “passive” voice.
- Use plain English and defined terms, while avoiding jargon, legalese or complex words.
- Use fewer words when possible and avoid repetitious words or “shot-gunning,” (using a long list of synonyms in an effort to be comprehensive).
- Use words that serve the same purpose, consistently, in all contexts, especially verbs that carry legal-weight. For example, “should” or “may” encourage, while “shall” and “must” require.
- Start a sentence with the main idea before listing exceptions or conditions. For example, Sec. 21-2.60(c), “Rules governing director’s failure to act within specified time period” and Sec. 21-2.140-1(n)(4)(B), “Specific circumstances – Sign Master Plan – Implementation” begin with exceptions.
- Update the LUO to use proper names. For example, the “Honolulu Academy of Arts” is now the “Honolulu Museum of Art.”
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GRAPHICS

ABOUT THE ISSUE
Graphics, such as tables, figures and exhibits, play a significant role in any document. Graphics can visually organize and
communicate large amounts of information effectively and aid in the reading comprehension of text. Graphics supplement text by efficiently displaying data to convey comparative relationships, as well as illustrating a complex concept. For example, graphical representation of development concepts and standards, such as transitional height setbacks, flag lot driveway dimensions, the “buildable envelope,” and the method of measuring heights on sloping lots enhance the LUO-user’s comprehension of such concepts. Graphics can also assist LUO-users to realize the development potential of their lot.

The LUO currently includes a copious amount of graphics, such as tables, figures and exhibits; however, many of these graphics need to be improved or updated with current information.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Recommendations on how to improve and increase the use of graphics in LUO include the following:

- Include hyperlinks to graphics, such as tables, figures and exhibits, throughout the LUO.
- Relocate the title of the graphic to follow the graphic number. For example, most figure titles are located at the bottom of the figure, while the figure number is above the figure.
- Rotate graphics that are landscape-oriented, to increase readability.
- Reorder certain graphics throughout the body of the LUO to follow the associated topic as much as possible.
- Resize figures to fit the page. For example, Figures 21-2.2, 21-3.2, and 21-3.3 need to be made larger.
- Revise existing graphics that require updated information and/or additional clarification. For example, Figures 21-2.1, 21-3.2, 21-3.10 and Table 21-6.1 need to be updated. A full listing of proposed existing graphics that should be updated and new graphics that should be included in the LUO is included in the “Revised LUO Table of Contents” section of this report.
- Include new graphics in the LUO, such as figures that illustrate development concepts and standards and tables that formalize information that is currently displayed in a quasi-table format.
- Include high-quality photorealistic figures to illustrate concepts, development standards and/or SD design guidelines.
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>> DIGITAL

ABOUT THE ISSUE

A “digital zoning code” is a catch-all, but generally refers to a code that is accessible via the Internet and implies the presence of navigational features beyond static text and images displayed on a screen. A digital code might be published on a website; it might include the use of internal and external hyperlinks; it might utilize and encourage online permitting; and / or an interactive geographic information systems map with a joint query system and database. The purpose of a digital code is principally to increase the efficient retrieval of information.

The LUO is currently a static PDF that is accessed via a link on DPP’s website. The text in the PDF is “searchable;” however, the results are sequential, as the user must tread through the search results one by one. While the current medium and user interface is serviceable, it is quickly becoming outdated by the digital state of the art. Adoption of a digital zoning code may take time and resources, but should be considered now so that necessary planning and resources will be ready if/when a decision is made.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations regarding the creation of a digital LUO include the following:

- Increase the use of internal hyperlinks to jump around the LUO. For example, hyperlink section headings at the head of each article to the body of the text, as well as figures, tables and exhibits that are referenced in other articles.
- Use external hyperlinks within the LUO to link to relevant documents; for example, SD design guidelines, ROH Chapters and adopted Ordinances, when referenced in the LUO.
- Consider creating a fully interactive PDF document of the LUO; the LUO is currently partially interactive.
- Consider publishing the LUO through an established website, via software services or a third-party publishing firm.
- Consider developing an interactive map and associated address-based query database, in an effort to link planning, zoning, subdivision, and utility information for each property. Ideally, a user will be able to query
the database and receive customized information regarding the different types of zoning permits and approvals that are required for various types of development on a particular parcel.

REFERENCES

This section includes a proposed, revised TOC for the LUO. As previously discussed, information and concepts within the LUO should be organized and presented in a way that increases its navigability and readability for LUO-users. The recommended changes to the LUO TOC mainly involve the deletion, addition, relocation, incorporation and retitling of sections. It should be noted that the revised TOC may not reflect all of the abovementioned recommendations listed in this report. The following criteria were used to guide the reorganization of the LUO TOC:

- The order of the articles and sections in the LUO should be intuitive. Information should be presented in the chronological order which it will occur; for example, application filing should be listed before permit approval review times.

- Information that is frequently referenced should be listed at the beginning of the chapter, articles and sections; for example, zoning districts that apply to the greatest number of properties should be listed first.

- General information should come before specific information.

- Similar sections should be grouped in succession. Similarly, sections should be merged or combined to improve comprehension.

- Sections should be deleted if no longer relevant, if redundant or if superseded by new information.

- New sections should be added if additional clarification or explanation is needed. This is distinct from new content, concepts and definitions that are being proposed as a part of the various recommendations in this report.

- Section headings should be renamed to accurately reflect the information within the section.

- Note: the following “Revised LUO Table of Contents” table is organized so that the “existing” column lists the sections in the order and notation as is, in the existing LUO, and the “proposed” column makes a note where a recommended change should occur. Rows left blank in the “proposed” column means that no change is recommended for that section.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 1. General Provisions</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-1.10 Title.</td>
<td>• Consider moving Sec. 2.110-3 here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-1.20 Purpose and intent.</td>
<td>• Add / Move and rename “Rule-making authority, general” from Sec. 21-2.60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-1.30 Administration.</td>
<td>• Add / Move and rename “Rule-making authority, ohana dwellings” from Sec. 21-8.20-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move relevant text in “Authority of planning commission and / or council” from Sec. 21-2.70.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move “Rules governing director's failure to act within specified time period” from Sec. 21-2.60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-1.40 Appeals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-1.50 Variances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-1.60 Temporary uses.</td>
<td>• Differentiate between a temporary use that does not need a permit and one that does. TUs that need permits should get guidance from Sec. 21-2.40-1, Minor Permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move “Violations” from Sec. 21-2.150.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move “Criminal prosecution” from Sec. 21-2.150-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move “Administrative enforcement” from Sec. 21-2.150-2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 2. Administration and Enforcement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.10 Purpose.</td>
<td>• Rename “Permit Types and Processing Procedures”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.20 Administrative procedures.</td>
<td>• Rename to “Purpose and intent” for consistency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider moving to Article 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.30 Application procedures.</td>
<td>• Consider moving to Article 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider moving to Article 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move “Multi-permit process” from Sec. 21-2.50.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.40 Permits.</td>
<td>Add “Temporary Use” to list of Minor Permits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sec. 21-2.40-1 Minor permits. | • Add “Cluster housing, agricultural and country clusters, and all planned development (resort, apartment, interim transit, transit, and housing)” to list of Major Permits.  
• Consolidate all application procedures and processing, so that all major permits are the same (similar). |
| Sec. 21-2.40-2 Major permits. | • Delete. Move to Article 2.  
• Add “Cluster housing, agricultural and country clusters, and all planned development (resort, apartment, interim transit, transit, and housing)” to list of Major Permits.  
• Consolidate all application procedures and processing, so that all major permits are the same (similar). |
| Sec. 21-2.50 Multi-permit process. | • Delete. Move to Article 2.  
• Delete. Move to Article 1. |
| Sec. 21-2.60 Rules governing director's failure to act within specified time period. | • Delete. Move to Article 2.  
• Delete. Move to Article 1. |
| Sec. 21-2.70 Review of planning commission and/or council. | • Rewrite entire section. Move certain sections to specific permits, such as the PRU. Move certain sections to other articles, such as the LVO amendment procedures.  
• Consider removing “Special Districts, Other” in Sec. 2.70(b), and revise “Amendments to the Land Use Ordinance and Zoning Maps.” |
| Sec. 21-2.80 Conditional zoning--Agreements. | • Delete. Combine w/ Sec. 21-2.70, Zoning Map Amendments.  
• Add new section, use relevant text from “Criteria of Approval” from Sec. 21-2.90-2. |
| Sec. 21-2.90 Conditional use permit--Purpose and intent. | • Rename. |
| Sec. 21-2.90-1 Application requirements. | • Add new section, use relevant text from “Criteria of Approval” from Sec. 21-2.100-(a) and (b)(1) and (2)). |
| Sec. 21-2.100 Existing uses. | • Delete. |
| Sec. 21-2.110 Exceptions. | • Add new section, use relevant text from “Criteria of Approval” from 21-3.50-3 (c)). |
| Sec. 21-2.110-1 Cluster housing, agricultural and country clusters. | • Add new section, use relevant text from “Criteria of Approval” from Sec. 21-2.110-(a) and (b)(1) and (2)). |
| Sec. 21-2.110-2 Planned development-resort, planned development-apartment, interim planned development-transit projects. | • Add new section, use relevant text from “Criteria of Approval” from 21-3.50-3 (c)). |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Add new section, use relevant text from “Criteria of Approval” from 21-2.90-2.</td>
<td>• Add / Move “Planned development housing (PD-H)” from Sec. 21-8.50-4. Reorganize the PD-H procedures so that they’re more similar to existing sections in Article 2. Add Section for Criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Add / Move “PD-H applicability” from Sec. 21-8.50-5.</td>
<td>• Add / Move “PD-H use regulations” from Sec. 21-8.50-6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Add / Move “PD-H density and minimum land area” from Sec. 21-8.50-7.</td>
<td>• Add / Move “PD-H site design standards” from Sec. 21-8.50-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Add / Move “PD-H procedures” from Sec. 21-8.50-9.</td>
<td>• Add / Move “PD-H application requirements” from Sec. 21-8.50-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Add / Move “PD-H Director’s decision” from Sec. 21-8.50-11. Rename Criteria of Approval.</td>
<td>• Delete. Consolidate in Article 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.110-3 Designation of ohana-eligible areas.</td>
<td>• Consider moving Sec. 2.70(a) to this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.120 Plan review uses--Purpose and intent.</td>
<td>• Add new section: “Criteria of Approval.” Use text from Sec. 21-2.90-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.120-1 Applicability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.120-2 General provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.120-3 Application requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.130 Waiver of requirements.</td>
<td>• Add new section: “Criteria of Approval.” Use text from Sec. 21-2.90-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.140 Zoning adjustments.</td>
<td>• Rename “Zoning adjustment, types.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.140-1 Specific circumstances.</td>
<td>• Remove Sign Master Plan (Sec. 21-2.140-1(n) and move to new section as a minor permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add new Zoning adjustment type: Lot &amp; Structure Irregularities (or something like that – to handle dimensional variances).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.140-2 Criteria.</td>
<td>• Rename “Zoning adjustment, criteria of approval.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.150 Violation.</td>
<td>• Add: Sign Master Plan. Use text from Sec. 21-2.140-1(n).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.150-1 Criminal prosecution.</td>
<td>• Delete. Move to Article 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-2.150-2 Administrative enforcement.</td>
<td>• Delete. Move to Article 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Delete. Move to Article 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move “Farm dwellings—Agricultural site development plan” from Sec. 21-8.30; see criteria in (c). This should be a Type of Permit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Article 3. Establishment of Zoning Districts and Zoning District Regulations

| Sec. 21-3.10 Zoning district classifications and map designations.     |                                                                       |
| Sec. 21-3.20 Zoning precinct classifications and map designations.   |                                                                       |
| Sec. 21-3.30 Zoning maps and interpretations.                        |                                                                       |
| Sec. 21-3.40 Preservation districts--Purpose and intent.             |                                                                       |
| Sec. 21-3.40-1 Preservation uses and development standards.          | • Remove references to pages, refer to sections.                      |
| Sec. 21-3.50 Agricultural districts--Purpose and intent.             |                                                                       |
| Sec. 21-3.50-1 Agricultural clusters.                                |                                                                       |
| Sec. 21-3.50-2 Agricultural cluster--Site standards.                 |                                                                       |
| Sec. 21-3.50-3 Agricultural cluster--Application requirements.       | • Move to Sec. 21-2.2.110.1.                                          |
| Sec. 21-3.50-4 Agricultural uses and development standards.         |                                                                       |
| Sec. 21-3.60 Country district--Purpose and intent.                   | • Add / Move “Housing—Flexible site design” from Sec. 21-8.50.        |
| Sec. 21-3.60-1 Country clusters.                                     | • Add / Move “Cluster housing” from Sec. 21-8.50-1.                    |
| Sec. 21-3.60-2 Country cluster--Site standards.                      | • Add / Move “Cluster site design standards” from Sec. 21-8.50-2.      |
| Sec. 21-3.60-3 Country cluster--Application requirements.            |                                                                       |
| Sec. 21-3.60-4 Country uses and development standards.               |                                                                       |
| Sec. 21-3.70 Residential districts--Purpose and intent.              |                                                                       |
| Sec. 21-3.70-1 Residential uses and development standards.           |                                                                       |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.80 Apartment districts--Purpose and intent.</td>
<td>● Add / Move “Cluster housing procedures” from Sec. 21-8.50-3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.80-1 Apartment district uses and development standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.90 Apartment mixed use districts--Purpose and intent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.90-1 Apartment mixed use district uses and development standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.100 Resort district--Purpose and intent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.100-1 Resort uses and development standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.110 Business districts--Purpose and intent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.110-1 Business uses and development standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.120 Business mixed use districts--Purpose and intent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.120-1 BMX-4 business mixed use special height controls.</td>
<td>● Consider summarizing and moving to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.120-2 Business mixed use district uses and development standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.130 Industrial districts--Purpose and intent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.130-1 Industrial uses and development standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.140 Industrial-commercial mixed use district-- Purpose and intent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.140-1 Industrial-commercial mixed use district uses and development standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Article 4. General Development Standards

| Sec. 21-4.10 General development regulations--Purpose and intent.       |                                                                           |
| Sec. 21-4.20 Flag lots.                                               |                                                                           |
| Sec. 21-4.30 Yards and street setbacks.                               |                                                                           |
| Sec. 21-4.40 Retaining walls.                                        |                                                                           |
| Sec. 21-4.50 Lots in two zoning districts.                           |                                                                           |
| Sec. 21-4.60 Heights.                                                |                                                                           |
| Sec. 21-4.70 Landscaping and screening.                              |                                                                           |
| Sec. 21-4.70-1 Screening wall or buffering.                          |                                                                           |
| Sec. 21-4.80 Noise regulations.                                      |                                                                           |
| Sec. 21-4.90 Sunlight reflection regulations.                        |                                                                           |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-4.100 Outdoor lighting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-4.110 Nonconformities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-4.110-1 Nonconforming use certificates for transient vacation units.</td>
<td>• See proposed Bill 79.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-4.110-2 Bed and breakfast homes—Nonconforming use certificates.</td>
<td>• See proposed Bill 79.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move “Designation of ohana-eligible areas” from Sec. 21-2.110-3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move and rename “Housing—Ohana dwellings” Sec. 21-8.20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move “Procedures for approval of ohana dwellings” from Sec. 21-8.20-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add: no vehicular queuing that spills on to street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move “Developments in Flood Hazard Areas” from Sec. 21-9.10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move “Housing—Zero lot line development” from Sec. 21-8.40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move “Zero lot line site plan” from Sec. 21-8.40-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move “Zero lot line site design standards” from Sec. 21-8.40-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add / Move “Housing—Multiple dwelling units on a single country or residential district zoning lot” from Sec. 21-8.20A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Article 5. Specific Use Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.10 Purpose and intent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.10A Agribusiness activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.20 Agricultural products processing, major and minor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.30 Amusement and recreation facilities--Indoor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.40 Amusement facilities--Outdoor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.50 Antennas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.60 Automobile service stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.70 Bars, nightclubs, taverns and cabarets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.80 Base yards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.80A Biofuel processing facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.90 Car washing establishments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.100 Cemeteries and columbaria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.110 Centralized bulk collection, storage and distribution of agricultural products to wholesale and retail markets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.120 Centralized mail and package handling facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.130 Commercial parking lots and garages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.140 Composting, major and minor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.150 Consulates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.160 Convenience stores.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.170 Dance or music schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.180 Day-care facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.190 Drive-through facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.200 Dwellings for cemetery caretakers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.210 Dwellings, multifamily.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.220 Dwelling, owners or caretakers, accessory.</td>
<td>• Add Dwelling, one-family and two-family detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.230 Eating establishments.</td>
<td>• Remove subsection (a) from Sec. 5.230.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.240 Explosives and toxic chemical manufacturing, storage and distribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.250 Farm dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.260 Food manufacturing and processing facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.270 Freight movers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.280 Golf courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.290 Group living facilities.</td>
<td>• Consider directing reader to “see definitions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.300 Guesthouses, accessory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.310 Heavy equipment sales and rentals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.320 Helistops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.330 Historic structures, use of.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.340 Home improvement centers.</td>
<td>• Consider directing reader to “see definitions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.350 Home occupations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.360 Hotels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.370 Off-site joint development of two or more zoning lots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.380 Joint development of two or more adjacent zoning lots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.390 Joint use of parking facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.400 Kennels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.410 Livestock production--Major.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.420 Manufacturing, processing and packaging, general.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.430 Marina accessories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.440 Medical clinics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.450 Meeting facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.460 Motion picture and television production studios.</td>
<td>• Add Mobile Commercial Establishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.470 Neighborhood grocery stores.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.480 Off-site parking facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.490 Offices, accessory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.500 Petroleum processing.</td>
<td>• Move Sec. 5.500A and Sec. 5.500B outside of Sec. 5.500. Plant Nurseries and Real Estate Offices are not related to Petroleum Processing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.500A Plant nurseries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.500B Real estate offices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.510 Recreational facilities--Outdoor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.510A Repair establishments, Major.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.520 Resource extraction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.530 Retail, accessory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.540 Roadside stand, accessory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.550 Roomers, accessory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.560 Sale and service of machinery used in agricultural production.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.570 Salvage, scrap and junk storage and processing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.580 Sawmills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.590 Schools--Elementary, intermediate and high.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.600 Schools, language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.610 Self-storage facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.610A Special needs housing for the elderly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.620 Storage and sale of seed, feed, fertilizer and other products essential to agricultural production.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.630 Storage yards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.640 Time sharing and transient vacation units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.650 Utility installations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.660 Vacation cabins.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.670 Veterinary establishments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.680 Waste disposal and processing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.690 Wholesaling and distribution outlets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.700 Wind machines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.710 Zoos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article 6. Off-street Parking and Loading</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.10 Off-street parking and loading--Intent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.20 Off-street parking requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.30 Method of determining number.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.40 Arrangement of parking spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.50 Minimum dimensions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.60 Improvement of off-street parking spaces, parking lots and driveways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.70 Parking spaces and required yards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.80 Mechanical parking and storage garages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.90 Required parking spaces located off premises.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.100 Off-street loading requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.110 Method of determining number.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.120 Dimensions of loading spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.130 Location and improvement of loading spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.140 Exceptions to off-street parking and loading requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 7. Sign Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-7.10 Sign regulations—Purpose and intent.</td>
<td>● Delete entire Article, move all sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-7.20 Definitions and general sign standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-7.30 Prohibited signs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-7.40 Specific district sign standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-7.50 Special regulations for certain uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-7.60 Permits and fees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-7.70 Abatement and removal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-7.80 Signs for nonconforming uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-7.80-1 Nonconforming signs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 8. Optional Development Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-8.10 Purpose and intent.</td>
<td>● Delete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-8.20 Housing—Ohana dwellings.</td>
<td>● Delete. Move to Article 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-8.20A Housing—Multiple dwelling units on a single country or residential district zoning lot</td>
<td>● Delete. Move to Article 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-8.30 Farm dwellings—Agricultural site development plan.</td>
<td>● Delete. Move to Article 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-8.40 Housing—Zero lot line development.</td>
<td>● Delete. Move to Article 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-8.40-1 Zero lot line site plan.</td>
<td>● Delete. Move to Article 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-8.40-2 Zero lot line site design standards.</td>
<td>● Delete. Move to Article 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-8.50 Housing—Flexible site design.</td>
<td>● Delete. Move to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-8.50-1 Cluster housing.</td>
<td>● Delete. Move to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-8.50-2 Cluster site design standards.</td>
<td>● Delete. Move to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-8.50-3 Cluster housing procedures.</td>
<td>● Delete. Move to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-8.50-4 Planned development housing (PD-H).</td>
<td>● Delete. Move to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-8.50-5</td>
<td>• Delete. Move to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-8.50-6</td>
<td>• Delete. Move to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-8.50-7</td>
<td>• Delete. Move to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-8.50-8</td>
<td>• Delete. Move to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-8.50-9</td>
<td>• Delete. Move to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-8.50-10</td>
<td>• Delete. Move to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-8.50-11</td>
<td>• Delete. Move to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-8.60</td>
<td>• Delete. Allowed by right, no need for additional review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Article 9. Special District Regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-9.10</td>
<td>• Delete. Move to Article 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9.20-1</td>
<td>• Rename: “Purpose and intent.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9.20-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9.20-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9.20-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9.20-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9.20-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9.30-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9.30-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9.30-3</td>
<td>• Rename: “Prominent views” to use consistent subheadings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9.30-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9.30-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9.40-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9.40-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-9.40-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.40-4 Design controls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.40-5 One-family and two-family detached dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.40-6 Project classification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.50 Punchbowl special district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.50-1 Objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.50-2 Boundaries.</td>
<td>● Rename: “District boundaries” to use consistent subheadings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.50-3 Prominent vistas and viewing areas.</td>
<td>● Rename: “Prominent views” to use consistent subheadings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.50-4 Design controls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.50-5 One-family and two-family detached dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.50-6 Project classification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.60 Chinatown special district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.60-1 Overall objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.60-2 District boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.60-3 Prominent view corridors.</td>
<td>● Rename: “Prominent views” to use consistent subheadings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.60-4 Historic and architecturally significant structures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.60-5 Design controls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.60-6 Mauka precinct objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.60-7 Mauka precinct development standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.60-8 Historic core precinct objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.60-9 Historic core precinct development standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.60-10 Makai precinct objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.60-11 Makai precinct development standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.60-12 Street facade guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.60-13 Project classification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.70 Thomas Square/Honolulu Academy of Arts special district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.70-1 Objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.70-2 District boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.70-3 Significant public views.</td>
<td>● Rename: “Prominent views” to use consistent subheadings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.70-4 Design controls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.70-5 Project classification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.80 Waikiki special district--Findings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.80-1 Waikiki special district--Objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.80-2 District boundaries and land use control system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.80-3 Prominent view corridors and historic properties.</td>
<td>• Rename: “Prominent views” to use consistent subheadings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.80-4 General requirements and design controls.</td>
<td>• Move PD-R and PD-A permit descriptions to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.80-5 Apartment precinct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.80-6 Resort mixed use precinct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-7.80-7 Reserved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.80-8 Public precinct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.80-9 Tables for permitted uses and structures, development standards and project classification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.90 Haleiwa special district.</td>
<td>• See proposed LVO Amendment Resolution 17-079.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.90-1 Objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.90-2 District boundaries.</td>
<td>• Rename: “Prominent views and resources” to use consistent subheadings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.90-3 Significant public views and resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.90-4 Design controls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.90-5 Detached dwellings and duplex units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.90-6 Project classification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.100 Transit-oriented development (TOD) special districts.</td>
<td>• See proposed LVO Amendment Resolution 16-261.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.100-1 Creation of TOD development regulations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.100-2 Neighborhood TOD plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.100-3 Processing of proposed ordinance establishing TOD zones and the TOD development regulations applicable thereto.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.100-4 TOD development regulations minimum requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.100-5 Interim planned development – transit (IPD-T) projects.</td>
<td>• Move IPD-T permit descriptions to Article 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 10. Definitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-10.1 Definitions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section includes a proposed listing of existing graphics that should be updated and new graphics that should be included in the LUO. As previously discussed, graphics (tables, figures and exhibits) play a significant role in reader comprehension; the graphics in the LUO should effectively and efficiently organize large amounts of data and illustrate complex concepts.

Note: the following “Revised LUO Graphics” table is organized so that the “Existing Graphics” column lists the existing graphics that should be revised, in the order and notation as is currently in the LUO. The “Proposed Graphics” column lists the graphics that should be added to the LUO. The “Recommendation” column provides a brief description and / or rationale regarding the revision that needs to occur.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Graphics</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 21-2.1 Permit Application Processing Time</td>
<td>• Update with pertinent information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 21-2.2 Zoning Adjustment: Grade Irregularities</td>
<td>• Make the figure larger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 21-3.2 Heights on Sloping Lots (Country District)</td>
<td>• Make the figure larger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update with pertinent information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 21-3.3 A-2, A-3, AMX-2, AMX-3 District Height Setback</td>
<td>• Make the figure larger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 21-3.4 Resort District Height Setback</td>
<td>• Make the figure larger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 21-3.5 Transitional Heights (Business, BMX, IMX and All Industrial Districts)</td>
<td>• Make the figure larger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update with pertinent information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 21-3.6 Front Yards (B-2, BMX-3, BMX-4, IMX and All Industrial Districts)</td>
<td>• Make the figure larger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 21-3.7 Street Setbacks (B-2, BMX-3, I-2, I-3 and IMX Districts)</td>
<td>• Make the figure larger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 21-3.8 Front Yard BMX-4 District</td>
<td>• Make the figure larger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 21-3.10 Height Measurement in Residential Districts</td>
<td>• Update with pertinent information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 21-7.1 Sign Area</td>
<td>• Update with pertinent information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 21-10.4 Floor Area</td>
<td>• Update with pertinent information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 21-3.2 Residential Districts Development Standards</td>
<td>• Update with pertinent information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 21-6.1 Off-street Parking Requirements</td>
<td>• Update with pertinent information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 21-9.10 Chinatown Special District / Registered Historic Areas</td>
<td>• Update with pertinent information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Graphics</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-3.140-1(c)(1) Density standards.</td>
<td>• Create a new table and assign a table number, as the information is currently listed in a quasi-table format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-4.30(b) Roof overhangs and eaves projection.</td>
<td>• Create a new table and assign a table number, as the information is currently listed in a quasi-table format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-4.50(c) and (d) FAR calculations for lots in two zoning districts.</td>
<td>• Create a new table and assign a table number, as the information is currently listed in a quasi-table format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-5.720(c)(1) Accessory dwelling units.</td>
<td>• Create a new table and assign a table number, as the information is currently listed in a quasi-table format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.50(d) Minimum parking space dimensions.</td>
<td>• Create a new table and assign a table number, as the information is currently listed in a quasi-table format.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.100</td>
<td>Off-street loading requirements.</td>
<td>• Create a new table and assign a table number, as the information is currently listed in a quasi-table format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-6.150</td>
<td>Bicycle parking standards.</td>
<td>• Create a new table and assign a table number, as the information is currently listed in a quasi-table format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-8.50-2(a)</td>
<td>Cluster site design standards.</td>
<td>• Create a new table and assign a table number, as the information is currently listed in a quasi-table format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-8.50-7</td>
<td>PD-H density and minimum land area.</td>
<td>• Create a new table and assign a table number, as the information is currently listed in a quasi-table format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.100-8(a)(1)(A)</td>
<td>General requirements and development standards.</td>
<td>• Create a new table and assign a table number, as the information is currently listed in a quasi-table format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.100-8(a)(3)</td>
<td>TOD yards, setbacks, street facade, and building placement.</td>
<td>• Create a new table and assign a table number, as the information is currently listed in a quasi-table format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 21-9.100-8(3)</td>
<td>Vehicle Parking, Loading, and Bicycle Parking.</td>
<td>• Create a new table and assign a table number, as the information is currently listed in a quasi-table format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building envelope on lots with multiple slopes.</td>
<td>• Create new figures to illustrate the listed information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of determining slope, Reference DPP’s interpretation memo: 2007/ELOG-2006.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Create new figures to illustrate the listed information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space bonus.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Create new figures to illustrate the listed information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable roof forms for single-family dwellings and new buildings in rural areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Create new figures to illustrate the listed information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For commercial uses in all zoning districts, include diagrams that illustrate the placement and treatment of principal pedestrian entries to buildings, required landscaping, on-site parking lots and garages, bicycle facilities and transit (bus) stops adjacent to a property, building façade treatment along certain designated streets in urban and suburban commercial-zoned neighborhoods, and roof treatment in rural areas.</td>
<td>• Create new figures to illustrate the listed information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm dwelling, per Sec. 21-5.250(b).</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Create new figures to illustrate the listed information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of walls and fences, as listed in Articles 4 and 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Create new figures to illustrate the listed information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing guidance documents, application instructions, maps and other reference materials that are used to educate users and clarify LUO requirements, standards and processes may require updates to ensure that they remain consistent with any proposed amendments to the LUO. In addition, new guidance documents may be required to support proposed amendments. The following is a list of LUO-related reference materials that may require updating:

**APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS**

**LAND USE CHANGE AND PLAN AMENDMENTS**
- Zone Change Application
- Zoning District Boundary Adjustments

**ZONING AND LAND USE PERMITS**
- Obtaining Exemptions for Affordable Housing Projects
- Cluster Housing, Country Cluster, Agriculture Cluster
- Conditional Use Permit (Major)
- Conditional Use Permit (Minor) – All Uses, Meeting Facility, Day-care Facility, School, Off-site or Joint use of Parking
- Existing Use Permit
- Minor Modifications
- Plan Review Use – All Uses
- Planned Development - Interim Planned Development – Transit, Resort and Apartment, Housing
- Special District Permit (Major) and (Minor)
- Waiver Permit

**GUIDEBOOKS AND STANDARDS**

**EXISTING**
- Affordable Housing Rules for Unilateral Agreements, and Amendment adopted February 12, 2010
- Cluster Design Guidebook
- Zoning Variance Guidebook
- Off-Street Parking and Bike Parking Guidelines
- Ohana Guidebook
- Requirements for Signage
- Standards and Procedures for the Planting of Street Trees
- Zoning Variance

**PROPOSED**
- LUO User’s Guidebook – To assist new users on how to use the LUO.
- Signage Guidelines (Supplement) – To incorporate DPP’s interpretations, and to address new technologies (digital, interactive, smart street furnishings).
- Small Lot Residential Development Standards and Design Guidelines – To ensure that the characteristics of existing neighborhoods are retained while accommodating small lot development.
- Solar Farm Guidelines
- Solar-Ready Building Design Guidelines
• Standards for Landscaping (proposed revision to DPP’s Standards and Procedures for the Planting of Street Trees [July 1999])
  o Include a green infrastructure / permeability checklist.
  o Coordinate with the City, DPR.

**SPECIAL DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES**

SD Design Guidelines will require updates to address new concepts and changing conditions related to transportation, parking, green infrastructure, and other proposed amendments to the LUO that affect urban uses and design. The SD Design Guidelines may also require updates to reflect changes to SD project classifications for various uses, as well as the proposed inclusion of waiver procedures for SD Design Guidelines. Existing SD Design Guidelines are listed below in descending chronological order:

- **Diamond Head SD Design Guidelines** (November 2018)
- **TOD SD Design Guidelines** (June 2018)
- **Waikiki SD Design Guidelines** (May 2002)
- Punchbowl SD Design Guidelines (November 2000)
- **Thomas Square/Academy of Arts SD Design Guidelines** (June 1995)
- **Haleiwa SD Design Guidelines** (April 1991)
- **Chinatown SD Design Guidelines** (April 1991)
- **Hawaii Capital SD Design Guidelines** (April 1991)

**URBAN DESIGN PLANS**

Urban Design Plans (UDPs) provide a general framework for site planning, land use, circulation and infrastructure for master planned communities and large scale development. Current UDPs may require amendments, in accordance with procedures outlined in the plans, to respond to new conditions and standards, or to take advantage of new opportunities created by LUO revisions. Existing UDPs are listed below in descending chronological order:

- **Ho‘opili Urban Design Plan** (May 2018)
- **Koa Ridge Urban Design Plan** (May 2018)
- **Hoakalei Master Plan Update** (November 2014)
- **University of Hawaii West Oahu Non-Campus Lands Urban Design Plan** (November 2011)
- **Mehana Design Guidelines** (April 2008)
- **The City of Kapolei Urban Design Plan** (November 2007)
- **Mill Town Center – Commercial and Park Project** (July 2000)
- **Wahiawa Urban Design Plan** (January 1998)
- **Mill Town Center – Business and Industrial Park** (February 1997)

**ZONING MAPS**

- Zoning Maps
Various planning and regulatory documents were reviewed for this project, to ensure the recommendations were consistent with the existing regulatory framework in Honolulu. To keep the discussion contemporary, only the LUO-related, City plans, policies, ordinances and resolutions which were updated, adopted or passed within the last five years or are currently being updated were reviewed. The exception being the review of the most recently adopted DPs and SCPs, as it is recognized that long-range plans such as DPs and SCPs undergo lengthy update processes prior to adoption. The current City administration’s priorities and directives were also reviewed. Specific actions or emerging themes that were identified in the below City plans, policies, ordinances and administrative priorities were then used to guide the proposed recommendations for the LUO Update project, with the intent to encourage consistency between the LUO and the aforementioned. The planning and regulatory documents used to frame recommendations are listed below in descending chronological order.

**PLANS**

**OAHU GENERAL PLAN**
- *Oahu General Plan* – Introduced as Resolution 18-93, transmitted from the Planning Commission to the City Council on April 20, 2018, and is currently under review.

**SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY PLANS**
- *Waianae SCP* (March 2012) – The plan took effect as Ordinance No. 12-3.
- *North Shore SCP* (May 2011) – The plan took effect as Ordinance No. 18-93.
- *Central Oahu SCP* (December 2002) – A Proposed Revised Plan updated in 2017 is currently under review by City Council as Bill No. 75.
- *Koolau Loa SCP* (October 1999) – The Proposed Revised Plan was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission in April 2013. The plan was re-introduced by City Council as Bill No. 1 in 2017, and is currently awaiting adoption.

**DEVELOPMENT PLANS**
- *PUC DP* (June 2004) – The PUC DP update is currently in its public outreach phase. Several white papers summarizing critical data and trends have been published on DPP’s website. DPP will have a PRD in winter 2019.
POLICY FRAMEWORK

URBAN DESIGN PLANS

- *Hoopili Urban Design Plan* (May 2018)
- *Koa Ridge Urban Design Plan* (May 2018)
- *Hoakalei Master Plan Update* (November 2014)

TOD

- *TOD Neighborhood Plans* (2014 – 2017) – DPP has prepared TOD plans for each of the eight identified TOD neighborhoods. To date, four have been adopted by the City Council.

OTHER PLANS

- Development Plan / Sustainable Communities Plan Implementation Program Reports:
  - *Program Phase II* (August 2017)
  - *Phase II Working Paper #2* (December 2016)
  - *Phase 1 Report* (July 2011)
- *Oahu Important Agricultural Land Mapping Project* (August 2018) and *Oahu Important Agricultural Land Phase 1 Study* (April 2014) – State Constitution, Article XI, Section 3, “Agricultural Lands” and HRS, Chapter 205, “Land Use Commission” require the county to identify Important Agricultural Lands on the island to ensure high quality farm land is protected. The report was transmitted to City Council in August 2018.

ADMINISTRATIVE PRIORITIES

- Directive No. 18-01, “City and County of Honolulu Actions to Address Climate Change and Sea Level Rise” (July 16, 2018) – Mayor Kirk Caldwell’s directive on climate change and sea level rise instructs City department heads to treat climate change as an “urgent matter” and to develop land use policies, building codes, and hazard mitigation actions to prevent adverse impacts caused by climate change and SLR in accordance with the findings and recommendations of the City Climate Change Commission 2018 Sea Level Rise Guidance.
- Ordinance 18-10, Establishing an Affordable Housing Requirement (April 2018) – The AHR under this ordinance prioritizes the production of affordable housing for lower-income households and generally requires the housing produced to remain affordable for at least 30 years.
- *Hawaii Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Adaptation Report* (December 2017) – The Hawaii Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Commission published this comprehensive report to provide a basis for recommendations on reducing exposure and increasing adaptability to the impacts of SLR and climate change.
- **City and County of Honolulu Complete Streets Design Manual** (September 2016) – This manual, a joint effort between the City Department of Transportation Services and DPP, guides the implementation of the Complete Streets Ordinance No. 12-15.

- **Making Honolulu an Age-Friendly City: An Action Plan** (June 2015) – This action plan, in cooperation with AARP Hawaii, was published to identify goals and recommendations for features that the WHO has found impact the quality of life for the aged-population, including transportation, housing, and outdoor spaces and buildings. Ordinance 18-36 was subsequently signed in October 2018, establishing Honolulu as an “Age-Friendly City” and mandating that the action plan be implemented.

- **Honolulu Bikeshare Organizational Study** (June 2014) – In accordance with Mayor Caldwell’s commitment to creating safer Complete Streets, this report was intended to guide the implementation of bikeshare in Honolulu. Subsequently, the city’s first-ever bikeshare system, Biki, was launched in 2017.

## ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

Legislation is ever-evolving. The below list is a snapshot of the ordinances and resolutions that are currently undergoing legislative review. For example, the Planning Commission may still be reviewing a particular proposal and a formal bill has not yet been introduced. Overall, the recommendations in this report support the ongoing legislative efforts being initiated by DPP on the below-listed issues (by topic and in descending chronological order; current as of publication of this document):

- **Short-Term Rentals**
  - Resolution No. 17-301, Relating to Short-term Rental Accommodations (Introduced October 20, 2017) – expands B&B homes and includes new enforcement tools.
  - DPP Report to Commission Relating to Short-Term Rentals (Transmitted October 19, 2018).
• Large-detached dwellings, i.e. “Monster Homes”
  o Resolution No. 17-276, Related to Detached Dwellings (Introduced October 4, 2017) – would limit the number of bedrooms and wet bars in a single family dwelling.
  o DPP Report to Planning Commission Relating to Detached Dwellings, including a proposed Bill B (Transmitted September 4, 2018).
  o Resolution No. 18-72, Relating to Detached Dwellings (Introduced March 27, 2018) – requires that the advertising of residential rental units comply with new standards and includes penalties for noncompliance.
  o Ordinance 18-6: Regulating for an Interim Period the Issuance of Building Permits (Enacted March 13, 2018).
  o Resolution 18-78, Relating to Development in the Apartment and Apartment Mixed Use Districts to Increase the Supply and Affordable Housing and Reduce the Proliferation of Monster Homes (Introduced April 25, 2018) – The CD1 creates a permitting process for “affordable multifamily dwellings” in the Apartment, Apartment Mixed Use, and Business Mixed Use districts; revises the development standards for these districts; and allows for reduced parking.

• Accessory Dwelling Units:
  o Bill 63 (2018)
  o Ordinance No. 15-41
  o Ordinance No. 16-19
  o Ordinance No. 17-30

• Resolution No. 17-287, Relating to Joint Development (Transfer of Development Rights) (Introduced October 18, 2017).

• Resolution No. 17-236, Relating to Sign Regulations for All Public and Private Schools (Introduced August 23, 2017).
SCOPE OF WORK

The City hired RMTC to undertake Phase 1 of the LUO Update. Phase 1 includes outreach to stakeholders (City and State government agencies, consulting firms, professional and non-governmental organizations, major landowners, and developers), coupled with an independent technical analysis to develop preliminary recommendations for LUO revisions, culminating in the development of this report.

In the fall of 2018, RMTC submitted a Stakeholder Data Compilation and Summary #2 Report to the DPP, which provided DPP with a status update of stakeholder outreach efforts, as well as a summary and compilation of stakeholder comments that were received during the months of March to November 2018. The Stakeholder Data Compilation and Summary #2 Report contains meeting minutes from listening sessions held on May 9th and 11th; meeting minutes from face-to-face and phone interviews; reports and memos from local chapters of APA, AIA, ASLA, BIA and NAIOP working groups; a summary of references that were provided by stakeholders; a qualitative summary of the comments received, organized by Article; and a “Master Table of Comments,” which is a comprehensive catalog of comments (near verbatim) that were received by stakeholders, organized by LUO Articles 1-10, with reference to the source of the comment and the topic. Essentially, it represents the “raw data,” prior to RMTC undertaking an independent technical analysis.

Recommendations in this report are the result of the collection and synthetization of comments and input received from stakeholder outreach and an evaluation and analysis of the input based on review of best zoning and land use practices found in literature, zoning ordinances of other municipalities in Hawaii and on the mainland, City plans and policies and administrative priorities.

Future phases of the LUO Update involve drafting proposed amendments, which will eventually be submitted to the City Council for review and adoption. Future phases are based on available funding.

OUTREACH OVERVIEW

In April 2018, RMTC sent an outreach letter to 70 stakeholders to solicit comments on how the LUO could be improved. Stakeholders included State and City agencies, Councilmembers, private consultants, professional, community, non-profit organizations, developers, large landowners and land use attorneys. Stakeholders were invited to participate in the project based on their familiarity with the LUO. Throughout the outreach process, additional stakeholders, whom were not included in the initial outreach invitation, were invited to participate in the project based on referrals. Additionally, the DPP concurrently and separately
collected recommendations and conducted interviews with various DPP divisions and branches, City agencies and City Council members; recommendations were then forwarded to RMTC. A full list of the stakeholders that provided recommendations is provided in the Acknowledgements section of this report.

OUTREACH METHODS
Stakeholder outreach methods involved hosting listening sessions, phone and face-to-face interviews, and coordination with professional organization working groups.

- RMTC hosted two, group listening sessions at RMTC’s office on Wednesday, May 9 and Friday, May 11, 2018. Five individuals representing five consulting firms / entities attended the session on May 9, 2018 and seven individuals representing five consulting firms / entities attended the session on May 11, 2018.
- RMTC conducted 11 phone and face-to-face interviews with stakeholders who could not attend the listening sessions.
- Five professional organizations established working groups, specifically to gain input from their members. Some of these working groups met consecutively for months and provided in-depth reports with thoughtfully-crafted recommendations. These organizations include the APA - Hawaii Chapter, the AIA Honolulu, the Hawaii Chapter of the ASLA, the BIA and the NAIOP Hawaii. RMTC met and coordinated with APA, AIA, ASLA, BIA, and NAIOP Hawaii to discuss their recommendations.
- RMTC received written comments via email and letters from approximately 32 individuals and organizations. Some of these individuals and organizations may have attended a listening session, participated in a phone and face-to-face interview, but wanted to submit additional comments.
- DPP staff met with each Councilmember and their select staff. Recommendations were then forwarded on to RMTC.
- The Neighborhood Boards (NBs) were also informed that the project was undergoing and that there would be several opportunities for the NBs to contribute throughout the LUO Update process.

RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS PROCESS
RMTC received an enormous amount of input from stakeholders, which serves as evidence that the community cares about this project and recognizes its importance in directing and shaping the development of Honolulu, and the design of the places where we live, work and play.

An independent technical analysis was undertaken by RMTC, which involved organizing, consolidating and evaluating stakeholders’ comments. Comments were organized by topic
and LUO article(s) / section; similar or related comments were consolidated in an effort to eliminate redundancy; and comments were screened against a list of criteria. In addition to leaning on the planning expertise and experience of staff at RMTC, the criteria used to evaluate the comments involved the following:

- Assessing the relevancy of the comment to the LUO and RMTC’s scope of work;
- Ensuring that the comment reflects an accurate read, understanding and interpretation of the LUO;
- Confirming that the comment is not already addressed in the LUO;
- Assessing whether the comment gives clear direction for the development of section-specific recommendations;
- Evaluating the comments against best zoning and land use practices found in literature, zoning ordinances of other municipalities in Hawaii and on the mainland, and City plans and policies and Administration priorities related to the LUO;
- Ensuring comments align with DPP’s interpretations of specific sections of the LUO, which are not readily available to the public or currently incorporated in the LUO;
- Assessing that the comment will not increase inefficiencies at DPP; and
- Ensuring that recommendations are legally sound.
FORM-BASED CODE

ABOUT THE ISSUE
The LUO is currently a “hybrid code,” in that it combines conventional “Euclidean” zoning code with elements of form-based code (FBC). Euclidean zoning codes are based on the separation of uses and contain development standards, such as minimum lot area, setbacks, maximum height and density, which creates “building envelopes” and represents the maximum potential of development. FBC is a reaction and response to the development patterns that Euclidean codes have perpetuated and codifies the desired form, scale, design and character of a development. Further, FBC typically encourages walkable, compact, Mixed Use neighborhoods.

RECOMMENDATIONS
In the “Development Plan / Sustainable Communities Plan Implementation Program – Phase 1 Report,” (“DP / SCP Report”) prepared by PlanPacific Inc. in July 2011 for DPP, it was concluded that a comprehensive replacement of the present LUO has some “conceptual appeal, but is fraught with practical limitations.” The DP / SCP Report recommended that FBC features could be incorporated into the LUO through the SD design guidelines, which already put forth the distinct aesthetic characteristics of that community’s vision. The DPP might consider introducing elements of FBC in the next update of design guidelines for certain SDs, similar to the TOD SD design guidelines which were published by DPP in June 2018.

AGE-FRIENDLY AND SOCIALLY JUST CITY

ABOUT THE ISSUE
Universal Design principles are based on the design and production of buildings and products that promote equal opportunity for use by individuals, whether or not they have a disability. Visitability principles are based on a movement to change construction standards so that new housing is designed to allow people with mobility impairments to live independently in the units and to have convenient accessibility to visit others (Evans-Cowley, 2006). Design standards found in other cities, such as Howard County, Maryland and Lafayette, California, have included Universal Design and Visitability principles into their standards (Lafayette, 2018; Evans-Cowley, 2006).

RECOMMENDATIONS
Honolulu might benefit in incorporating Universal Design and / or Visitability principles that are not currently addressed in ROH, Chapter 16, Building Code.

REFERENCES
CLIMATE CHANGE, ADAPTATION AND RESILIENCY

ABOUT THE ISSUE
As noted previously, challenges related to climate change, adaptation and resiliency, such as SLR or renewable energy, may not be directly governed through the LUO. Issues related to SLR would be directly addressed in ROH, Chapters 21A, 23 and 25; flood hazard-related issues would be addressed in ROH, Chapter 21A; and, renewable energy incorporation into structures would addressed in ROH, Chapter 16.

>> RESILIENCY ORDINANCE

ABOUT THE ISSUE
In an effort to respond to the current and future impacts of climate change, municipal planning departments around the nation have adopted a “resiliency ordinance” into their codes. It would be worthwhile to reference other municipalities’ regulations.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Adopting a resiliency ordinance would likely be an effort led by OCCSR with support by DPP. A resiliency ordinance could either be incorporated into the following chapters of ROH: Chapter 21, “LUO”; Chapter 16, “Building Code”; Chapter 23, “Shoreline Setbacks”, or Chapter 25, “Special Management Area”. Another option could be to adopt a stand-alone resiliency ordinance altogether.

REFERENCES

>> MANAGED RETREAT AND TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

ABOUT THE ISSUE
Locally, the State Office of Planning, Coastal Zone Management Program (OP-CZM) is currently assessing the feasibility of managed retreat strategies for the state’s vulnerable coastal areas. The 2017 Hawaii SLR Vulnerability and Adaptation Report recommended a land inventory be conducted to identify areas that could support a managed retreat strategy. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Coastal Services Center defines the concept of managed retreat as an adaptation strategy to address issues caused by SLR and increased storm surge and erosion. Such strategies “typically involve establishing
thresholds to trigger demolition or relocation of structures threatened by erosion” (NOAA, 2013).

Further, the 2017 report recommends implementation of a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program and coordinated land swaps to relocate development from hazard areas to safer areas as a way to facilitate managed retreat from the shoreline. TDR is considered by NOAA as one form of managed retreat. While TDR programs are typically used to protect ecologically valuable land like farmland, floodplains and wetlands or for historic preservation, using such a program as an explicit part of a climate adaptation strategy is a relatively new concept. TDR can be defined as a voluntary “market tool that can be used to achieve land preservation by allowing a landowner to sever unused development rights (“sending site”) in exchange for compensation from another landowner who wants additional development rights for another parcel (“receiving site”) (ULI, 2017). On Oahu, many possible coastal sending areas, like Waikiki, have reached development capacity. In researching TDR strategies for this report, there are no documented efforts of a TDR program in response to climate change. However, other cities – notably also within the Rockefeller Foundation 100 Resilient Cities program – are currently exploring it. Ongoing efforts both nationally and locally are still evolving.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

While these issues are primarily addressed in ROH, Chapters 23, 24 or 25, should the State adopt a TDR strategy, the LUO would need to be reviewed in conjunction with this effort. It is noted that TDR is complicated to administer. It is recommended that DPP follow the effort led by the State OP-CZM and OCSSR regarding managed retreat and a potential TDR program.

**REFERENCES:**

This report and Stakeholder Data Compilation and Summary #2 Report are intended to document the extensive participatory process of this project and serve as a public reference document and key resource to be used by City agencies, civil servants, policy makers, elected officials, stakeholders who participated in its preparation, and the residents of Oahu. The report and Stakeholder Data Compilation and Summary #2 Report reflect the diversity of input based on various perspectives and experiences that individuals and organizations have with the regulation of land use planning on Oahu.

This report and Stakeholder Data Compilation and Summary #2 Report will serve as a resource during the subsequent future phases of the project, and the eventual rewriting and reorganization of the LUO. Future phases of the project involve drafting proposed amendments, which will eventually be submitted to the City Council for review and adoption. It should be noted that the recommendations in this report are put forth by RMTC and have not been endorsed or vetted by DPP. Additional research will be required in subsequent phases to ensure that proposed amendments to the LUO are legally sound. Future phases are based on available funding; given competing funding interests, this project will move ahead incrementally with proposed amendments submitted to the City Council as they are completed. Outreach and communications with stakeholders will occur at every phase of the project.
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