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PROCEEDINGS

Chair Hazama: Okay. Good afternoon. At this
time I'd like to call to order the meeting of the Planning
Commission of July 6, 2016. Welcome. And at this time for
order of business—before I move on I'd like to thank
Mr. Garrick Iwamura from Enterprise Services for allowing us
to use this facility this afternoon as well as always our
Commission staff Gloria Takara for setting up the room and
sound systems for us to enable us to have this meeting out
here for you this afternoon. So, let's give them a hand.
Okay. Moving on our agenda approval of our
minutes for our June 6th, 2016 meeting. Commissioners, do
we have any comments or changes regarding the minutes? [no
response] Okay. Seeing none, any objections to adopting
the minutes? [no response] Seeing no objections, any
abstentions? [no response] Seeing none, the minutes are
adopted.

Moving onto our public hearing today, Bill to
Adopt the Revised Koolau Pono Sustainable Communities Plan
for the City and County of Honolulu. At this time, I'd like
to call up the Department.

Mr. Young: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission, my name is
Raymond Young. I'm the staff planner assigned to take care
of this project. It's a massive project.

It started back in 2009.
Chair Hazama: Okay. Couple things before we move
on. For those who are interested in testifying before the
Commission today, if you can sign the sign-up sheet at that
table, we appreciate it. Also, our restrooms are right
outside the door here to the right and there are some
vending machines and when we take our break downstairs on
the first floor. Please keep in mind that there are people
working in the building. There are staff here that work at
the golf course. So, when we take our breaks if we can
respect their time and space. Yes.

Unknown male in the audience: Yeah. I signed up
to talk, and it says, "you approve or disapprove". Is it as
written or is it as changed? You're voting for or against as
written or as changed with the modification?
Chair Hazama: It is as the draft currently
stands.

Unknown from the audience: So, with the changes?
Chair Hazama: Yes.

Unknown male from the audience: Thank you.
Chair Hazama: Okay. I'm sorry. Please proceed.
Mr. Young: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I was
saying this project began in 2009. The Charter calls for
the regional plans to be updated every five years. The
1 current plan is dated 2000, so we're far behind but at least
2 we're at this point. We're ready to present to you and
3 hopefully you will support it and move it on to City
4 Council.

The first community wide meeting that we took was
6 back in November 2009. We had another one in September 2010,
7 and the last one where the public review draft was released
8 was November 2014. We had several focus groups meetings
9 held on various subjects including local food, residential
10 character, natural resources and cultural resources. Now,
11 the regions of population and household sizes are projected
12 to continue to decline. Although an analysis of the land
13 use supply does not support an expansion of the growth
14 boundary. Housing units are projected to grow about 75
15 units each year due to accessory and infill housing
16 development. Now, with respect to the significant
17 updates—let me just briefly go over them. First one is we
18 want to bring the information found in the 2000 plan to
19 current. So, the new planning horizon now stands at 2035.
20 References or updates and descriptions of other relevant
21 plans were included since 2000. We've incorporated new
22 legislative mandates including renewable energy, water
23 reuse, complete streets, outdoor lighting, telecom antennas
24 and the principles of sustainability. We also try to make
25 this plan consistent with other development plans and
1 sustainable community plans that have been updated since.
2 And so the contents and the planning definitions are kind of
3 similar or same. We added an implementation matrix which
4 specifies actions, codes and responsible entities to try
5 carry out this plan rather than have it sit on the shelf. We
6 also have for you a summary of language changes and are
7 listed in the handouts, and you probably got all that and
8 the technical report.

9 Now, we did have several third party request to
10 amend the sustainable communities plan proposed by the
11 Hawaiian Memorial Park, the Waimanalo Koa, the DeReis
12 family, the awa projects. All of these are outside of the
13 growth boundary were not generally supported. However, with
14 respect to the Hawaiian Memorial Park we did clarify that
15 it's a permitted use in the open space area or the
16 preservation area designated in the plan and also in the
17 state conservation district. So, we made that slight
18 clarification.

19 The major issues we faced during the review,
20 including again, Hawaiian Memorial Park, where they were
21 pressured to expand the growth boundary through a State Land
22 use change from conservation to urban, however, that was not
23 supported by the Department and ultimately was denied by the
24 Land Use Commission.

25 In checking with what can be established in the

1 least, in my copy they weren't in the final version. It
2 could've been a collating, I just wanted to make sure.
3 Mr. Young: That's possible. Does everybody else
4 have that missing maps from the Ramseyer?
5 Member Sodaro: They're not in the final.
6 Chair Hazama: Just the final.
7 Member Sodaro: Yeah, it's supposed--So, it was
8 supposed to be collated into the final?
9 Mr. Young: Yes.
10 Member Sodaro: Okay. I just wanted to make sure.
11 Mr. Young: Yeah, it should be in the same thing.
12 Chair Hazama: I think it was just the filing.
13 Member Sodaro: That's fine. Thank you, Raymond.
14 I just wanted to make sure.
15 Mr. Young: All right. Thank you.
16 Chair Hazama: Okay. Any other questions.
17 Commissioners?
18 Member Lin: Raymond, you might have said
19 something about it, but the pending General Plan amendment,
20 you said you're going to bring that out for public reviews
21 soon or for hearing soon? What's the schedule on that?
22 Mr. Young: Let me defer to Kathy who's better
23 versed in the scheduling of that.
24 Ms. Sowigawa: Good afternoon, Kathy Sowigawa,
25 Planning and Permitting Department, Planning Division The
1 General Plan is going to through a second public review
2 draft and should be out in another couple months for public
3 review.
4
5 Member Lim: What's the schedule after that for a
6 public hearing with the Planning Commission?
7 Ms. Sokugawa: It depends on to what extent we get
8 feedback. Generally, we ask for 30 to 60 days of review
9 comments but if community organizations need more time we'd
10 be happy to give them that additional time, and then we'll
11 go through another internal review to update and finalize
12 and then go come to you. Maybe before the end of the year.
13 I'm not promising.
14
15 Chair Hazama: Okay. Any other questions at this
17
18 Mr. Young: Thank you.
19
20 Chair Hazama: Okay. So, Commissioners, we'll
21 open up for public testimony. So, I'm going through the
22 sign-up sheet, and I will do my best to not mispronounce
23 your names. I'll try read the handwriting. First testimony
24 is Mr. Grant Yoshimori, please come up.
25
26 Mr. Yoshimori: Hello. My name is Grant
27 Yoshimori. And Commissioners thank you for letting me
28 testify. I would like to submit the following testimony on
29 behalf of myself and the supporters of savekaneohe.org. We
30 have submitted over 1,000 signatures collected both online
31 and via signature cards, requesting that the Koolau Poko
32 Sustainable Communities Plan update be modified to ensure
33 that the Hawaiian Memorial Cemetery does not expand on state
34 conservation land. Specifically, we are requesting three
35 changes to the existing proposed plan. No. 1, on page 318,
36 line No. 16, we'd like to strike the phrase, "the Hawaiian
37 Memorial Park is currently proposing an expansion." The
38 reason we're requesting this is the KSCP is a long-term
39 planning document, and we feel it should not recognize a
40 transient event.
41
42 No. 2, on page 318, line 23, and on page 512, we'd
43 like to strike the wording, "located in state conservation
44 district." The reason why is the language implies City
45 consent that the cemeteries are allowed in state
46 conservation district. There is some overlap with the
47 preservation area and our proposed language we feel would
48 have the same protections without confusion.
49
50 The third thing we'd like to request, and is a key
51 one for us. It's really, really key for us is on page 44,
52 line 39. We'd like to strike the phrase "and cemeteries". 
53 So, the phrase "and cemeteries" was added. The language
54 should read, "golf courses not located within the community
55 growth boundary and/or agriculture areas as described
56 above." The reason we're requesting this is firstly the
57 wording would effectively allow cemeteries outside of the
58 community growth boundary. So, this does not exist in the
59 current plan right now. This would undermine the State Land
60 Use Commission's Decision and Order on Docket A077777, where
61 the LUC denied Hawaiian Memorial Life's Plan to expand the
62 cemetery on conservation land. The addition of the phrase
63 "and cemeteries" occurred after the KSCP public review
64 draft. So, people didn't have a chance to comment on that
65 addition.
66
67 It's not currently in the existing KSCP, and it's
68 not consistent with the rest of the KSCP. So, we really
69 would like to strike that language. And, lastly, golf
70 courses and cemeteries should not be treated equally as
71 cemeteries involve much greater vehicle traffic. There's
72 greater pedestrian traffic, larger security concerns, more
73 buildings, and it would have a greater negative
74 environmental impact by altering more square footage then a
75 golf course.
76
77 So, I just like to state some of the reasons why
78 the State Land Use Commission had denied Hawaiian Memorial
79 Life rezoning request. 1. They stated that there was no
80 need for additional cemeteries. They stated that there was
81 risk of run-off and erosion, risk for rock fall hazards to
82 the neighborhood. Is that my time? [referring to timer]
83 Chair Hazama: Yeah, go ahead and summarize,
84 please.
1 DeReis. This is in support of our request to amendment that
2 was one of the attached modifications to the--I guess, not
3 sure of it was an amendment to the current draft. I just
4 wanted to--I don't know if anybody, everybody had a chance
5 to review that document. But I wanted to speak to the merits
6 of the request on both sides. Mr. DeReis owns a 10-acre
7 parcel at the back of Ahiimanu Road, off of Melekula Road.
8 So the Melekula access is through an existing residential
9 neighborhood that's comprised primarily of R-10, 10,000
10 square foot lots. That's the only property that's not zoned
11 residential in that neighborhood with that access. It's
12 physically bounded. There's no access on three of the
13 boundaries. The east side is Kahaluu Stream, to the south
14 or makai is a ridge line that extends all the way up, such
15 there is no physical access through. So essentially through
16 this residential block it's a geographically constrained
17 area. It's currently zoned AG-2. He moved in 1990 and have
18 been using it for corral. So, he raised some livestock
19 there, and he was training horses. That's been the only ag
20 use on the property. It's not designated by (inaudible)
21 either unique or prime agricultural land. So, based on just
22 the characteristics of the site, it is one of those sites
23 that's suitable for infill development. What we're
24 requesting is the modification to the community, the urban
25 community boundary. Right now it follows the mauka edge of

1 there is a steep slope, vegetated. The area that's proposed
2 for the housing is pretty much in the middle. And along the
3 stream--We're proposing a stream buffer. Initial proposal
4 was for 2 acres. The Department, in one of their responses
5 most recently had asked that we--If we move forward as part
6 of an environmental assessment that we include a more in
7 depth study to establishing a stream buffer along that
8 corridor. But right now we're proposing between, I think
9 between 40 and 120 feet offset from the stream. That more
10 less follows the geographic contours. So, I'll just leave it
11 and one other concerns expressed by the community was water
12 quality, and we think that the project as a country housing
13 actually has an opportunity to provide better safeguards to
14 the establishment of that stream buffer as well as through
15 the creation of the drainage infrastructure that would have
16 to accompany the development of the site. Right now--
17 Chair Hazama: What is the project area size?
18 Mr. Niermann: The project area size is 7.2 acres--
19 Chair Hazama: 7.2?
20 Mr. Niermann: Yeah.
21 Member Sodaro: So the current community growth
22 boundary does not include it?
23 Mr. Niermann: It's right along the edge. So, it
24 follows--
25 Member Sodaro: So, it's not separated?

1 the property and along the stream. We're requesting that
2 the boundary actually follow the zoning line for AG-2. And
3 the intention--Mr. DeReis' intention is to rezone to
4 country. We initially, back in 2009 when we started this,
5 had proposed residential rezone. And in response to
6 consultation with the Department of Planning and Permitting
7 as well as three trips to the neighborhood and
8 acknowledging that at each of those three trips, they
9 rejected the request. But we had modified the plan from
10 putting in, I think 21, 10,000 square foot lots, that will
11 be consistent with the neighborhood. We reduced it to 12
12 and then finally reduced it further to six country zone lots
13 is what the proposal--What he is proposing to do if this
14 goes forward. I'll leave the testimony at that. I think
15 Mr. DeReis has some comments he'd like to make sure as well
16 when his time comes up.
17 Chair Hazama: Okay. Commissioners, any questions
18 at this time? [no response] So based on her map then the P-2
19 section is you're not requesting for anything in the P-1
20 section?
21 Mr. Niermann: Yeah. In the P-1 section we're not
22 requesting any change. That portion would be included in
23 Mr. DeReis' residential parcel so we couldn't argue later
24 for a hardship, for developing a house within conservation
25 district. So, that would remain as is. The condition out

1 Mr. Niermann: Yeah. It basically follows the edge
2 here, and we're requesting that rather then going all the
3 way down to the stream at the zoning line, that it follow
4 the zoning line and reconnect. So, it bring about that 7.2
5 acre.
6 Member Sodaro: What's the status of your zone
7 change application for the six country?
8 Mr. Niermann: It will have to follow--Actually it
9 doesn't necessarily have to follow. Most recently in
10 discussions with DPP at the beginning of the year. They've
11 indicated that they want an environmental assessment to be
12 prepared for the zone change. That has to proceed the
13 application being processed.
14 Member Sodaro: So, there's no zone change
15 application in file?
16 Mr. Niermann: No. None has been filed.
17 Member Sodaro: Thanks.
18 Chair Hazama: So the A-2 that's within the growth
19 boundary now, what is that small little section there?
20 Mr. Niermann: That's a lot at the end of this
21 subdivision here. That's Henoheno Street, and that's
22 basically AG-2 remnant that's part of that residential
23 subdivision.
24 Chair Hazama: So, it's AG-2 but it's within the
25 boundary?
Mr. Niemann: Yes, that's correct. If I can just add one thing. One of the request or recommendation, informal from DPP is we do a regional study of all similar conditions to this just to see if this could be used as a 5 precedent in other areas of Koolau Poko. We did that. We looked literally at every lot and the criteria we applied was 2 acres or greater. AG-2 that could be rezoned to country that was not either prime or unique agricultural lands. So, we use the same characteristics as the site.

We found about 36 acres or so in various pockets around that actually follow the same criteria. So, that would be, I guess the risk of a precedent or other people following this pattern and using the same arguments. But in those cases, we could probably have long discussions over a table over whether it was such a bad thing in those particular locations.


Mr. Niemann: All right. Thank you.

Chair Hazama: Okay. All right. Next testifier is Ron DeReis.

Mr. DeReis: Hi. I'm Ron DeReis, and we just talking about that zoning that I wanted for my property in Kahalu'u. Well, I have grand kids. I have kids, and I'd like to split it up if I can for them in the future. That was the whole intent of this, and I had cattle there. I was raising cattle and horses and whatever there, but I have a subdivision right around me. It surrounds my property and whatever so I had to give that up in a sense or right with the neighbors. So, I felt the best deal now is rezone this thing if I can, you know and move on from there, and see what I can do. Or open up a biggy. I mean, I've tried everything, been going over this for nine years already, and I don't know what to say. But that's all I left have to say.

Chair Hazama: Okay. Any questions for testifier? [no response] Is your—is your intention still to maintain some kind of agricultural activity on this property?

Mr. DeReis: That's why we've planning on that 1 acre lot, that it will stay, it'll grow flowers. Keep it ag in a sense, but I could put dwellings on the property.

Chair Hazama: But under AG-2 you're allowed to build, I guess, per square lot you're allowed to build like a house or home on it on AG-2 zoning. So, I guess my question is if that's kind of your intent then why would you want to rezone it back to country when you can subdivide the current parcel; leave it under the current AG-2 zoning and then still be able to build and subdivide at the lots.

Mr. Niemann: So, right now we could subdivide to create three agricultural lots, and I think under the UDO we could put two houses on each. And, so by the main reason for going to country is so the ownership of the lot could be transferred in fee simple. And, I know there's no guarantee if we say, kids, grand kids, family, friends. That's his intent. Of course, it would just be out there on the market essentially. But the intent is if he transferred fee simple and primarily so that it doesn't--it avoids some of the conflict that could result from family members having shared property even under CPR regime. So, that's the intent. And initially, again—I mean, it started as residential. And the idea was not just family and friends obviously. It was to sell for market value and help, you know, make some revenue return for Mr. DeReis. As it scaled back that's still a possibility for doing this fee simple, the lots.

Chair Hazama: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions, Commissioner Hazama: response All right. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. DeReis: Thank you.

Chair Hazama: All right. Next testifier is Richard Miller.

Mr. Miller: Good afternoon. Thank you for hearing me. My name is Richard Miller, and I am now retired and been living with my wife in Pohai Nani. My background as a professor of law, emeritus at the UH Law School.

Part of my problem here is I'm not as familiar with the details of the legal stuff, applicable to your group. So, I'm going to talk about the effects of the proposed expansion of cemetery property, but in a lay sense because I just don't know all the details of the requirements so far. I tried to read some of the stuff but haven't, and had it only for a short time. First, there is a beautiful forest that can be seen from Pohai Nani, and the view is lovely for the elderly people who live especially on that side of building. And the comments as I understand them is what is proposed would do away with a significant portion of that forest and include—I think, the views of these people now see the comment in one of the things that I read was that some view alteration will occur as the landscape cemetery will extend across the portion of what is now primarily overgrown non-native Schefflera java plum forest. So, since it's non-native we're going to take it down, and we will replace it with essentially a cemetery, which will have some agricultural additions, but nothing like the gorgeous forest which is right there. Instead, I think the elderly, the most of us are elderly who look out the window will be looking down on the cemetery which is not exactly the most happy kind of view for us. But I also noticed, and this is in the--And, I'll cite you what I've been reading is, "Koolau Poko Sustainable Communities Plan application for amendment" and the date of this letter was April 29, 2009.
1 and I gather you did not permit a change in 2009. I find 3 really troublesome apart from removing a beautiful forest is 4 that the proposed time for this project, according to what 5 I've been reading is 10-20 years. That means 10-20 years of 6 taking down a whole forest, that's part of it or significant 7 piece of the forest and having to build all this stuff that 8 has been shown in the plans that have been submitted which 9 include three, what is called retention sites, which I 10 gather small lakes that will have to hold the water that 11 comes flowing down off what used to be a forest and was 12 retained within the forest will now be rolling down and 13 going into not only the property of Pohai Nani, but of the 14 homes that are below that, that run along Moku Street and 15 below all the way down to Mokulele Street will be getting an 16 enormous amount of water if you have seen the rain the last 17 few days from where I sit in Pohai Nani. You would notice 18 that it's extremely heavy almost you cannot even see 19 individual drops. It's like water falling from the sky in 20 large tubs. That much water will now be free to go down 21 towards Kanehoe Bay, I guess. If the retention lakes don't 22 manage to hold it each time. What is also troublesome is 23 the notion that this could take 10 to 20 years. 24 So, we're not just talking about coming in, cleaning things 25 up, taking away little forest. We've got a nice cemetery 26 going. It's about something that's gonna be, going by way

1 of construction and building and shopping and so forth.

2 They say from 10 to 20 years.

3 Chair Hazama: Can I ask you to summarize, please?
4 Mr. Miller: Yes.
5 Chair Hazama: Okay.
6 Mr. Miller: In any event, I think this is 7 something which is going to have a really negative effect 8 not only on Pohai Nani and the 400 or so elderly citizens 9 who are there but upon the entire residential area that's 10 going to be affected. And it will be trucks and noise and 11 buildings. There is a new road that's going to be built 12 through the area and who knows how much else. But, we think 13 that perhaps if we're going to have new cemeteries maybe we 14 need them out in the west side of the island where the 15 population is growing quite fast out there. But certainly 16 not to extend to a great extent this existing cemetery.
17 Thank you very much.
20 Thank you very much. Okay. Our next testifier is Chuck 21 Prentiss.
22 Mr. Prentiss: Good afternoon. My name is Chuck 23 Prentiss. I'm the Chair of the Kailua Neighborhood Board, 24 and thank you all for coming to the Windward side today.
25 My background is I'm a retired planner from DPP. I've

1 worked there for 20 years sometime ago. And, also during 2 that time I was the executive secretary of the Honolulu 3 Planning Commission and that's back in the days when you 4 folks had your own staff, which I would recommend that 5 somehow you continue that. But the first thing I want to 6 say is that the Neighborhood Board has one general statement 7 that the Board opposes finalizing the Koolau Poko 8 Sustainable Communities Plan before the General Plan 9 revision is completed. And, as you know DPP is currently 10 working on that revision. As far as the sustainable plan is 11 concerned, the Board has been working with DPP for over two 12 years on the revision. We would like to thank DPP for 13 incorporating many of our suggestions in their final draft. 14 We do, however, have a number of concerns remaining that 15 have been adopted unanimously by our 19-member Board. 16 Our testimony has 21 comments. We would like to, interest 17 of time, just highlight three of those this afternoon.
18 And, the first one is on page ES-7 in the appendix, 19 Appendix A, which relates to the maps in the plan. The 20 revision states that these maps are intended to be 21 conceptual illustrations which detects and should be 22 considered secondary to the policies and the guidelines that 23 are articulated in the text. We ask that the current 24 language be retained. The current language says these maps 25 show the long range vision of the future of the plan area
It was recognized that it was necessary to more easily communicate the boundaries of the various land uses plan because the nature of the Koolau Poko with its steep valleys, slopes, wetland and vistas, along with the policy of non-expansion of its residential, commercial, industrial areas. It was considered most appropriate to the implementation of the City Charter statement that an undesirable spreading the development is prevented. We believe that the current DPP staff is not aware. Why the maps adopted 16 years ago for Koolau Poko are different then for other areas.

They also had provided no justification for changing the size or the description of the intent of the maps. And the current size of the maps and the existing description of the intent of the maps should be retained. Secondly, our comment is on page 3-36, Guidelines for Agriculture. Currently, it says permit a dwelling only if it is accessory to a verifiable agricultural use on the same lot. We would like to see that replaced with prohibit dwellings on AG (inaudible) lands.

The rationality for this is that there has not been in any way found by the City to effectively enforce current agricultural income requirements. You may have heard that one papaya tree meets the requirement. This has resulted in agricultural land being used for fake farms and

gentlemen’s estate. There's effectively no current agricultural zoning, and we only have large gentlemen estates zoning. The only way to preserve the agricultural land is to prohibit dwellings on the agricultural land.

And finally we have a comment on page 3-38 on Residential Use. We have a section that we would like to see deleted and replaced with another section. Factors such as use of residential units as vacation units, rentals to military personnel or rising property taxes are having an adverse effect on the housing affordability in the region. Other factors influencing housing prices such as a lifestyle preferences of individual residential property owners, market forces and restricted supply of land for housing development in a region with the slow growth policy but continued high island-wide demand for housing. That's in the proposed revision. The other thing in the revision that we would like to see removed is--it says "however, the ongoing General Plan review is evaluating the appropriateness of vacation rental units outside the resort areas. Should an adopted General Plan policy support vacation rentals outside resort areas then it follows that more specific policies and guidelines be established at the regional planning level. These policies and guidelines should be devised to allow vacation rentals in areas other than resort zoning, such as residential areas while

1 illegal vacation rentals to propagate throughout the island.
2 Analysis of the units, the HEGA identified on Oahu, uncovers the minimum of 50% are operating illegally.
3 Increased enforcement of the current LDO provisions will go a long way to prevent residential areas and help remedy the rental housing crisis especially in the heavily impacted communities of Kailua and Waimanalo.

So, finally DPP's draft in this section includes statements that are inappropriate in the plan. And pure speculation with respect to future changes in the provisions of the General Plan which are currently being revised.

Left out is the proper analysis of the current housing crisis on Oahu, and the impact of a proliferation of vacation rentals on the cost and quality of life in residential areas.

Examples of important facts are in the proposal that we included that will be in the change that we recommended.

Thank you for coming to the Windward side today, and I hope you will carefully review our written testimony that we have submitted. Thank you very much.


Mr. Chock: Good afternoon, Mr. Hazama, members of
1 the Planning Commission. I'm Al Keelli Chock. I'm retired
2 from the foreign service of the US Department of
3 Agriculture, but unlike my colleagues, Dick Miller, I'm still
4 at the University of Hawaii. I want to again raise my
5 objection to the proposed efforts of the Hawaiian Memorial
6 Park to expand their graveyards in conservation land. I
7 would like to remind this business entity that the Land Use
8 Commission denied their proposal from conservation to urban
9 in 2009. The proposed expansion in incapable and
10 inconsistent with environmental policy, precepts and
11 practices. Any expansion work because of the angle of the
12 land, which is sometimes like this, other times it's like
13 this. However, small it might be, we result in erosion,
14 soil run-off and immediate pollution of Kaneohe Bay which is
15 a very fragile marine preserve. Hawaiian Memorial Park is
16 also inconsistent in their thesis for the need for more
17 burial purposes, spaces rather. Their own statistics
18 indicate that in 2005, 64% of the bodies were cremated. This
19 number has probably increased. Certainly in the huge
20 majority of the residents of Pahai Nani go out cremated. The
21 need for more burial spaces is minimal because there are
22 nitches and there are urns and there are other possibilities
23 available. The Hawaiian Memorial Parks support facilities
24 described in their 2009 documents were apparently not
25 communicated to the Mauna Kea employees since they wanted us

1 other matter that was discussed previously this is a request
2 to adjust the community growth boundaries in the current
3 draft to include this modern development, which is right
4 down here at the Keapuka subdivision expansion area. The
5 expansion area because it meets right where the current
6 subdivision stops and also involves agricultural cluster
7 subdivision below Likelike Highway and between H3 Highway.
8 But in general we're requesting your support in
9 adding this to the plan for the ability to have the
10 community growth boundary adjusted. And a lot of you know
11 previously I was the Director for the Department of Planning
12 and Permitting, and I was actually there when we were
13 looking at these urban growth boundaries at that point, and
14 we decided to call it community growth boundaries because
15 in the sustainable communities plan we wanted to have a
16 demarcation maps, saying where do we want things to end, but
17 they were never intended to be permanent in a sense that he
18 there forever in perpetuity. That's why there is a process
19 for these bodies like the Planning Commission and City
20 Council to take under consideration. This project as well
21 as the DeReis project was not supported as you know by the
22 Department. But from the perspective, I look at it as the
23 current policies here and as mentioned by the planner in
24 charge, Ray Young, that it doesn't justify expansion, and we
25 don't need anymore dwelling units because there is a decline

1 to go downtown for brief counseling when our aunt died in
2 2013. She had paid for a funeral plan. And since she has
3 been dying for 15 months, we did not want to go downtown.
4 because we persisted they finally came out to Kaneohe. The
5 need for additional burial spaces is inconsistent or
6 certainly mitigated when another cemetery is offering in
7 their sales documents ocean views.

8 We have been Pahai Nani residents for almost a
9 decade, and while we’re gullily cognizant of our mortality, we
10 do not wish to have a constant reminder of this which would
11 result if Hawaiian Memorial Park were allowed to expand. The
12 community and neighborhood organizations are (inaudible) to
13 this expansion. The only group which may be in favor of this
14 expansion is because of the Hawaiian Memorial Park promise
15 to provide funds to maintain a heirau which could be
16 constituted as a bribe. Mahalo.

17 Chair Hazama: Okay. Thank you very much.
18 Commissioners, any questions? [no response] Our next
19 testifier is Mr. David Tanoue.

20 Mr. Tanoue: Good afternoon, members of the
21 Planning Commission. David Tanoue for the record. I'm
22 speaking on behalf of one of the amendments to be added that
23 we're requesting to be added to the draft plan before you.
24 And this is specifically with the Wai'ele O Koolau
25 agricultural and residential subdivision proposal. Like the

1 in population. And I think one of the reasons why the
2 decline in population is because the current policy as move
3 forward is generally a no growth policy. And if you take a
4 look at the graphs that they're showing in the reports. And
5 the decline in the population is a long drawn out decline.
6 And if you measure it against the actual units available,
7 it's a flat, there's no growth in the unit. So, where the
8 graph shows there's no growth in the amount of dwelling
9 units. There's an eventual slow decline, whether it's
10 through natural attrition, whether the people moving out,
11 not being able to find housing here. But if you look at the
12 areas back in 15 years when there was an increase in
13 dwelling units, the population mural that increase. So, if
14 you kind of look at it, it kind of shows you there is a
15 demand, there is a need, a hidden need for additional
16 housing. And, I think as move forward we're just looking
17 for more local housing for local people who live on this
18 side. There's has not been any kind of major developments on
19 the Windward side and the reason why is because the City's;
20 their growth policies of trying to push a lot of development
21 on to the Ewa side, and the primary urban center, which is
22 good and that's where a lot of the focus is. But it wasn't
23 meant in the long run that you still have to look at and see
24 how you need to adjust it for the different community
25 planned areas. And I think these two proposals and this one
1 Council as we move for more specific review of our project.
2 But because just the time frame and the effort moving
3 forward has been pretty onerous for the applicants that is
4 part of this process, and we're hoping that we can continue
5 along the process for more discussion.
6 Member Sodaro: Thank you.
7 Chair Hazama: So, Mr. Tanoue, you have to excuse
8 us. Because there’s no formal application submitted for any
9 of these projects, there's not a lot of information that we
10 have before us. But this proposed project would you say
11 that it would provide the required number of affordable
12 units or the above, or is it a number units that will be
13 above the required number of affordable units for your
14 project?
15 Mr. Tanoue: Well, clearly, I think the current
16 standard or requirement now is 30%. So, at a minimum it’ll
17 meet that 30% standard for affordable housing requirements.
18 But I think if you look at the type of area that is being
19 developed and where it's located below HI, connecting to the
20 existing subdivision, it's not going to be a Kahala type
21 development and the lot size we're looking at are R-5. So, a
22 smaller lot size. So, it was meant for market and it be
23 consistent with the current neighborhood in that side. So, a
24 the applicants were looking for a market-type local style
25 Windward subdivision.

Mr. Tanoue: Part of it was consultation, and it’s
2 actually noted in the documents that are the data that’s
3 before you that the Department was not supportive of this.
4 And, you know, when we look at our housing situation in
5 general--I look at this life in general. We are where we
6 are based on the decision we make. And, we shouldn’t be
7 surprised on the island in general where we are in the
8 housing market of how hard it is to find affordable or
9 market priced home for everybody living here. It’s because
10 some of the policies and decisions in place. And it was
11 mentioned before that the DeReis project was started in
12 2007, 2009. This one is at least the same time. You know,
13 it just takes so long to go through the process.
14 And part of it was in 2009 when I was at the Department we
15 were starting this, this update required to the sustainable
16 communities plan. And it is a massive process going
17 through. And these projects, moderate to small projects,
18 they’re kind of caught up in the actual procedures. So, a
19 they’re struggling to maintain the resolve as well as
20 resources to continue with these projects on. And, so
21 during the time the Department was not supportive of the
22 move of the community growth boundaries. But we just, at a
23 minimum we ask them to be part of this draft because it was
24 moving forward. At first we would prefer to have gone
25 individually to provide the Planning Commission and the City
1 have to do a new a EIS; we have to do a lot changes on the 2 plan as far as that goes.
3 I also want to mention that one of the major 4 reasons we were denied at the Land Use Commission was that 5 we were not consistent with the KPIOCP. That what brings us 6 here today. So, I wanted to bring those points out. I want 7 to do also on the four points. I want to touch on that 8 we've submitted a lot of documentation today. There's four 9 points that I want to make out of that documentation.
10 There's been over a thousand letters that have been 11 submitted in support of the KPIOCP amendment which includes 12 letters in support from current residents that live down 13 below our last expansion that testified in their statements 14 that our project that we did in 2000 reduced their flooding 15 issues that went down into their area. So, there's 16 testimony in your documentation you have on that.
17 I also want to mention that another group that 18 supported our efforts which is the Koolau Poko Hawaiian 19 Civic Club. And part of our project was to create a 20 preservation to preserve the cultural sites on our property 21 and that's one of the things that we would be working along 22 with them and other members in the community to create a 23 plan for that project in the event rail move forward in the 24 future.
25 I want to speak a little bit about our inventory.

1 We have 80 acres of developed cemetery currently, which is 2 approximately 80,000 burial space. As of March of 2015, 3 we've sold over 80,000 of those spaces which leaves us only 4 8,000 left to scatter throughout that 80 acres of our 5 cemetery. That's only about 10% of our inventory for ground 6 burial. Now, it was mentioned about the percentage of 7 cremation. Hawaii has always been high in cremation rate.
8 But that is actual number. You have an increase of 9 population. So, percentage skewed the actual numbers of 10 burial interment that people want. So, the options that we 11 provide allows choice. We want people to have a choice if 12 they want a disposition of cremation or traditional burial 13 and that's what we provide to families.
14 In 2010, we reached out to QRek, and they did a 15 community pole for us. And that pole, the results of that 16 were 600 phone interviews were conducted, and more than 60% 17 of the respondents from the KPIOCP area boundaries. The 18 polling show that 77% of the respondents recognize a need 19 for additional cemetery space. 70% of Oahu residents 20 indicated the importance of being very close to their loved 21 ones. 70% of Oahu respondents had a favorable impression of 22 the proposed Hawaiian Memorial Park expansion and most 23 importantly 89% in the Koolau Poko area agreed Hawaiian 24 Memorial Park provides green space and are visually 25 appealing.
Chair Hazama: Okay. You don't need a boundary--
Mr. Ezer: We're not asking for a boundary amendment.
Chair Hazama: Okay. I guess that's something confusing in the revised plan because it's represented that the boundary would have to be moved, but you're saying that it doesn't. Okay. All right. Thank you. Any other questions?
Member Sodaro: So on that point, is there any other amendment that would be needed, not just the community growth boundaries because I was confused. So, thank you for that. Are there any other amendments that would have to--
Mr. Ezer: We would still have to go back to the State Land Use Commission and get a-- We have the option of either getting a State Land Use District Boundary amendment or going to the Department of Land and Natural Resources.
Member Sodaro: But there's nothing in this plan as in the draft that would cause you to amend to proceed?
Mr. Ezer: No, we're good.
Member Sodaro: Okay.
Chair Hazama: I guess because the state has jurisdiction over the conservation properties. Okay. Any other questions? [no response] Thank you, sirs, appreciate it.
Mr. Ezer: Can I make one last point. This property was purchased in 1984. It's private land, and at that time cemetery usage was allowed on conservation. The rules changed later and that's part of the reason why we're here today.
Chair Hazama: Okay. Thank you. Our next testifier is Richard Takase.
Mr. Takase: Hi. Richard Takase. Good afternoon. Chair and Commissioner. I'm with the Koolau Polo subdivision. I'm with the Wailele Golf Koolau project. I'm the agent and consultant for the project. I'm here to testify because the language that's in the current application is-- Anyway the current application that you have in front of you on page 417, we weren't allowed to provide the text so the description of the property is kind of wrong and we want to make sure that everybody knows what the project entails, and I can submit written testimony. We got this notice only last week, so it's kind of a rush situation. I live on Maui, so forgive me I didn't have time to print it. The project is actually about 600 acres. It's the remnant piece of the Koolau Golf Course, which the owners have given up to the church. So, the remaining acreage is approximately 598 acres. Out of the 598 acres, we're looking to rezone and extend the boundary of approximately 143.6 acres. We're looking at 18 ag lots. And depending on the layout and the setbacks, we're looking...
1 years, but they changed that to conservation too.
2 The 300 plus acres—If you look right outside your window,
3 the farthest part of the Koolau mountain range, that's the
4 land we're dedicating. It's like everything that we said,
5 we've taken the community plan by heart and looked at
6 the directives, affordable housing, smart growth that keeps
7 the neighborhood field, open space preservation, park and
8 schools as well as ag. We hope you guys will consider our
9 project.
10 Chair Hazama: Okay. Thank you, any other
11 questions?
12 Member Kodaro: You said dedicated. Did you meant
13 dedicated in use or dedicated to--
14 Mr. Takase: We're looking for stewardship, and I
15 see Herb Lee here. Herb has a wonderful operation, and we
16 had originally approached ONA, but it's been difficult.
17 So we're hoping that we can find a good steward of the land
18 and we're going to dedicate it. We also talked to the
19 public land trust people too. And actually even the State
20 of Hawaii, Forest Conservation was interested. So, we have
21 our options. But we're on record to give that land away.
22 Now, we can't define it the final acreage because there is
23 also a ha'ula on site there that we want to work with the
24 families to give that portion of the land to them, so they
25 can be caretakers of that portion too.

1 Like Dave said, I came to (inaudible) in 2008. So
2 we've been doing this for a long time, and we've met with
3 the community. Of course, there will be detractors and
4 people don't like it, but if we went to market today, we'd
5 probably sell out in two weeks. The average age of a home
6 in Kaneohe is 67 years old, I mean, 1967. There's only
7 11,300 homes. Where do the kids go? The average price now
8 is about $80K for a tear down. So, that's definitely a
9 need in Kaneohe for a good local subdivision.
10 Chair Hazama: Okay. Any questions? [no response]
11 All right. Thank you, sir.
12 Mr. Takase: Thank you very much, Commissioner.
13 Chair Hazama: Our next testifier is Nancy
14 Daylanes.
15 Ms. Daylanes: Hello. My name is Nancy Daylanes,
16 and I'm offering testimony on behalf of the Koolau Poko
17 Hawaiian Civic Club. And, I'll just read it. On behalf of
18 the Koolau Poko Hawaiian Civic Club, we commend and thank
19 you and your staff for the work that has been done on the
20 revised plan for the Koolau Poko Sustainable Communities. We
21 wish to offer our support for your efforts to retain the
22 general character of the moku of Koolau Poko and have no
23 serious objections to the draft as presented for your
24 approval and referral to the Honolulu City Council. We do,
25 however, wish to offer some comments and various issues and

1 statements within the draft plan should you consider
2 revising it in any way. As follows: First, the design of
3 sustainable communities plan we have recommended in the past
4 and continue to advocate that your plans be adapted to the
5 traditional moku of the Island of Oahu which prove very
6 effective in helping island residents manage their natural
7 and cultural resources efficiently and well. This would
8 entail changing the overall districts from the eight current
9 plans to six. Each moku would then be encouraged to help
10 take on the kuleana of caring for the natural resources of
11 their area. The current plan limits your long-term vision
12 to western planning and engineering, economic frameworks
13 which do not engage your communities is to become part of
14 the solution the City needs to meet its future goals and
15 objectives. The six moku would be Koolau Poko, Koolau Loa,
16 Waialua, Waianae, Ewa and Kona.
17 Solid waste disposal. Each district should have
18 its own comprehensive recycling center where all solid waste
19 from that district is taken for processing and reuse resale.
20 No solid waste should be transported outside of each
21 district unless such waste cannot be recycled. Therefore,
22 that waste should be taken to H-Power for burning. There
23 should be no more landfills and no one district should have
24 to absorb all the solid waste from another.
25 As far as proposed developments, on the Kahekili

1 Highway widening, we have strong concerns over the
2 feasibility of this project even though it is a state
3 project because it will create additional carrying capacity
4 for heavier traffic loads on Kahekili Highway, provoke
5 pressure to expand Kanehameha Highway pass the Hygienic
6 stores and drive greater urbanization of the Windward coast
7 from Kahaluu northward. These developments will then
8 increase traffic loads on both Kahekili and Kanehameha
9 Highways in the Koolau Poko leading to greater congestion.
10 There are alternative solutions that must be considered to
11 relieve congestion in a relatively short area of Kahekili
12 Highway between Ahuimanu and Kaneohe including the more
13 effective employment in timing of existing traffic signals.
14 As far as the Wai'ele O Koolau, we remain opposed
15 to the proposed development of conservation, watershed, and
16 agricultural lands in Kaneohe.
17 As far as the Hawaiian Memorial Park expansion, we
18 continue to support expansion of the cemetery with
19 appropriate consultation, provided that any approval be very
20 specific as to what would be allowed. We appreciate this
21 opportunity to share our mana'o with you, and ask that you
22 take into consideration our recommendations in your final
23 decision making, on behalf of Alice Hewett, president.
24 Chair Hazama: Commissioners, any questions? [no
25 response] Seeing none, thank you very much. Okay. Our next
1. testifier is Rich McCready.
2. Mr. McCready: Hello. Thank you for the
3. opportunity to speak to you. I'll keep it very short and
5. If you look at an aerial map of the area or even out the
6. window you can see there's quite an area that's devoted to
7. golf courses and cemeteries and in proportion to the rest of
8. the island. I think we have a big enough footprint of that
9. kind of land use. And since this plan is about the
10. long-term plan for this side of the island, I say we should
11. keep the size of those type of uses where they're at and not
12. expand them any further.
13. And I was out at Iroquois Lagoon area recently.
14. There's quite a bit of land there that's very easy to
15. develop, doesn't have any run-off issues that would make
16. more sense to locate any new cemetery space out in some
17. place like that on the banks of Pearl Harbor where security
18. is not issue and there is quite a bit of unused land. It'll
19. be better suited for that purpose. And I personally had
20. some first hand experience with a family member needing to
21. be cremated and the whole process was a thousand dollars,
22. and it just makes more sense for an island such as this to
23. utilize what bit of land that we do have and not use it for
24. frivolous use. So, thank you.
25. Chair Hazama: Okay. Thank you. Any questions?

1. [no response] Okay. Seeing none. Okay. At this time,
2. unless there's any objections, I'd like to take a 10-minute
3. recess, and we'll be back at 3. So, we're in recess.
4. [gavel]
5. [At this time, Chair Hazama calls for a 10-minute
6. recess; and reconvened at 3:05 p.m.]
7. Chair Hazama: Okay. Our next registered speaker
8. is Maureen McKeague. Good afternoon.
9. Ms. McKeague: Good afternoon. Thank you for
10. allowing me to testify. My name is Maureen McKeague, and I
11. appreciate all the work that goes into a project like this.
12. I can't imagine how after all these years and all the
13. changes of how things are. Anyway, I came just to address
14. No. 18, page 338 about the vacation rental. I support the
15. way it is originally written, that the ongoing general plan
16. review is evaluating the appropriateness of vacation rental
17. units outside of resort areas, should an adopted general
18. plan policy support vacation rentals outside of resort areas
19. in it, follows more specific policies and guidelines be
20. established at the regional planning level. These policies
21. and guidelines should be devised to allow vacation rental in
22. areas other than resort zoning such as residential areas
23. while protecting current potential character, thus regional
24. policies and guidelines should be established to limit their
25. scale, location, design and operations and an approval

1. should be required via discretionary permits, process which
2. involve community participation. And, I think that's
3. written very well, leaving the open for the possibility for
4. permitting vacation rentals in residential areas. In my
5. experience, many of the visitors who come to our
6. neighborhoods are previous residents, family or friends of
7. current residents or military family or friends who don't
8. have room in their homes to host them.
9. Also among those who wish to stay here in our
10. residential areas are military in transition
11. and business people who come regularly for work.
12. Many three generation families with small children also
13. come and stay in our neighborhood instead of Waikiki
14. because it is much easier, quieter and friendlier then
15. hotels. So, we continue to pray that permitting guideline
16. and regulation be adopted soon in order to allow vacation
17. rentals and B&Bs with reasonable limits. Thank you very
18. much.
19. Chair Hazama: Thank you. Any questions for the
21. next testifier is Mr. Bernard McKeague.
22. Unknown male in the audience: (inaudible).
23. Chair Hazama: Okay. Our next testifier is Justin
25. Mr. Soriano: Good afternoon, Commissioner and
1 said, and they've responded to it, and it's really a good
2 plan, and I would like to thank the folks that put it
3 together and listened very well and found our thoughts, and
4 put them in there. And then a couple of days ago, I
5 received a document via email that was from the Kailua
6 Neighborhood Board, and they had a lot of problems with the
7 report. And I read through it, and it was just more of the
8 same crap; more of the same baloney. We don't know need
9 extra housing, we don't have any community growth going on;
10 people won't need the homes; we don't need to have any
11 vacation rentals; we don't need to have any tourism; we
12 don't need to have anybody here. There was a fellow from
13 the neighborhood board a week ago that was up on TV on the
14 (inaudible) show, and he said that there would be a certain
15 amount of economic pain that the neighborhood board.
16 Neighborhood Board 31 would inflict certain amount of
17 economic pain in our neighborhood in order to stop us from
18 essentially doing what the people wanted to do that the
19 objective was essentially to drive folks out of business and
20 drive them out of the area. And it was like, "wow." It's
21 one thing to hold those thoughts to yourself, but it's
22 something else to say it on television and to make it really
23 clear that the objective of the neighborhood board has
24 nothing to do with supporting the wealth and the growth and
25 the development of our community but rather negative things.

So, I'm here to say thank you very much for the plan. The
2 lady that was here before who was reading from the original
3 plan and what she wrote was exactly--I'd seen those exact
4 words, and I thought well that's right on. I commend you on
5 the original plan, and I ask you not pay any attention to
6 Neighborhood Board 31 and the change they're requesting.
7 Thank you very much.

Chair Hazama: All right thank you. Any
9 questions, Commissioner? [no response] All right. Seeing
10 None. Thank you. Okay. Next testifier is Pat Newalu.
II Ms. Newalu: Hello. My name is Pat Newalu. I
12 would like to take the opportunity to thank you all for
13 listening to my testimony today. I am born and raised on
14 Oahu. I've been employed with Hawaiian Memorial Park
15 Cemetery since 1993, and I really support the expansion
16 because I feel it is important for families to have choice
17 and for generations to be together. We help families on a
18 daily basis, and I can't explain the importance of choice
19 and proper memorialization. And I have family buried at
20 Hawaiian Memorial Cemetery extended family. I married into
21 a local family of Kaneohe, and there's a lot of family
22 buried at Hawaiian Park Cemetery. And I'd like to see in
23 the future that our generations to follow have that choice
24 as well, and that we can all be together. Thank you.
25 Chair Hazama: Okay. Thank you. Any questions,
1. Now, there are some ways we can work it so that
2. somebody—certain parts that you can workout. So, maybe you
3. have to live on an island, manage your own house instead of
4. buying it and have somebody else manage it; whatever. But
5. the locals need the money in the area; the communities need
6. the money. And they don't represent local values. I doubt
7. if one of those 19 guys was born and raised here.
8. Chair Hazama: Thank you. Any questions,
10. is Senator Jill Tokuda. Good afternoon, Senator.
11. Ms. Tokuda: Good afternoon. Thank you very much
12. for your patience and for taking all of the public
13. testimonies today on our Windward side. We do have extra
14. copies as well. Chair Hazama, Commission members. While we
15. definitely respect a desire to be consistent with other
16. sustainable communities plan, these plans are specifically
17. regional with the intent that it reflect the unique
18. characteristics, needs and local visions, each of our
19. communities have. Specifically, both of us have heard very
20. loudly consistently and clearly for almost a decade at this
21. point regarding the proposed development and expansion of
22. Hawaiian Memorial Park, and as such we respectfully oppose
23. the changes that are being proposed to the Koolau Poko
24. Sustainable Communities Plan that would allow cemeteries
25. outside of the growth boundary in the preservation district.

1. If we're going to be consistent as a community in terms of
2. what we would like to see our Windward neighborhoods look
3. and feel like. Based upon what you've put forward in the
4. plan, we cannot support these amendments.
5. I think while the position is being taken that it
6. would contribute cemetery specifically to the Open Space
7. System. I don't believe it's taken into account the scale
8. and size of the above grade structures that are going to be
9. built. In the case of HWP, I believe it's a little
10. disingenuous to say that there's no active application or
11. even intent to carry-out any of the plans, given that the
12. application to actually amend the Koolau Poko Sustainable
13. Communities Plan specifically include four large mausolea
14. and internal roadways that would makeup almost five acres of
15. the expansion property in question. And while they
16. admittedly state the proposed structures and expansion would
17. only be marginally visible taking up an additional 24% of
18. the existing view planes. You can probably even see it from
19. this window leaving the remaining upper 42% unchanged. This
20. is a significant ridge line on our windward side. You can
21. see it from almost every point in Kaneohe as well as coming
22. over through the tunnels as well. Developments of this
23. magnitude in no way embrace the open space character or
24. feel that you folks hope to embody when you're talking about
25. it in the KSPCP and runs contrary to what I think you're

1. hoping to achieve in this particular plan.
2. We applaud the hard work and effort that went into
3. updating the sustainable communities plan. We know it's
4. never an easy job to go out there to have many community
5. meetings, talk to key individuals and stakeholder groups,
6. community individuals, residents. And the document before
7. you reflects their desires for the area to remain relatively
8. stable with the focus on protecting natural, cultural and
9. agricultural resources while investing in the importance of
10. aging infrastructure as well. But as much in order to
11. really embrace those tenants, you must also negate the
12. amendments that are being put forward by HWP.
13. We've also been working very closely with our
14. Keapuka community probably for the last seven to eight years
15. in regards to traffic, congestion, speeding. In particular,
16. we do support your decision to reject the proposal by Koolau
17. Lan Partners LLC for a residential and agricultural cluster
18. in the Haleku community area. We've been working, as I
19. said, with the City Council, member for the area, and others
20. to try improve congestion in this particular community
21. adding over 200 residential units, agricultural subdivisions
22. and other things to this particular community without
23. roadway access, separate and apart from this subdivision
24. would be devastating to a community that already deals with
25. quite a bit of traffic congestion.

1. So, we support your decision not to include the
2. proposal, and I assure you that if it goes forward in any
3. which way or form, the community will be
4. making itself known in particular about this particular
5. proposal. So, with that we thank you very much for being
6. here.
7. Rep. Ken Ito: Mr. Chairman, members of the
8. Commission. First of all, welcome to the 49th district,
10. and I worked on this testimony, and I concur with her 100%.
11. Thank you very much.
12. Chair Hazama: Okay. Thank you. Any questions,
15. Mr. Sager: I'm Bill Sager, and I'm wearing two
16. hats today. One is as the Chair of the Policy Committee
17. the Blue Zone Project, and the other one is as Vice Chair of
18. the Kaneohe Neighborhood Board. In general, the Kaneohe
19. Neighborhood Board supports your plan. We think you've done
20. a good job with certain exceptions. And the Blue Zone
21. Committee has submitted testimony related to transportation
22. within Koolau Poko, and we feel that the plan was developed
23. with the traditional approach of providing for traffic
24. during rush hours. And the Blue Zone Project recognizes
25. that one is the elements along and productive life is an
1 active lifestyle. And we want our community develop as a
2 neighborhood where pedestrians and bicyclists, wheelchairs
3 and people are the priority and we believe that cars and
4 people and an active lifestyle can be compatible with our
5 vehicle traffic if we look any complete street concept and
6 emphasizing pedestrian traffic. From the Kaneohe
7 Neighborhood Board standpoint we are bound by the Sunshine
8 Law, and we’ve received the hard copies of your plan at our
9 last meeting. It wasn’t actually enough for all of our
10 members, and I didn’t get one. One of the problems that we
11 identified was the map scale was not adequate to really let
12 us understand the relationship between the texts and the
13 maps. And I learned today that the maps are available
14 online and can be blown up so we can see far more detail and
15 the people that were complaining maps today probably also
16 didn’t realize that was the case. We formed a public
17 information group to review the Koolau Poko Sustainable
18 Communities Plan. We’ve held three meetings. All of them
19 were based on what we could get on the land because we
20 didn’t have hard copy, and at last night’s--Oh, Friday I
21 faxed you the testimony that we have developed, and we stand
22 on that testimony. I’m going to try to repeat it.
23 However, at our lastnight’s Planning Committee
24 meeting, we did make some revisions and I’d like to be able
25 to have those recognized. Our neighborhood board general

1 meeting is on the third Thursday of the month, and that’s
2 where we will look at all our recommendations. Try to
3 finalize them and get that testimony to you at that time.
4 Hopefully, that will be acceptable.
5 Chair Hazama: Okay. Any questions, Commissioner?
6 So, basically the entire board hasn’t actually taken action
7 on any of the recommendations yet?
8 Mr. Sager: That’s correct.
9 Chair Hazama: So, you’re requesting additional
10 time?
11 Mr. Sager: I can’t speak for the board because
12 only at this time the report of the public information group
13 is available. So we need to take action as a board.
14 Chair Hazama: So, you’re saying your testimony is
15 not finalized at this time?
16 Mr. Sager: That’s correct.
17 Chair Hazama: Okay. Thank you. Any other
18 questions, Commissioners? [no response] Thank you very
19 much, sir.
20 Mr. Sager: If you have any questions about the
21 Blue Zone Project in the Kaneohe Neighborhood Board, brought
22 it to Koolau Poko and have been working very, very closely
23 with its implementation.
24 Chair Hazama: Okay. Thank you. Next testifier is
25 Ursula Rutherford.
I may later be in contradiction which provisions of the revised general plan. I concur with the Kailua Neighborhood Board position, that the Koolau Poko Sustainable Communities Plan should not be finalized until the revisions of the General Plan has been completed. Thank you very much.

Chair Hazama: Okay. Thank you. Any questions, Commissioners? [no response] Thank you very much, ma'am.

Ms. Rutherford: Am I the last testifier?

Chair Hazama: No. Okay. Our next testifier is Stu Simmons.

Mr. Simmons: Thank you, Chairman Hazama and also the Planning Commissioners. I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I must say I agree with Mrs. Rutherford what she said so eloquently is exactly how I feel, but I will add some additional comments. I was offended when a gentleman, Mr. Burns, testified that the Neighborhood Board does not represent our communities. They are like democratically, and, I think they do represent our communities for that reason. I did a Google on Mr. Burns, and I found out that he doesn't live in our district. He lives in Hawai'i Kai. So, I find it quite interesting for him to make that statement. With that said, here in our district, we have having issues with our housing, stock and supplies, as many other testifiers had said, and the cost of our housing continues to increase. And one of the reasons that

1 contributes to this is the continuing conversion of residential home into many hotels and this is being done primarily by out-of-state investors, but also in-state investors who are able to generate greater revenue from using the homes and properties as a hotel use instead of residential. And this is putting a lot of strain on our community. I have many associates and employees who cannot afford their homes based on their current incomes as the rents continue to escalate. And, I think we need to be protecting our residential zoning. And, so I agree with the neighborhood board, Kailua Neighborhood Board that basically page 3-38 that the reference that the General Plan may consider allowing hotel-like uses in residential zoning is inappropriate, that's pure speculation General Plan is completed, I think that should be stricken from the plan.


Ms. Anulao: Aloha, Chair Hazama and Planning

Commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity to share my support for Hawaiian Memorial's amendment to treat cemeteries as open space and preservation land. Again, my name is Enna Anulao, and I work at Hawaiian Memorial Life Plan, dba Hawaiian Memorial Park Cemetery. It makes a lot of sense for Hawaiian Memorial Parks to be treated as open space because that's what parks are. In addition, Hawaiian Memorial Parks provides an important service to our families, throughout all families of different backgrounds, religions, and cultural traditions throughout Oahu which is necessary for our diverse population who may not want to be cremated. As I speak right now, I am in the process of helping with funeral arrangements for my hanai grandma, and part of the grieving process is to do the burial for my family and friends. So that is very important to us. Hawaiian Memorial is a beautiful memorial park that is very well maintained and many go there to visit their love ones. Also allowing Hawaiian Memorial to use the land it owns will keep the greenery in the area and prohibit any other development. Lastly, if you do visit Hawaiian Memorial you will see that most of our staff are local people who are from the Windward side. Thank you for your time.


Mr. Ralston: Thanks for hosting us and having us all here. Ted Ralston is my name, originally from Waimanalo, live there today, and I'm actually on the Neighborhood Board of Waimanalo but not speaking on that behalf, speaking on my own behalf. What I want to observe to you is that Waimanalo in the last couple years has been
Ms. Obayashi: Aloha mai kako. My name is Flora Obayashi. I'm the Chair of the Kāhalu'u Neighborhood Board. We submitted our recommendations so you folks have that. We were assisted in the drafting of those recommendations by Amy Lewenson (phonetic), who is very respected planner and resident of our community who has been following the Kōolau Poko Sustainable Communities Plan from the original draft decades ago. So, she has watched the development. I wanted to share with you a little bit about what our mission is, the Kāhalu'u Neighborhood Board. We represent the rural communities of Heeia, Ahupua'a. We still have the traditional land divisions from ancient times. So we represent Heeia, Ahuimanu, Kāhalu'u, Waihee, Kaalae, Waiahole, Wāikane and Hakipuu and Kāhalu'u. And those areas have a lot of agricultural, and the history of the neighborhood board has been to be vigilant over AG zoning also over the natural resources. We take very seriously the water production in our area, and we've been concerned lately that the high tourist traffic into our watersheds, where there's no toilet contains contaminated water. We understand that Hawaii Kai is now benefiting with the new 8-inch main and 16-inch mains, both of those that are conducting water over to Kāhalu'u. And as you know Waiahole and Wāikane water is being pumped over to the Ewa planes. And, so we're also vigilant watching over Kaneohe Bay, with the development, toxic run-offs that's killing off the coral reefs, and we're also very vigilant on the commercial boat traffic that is out there and disturbing the very delicate ecology of Kaneohe Bay. So, those are the things that our Board has been very concerned about and watching the plan and how we protect that. And, for those reasons we've been paying particular attention to development which would disrupt the hydrologic cycle. And as you know when you concrete over open land, the fresh water flows off into the ocean. It doesn't recharge the underground water supply.

Chair Hazama: Thank you. Any questions?

Commissioners: Thank you very much. Okay. Our next testifier is Mr. Bartley.

Mr. Bartley: Hi there. Thanks for coming out here and taking the time out of your day and our day so we can vet this thing and get it taken cared of. I'm Larry Bartley. I'm executive director of Save Oahu Neighborhoods. We were formed in 2005 by a bunch of volunteers who were fed up with the City's responsibility encroachment of vacation rentals into our neighborhoods. We have many volunteers all the way to Waimanalo to Kāhalu'u and Kōolau Poko. I want to read this sentence about putting into the plans. These policies and guidelines should be devised to allow vacation rentals in areas other than resort zoning such as residential areas while protecting current residential character. Well, we're not talking about bed and breakfast. We're not talking about a room in a house; we're talking vacation rentals where the entire house is taken over by vacationers. And so the end that of sentence the basis of that whole sentence was wrong, residential zoning cannot be protected when vacation rentals move into the neighborhood. It doesn't work. It's been proven time and again across the country, here in Hawaii. I mean there's revolutions going on now in New Orleans, New York City, San Francisco because this very problem. Its proven time again that they're not a good mix. So, they also—vacation rentals as being shown in other cities around the country, and it's obvious here on Oahu, the cost of housing, they raise rents and they increase homelessness. This is now proven. Who's supporting this? Really, it's only the legal operators and their supporters in the council and the administration, and the people and money (inaudible). So, people you see here today supporting this fits one of those categories in general. If we put this in the plan—See right now the City just $300,000 in the budget to enforce against legal vacation rentals. So, if you put this in the plan, it's going to undermine the efforts. Why are they going to try to enforce if they think it's going to be legalized and the City wants it anyway. This says that the City wants them to exist. You're going to send an enforcement officer out there who doesn't really want to be knocking on that door to try and bust somebody anyway. And they know that their bosses are not behind them. So, it's a mistake to put this from an enforcement standpoint to put this in a document like the 20 general plan. We say we want these and you can't do it, and your poor person who works at DPP you have to go out and enforce people against people while your general plan says they should be okay; they should be there. It's a big contradiction that shouldn't exist. So, my last point is, you know, we've had this...
I really strongly if we are talking about residential areas, 1 that's what they ought to be. I have a friend that's 2 desperately looking for a place to rent, and she has limited 3 income and cannot find anything in her price range. So, for 4 those people out there that want to keep their houses, and 5 they don't feel they can afford them. I have a friend that 6 would gladly rent a portion of that house as their primary 7 residence. I just feel that unless we are currently 8 enforcing rules then there ought be no consideration for 9 expanding any illegal activities weather it's B&Bs, vacation 10 rentals, or illegal use of AG land, such as is happening out 11 at Konaloa [phonetic]. So unless there's some force, power 12 to enforce laws, we are not to be saying we ought to be 13 considering this. I don't think we think we ought be 14 considering changing the characters of residential areas. 15 One of the main reasons that I feel it's critical, 16 like I said, it changes the character. It's not a 17 neighborhood anymore. People are just coming and going, 18 visitors are coming and going. We're your neighbors. But 19 also importantly is a health and safety issue. We don't 20 have the infrastructure for the volume of people and traffic 21 that are coming into our areas. Unless that can be 22 recognized, our neighborhoods are going be history. So, 23 support the Kailua Neighborhood Board recommendations for 24 revisions and will echo several of the other speakers. I

1 Use Commission will need to be amended, and I also conferred 2 with my client, and he categorically declared that there 3 will be no moseleums or structures as part of any plan 4 moving forward. I just wanted to make sure that was put on 5 the record. Thank you.


9 Ms. Alexander: Good afternoon. I first wanted to 10 thank everybody involved working on this plan both BPP, 11 anybody else in government and our neighborhood boards. I'm 12 a resident of Kailua, and I would just like to say that I 13 feel my Kailua Neighborhood Board does represent me. If I 14 were to count on—and this is just editorial comment 15 quickly. If were to just count on just what's going on in 16 Honolulu, I would feel not very well represented. So, I 17 thank you all for all your work. I wanted to specifically 18 address what the neighborhood board has proposed as 19 revisions specifically about vacation rentals and B&Bs, and 20 I'm going to echo some of the prior speakers, but I really 21 want to get my thoughts in here too. I do not feel that I 22 can call the area that I live in Kailua a neighborhood 23 anymore. My block has probably 50% of the dwellings as 24 vacation rentals. The next block has about 50% vacation 25 rentals. That does not make a neighborhood. So, I just feel
1 Please come up, sir.
2 Mr. Nichols: My name is Norm Nichols. I'm a
3 Kailua resident, additionally from Maui, went to the
4 University of Hawaii and then moved to Kailua. On behalf of
5 the vacation rental issue, I think there’s several things
6 that go somewhat unsaid and unclarified. On this whole
7 issue everyone that has spoken against vacation rentals does
8 not qualify what they’re talking about. If I take in a
9 family member that come stay for a week and they come and
10 go, I'm looked as a vacation rental. There are egregious
11 units here on the beach and in Kailua that everybody
12 recognizes, but owner operated units like a bed and
13 breakfast do not impact. I am a resident. The structure of
14 our neighborhood is import by me. Because I've lived here
15 for 40 years in Kailua. So, I don't see the whole permitting
16 process in I am a legal business for the businesses that I
17 run, the state gives me a tax license, registers me as a
18 business and then it is up to the City Council and the
19 Department of Planning to regulate what I do as a legal
20 business, so sanctioned by the State of Hawaii. So, there's
21 a lot of different factors here that are going into this
22 whole argument of what’s legal, the neighborhood, the noise,
23 the traffic and everything else that isn't explained. The
24 statistics that are being given. I happen to know a number
25 of people that are operating bed and breakfast.

1 They have tax licenses. They pay TAT [phonetic]. The
2 state takes that money and devotes it some back to it the
3 counties, but they're legal businesses. And this whole
4 thing of the legality, I don't think the county has the
5 right to determine whether what I do as a business is legal
6 or not. You have the right to put in ordinances that say I
7 can or can't do certain things as it applies to the county.
8 But each county in this state is different. They're all
9 struggling with it. Based on the tenure and the complexion
10 of where we're are in Kailua, Kaneohe, North Shore or
11 whatever. And I think that some sort of vehicle needs to be
12 put in place with the proper controls, proper enforcement to
13 allow some of this to at least that is occurring. Vast
14 majority people speaking against does not surveys that had
15 been taken by the hotels and a number of other institutions
16 that show by far people don't have a problem with a
17 home-based bed and breakfast or they're being controlled by
18 whoever owns or is on the property watching it. The
19 investor units, the overseas units, both investors offshore
20 and onshore do create some problems. They deserve a
21 different kind of consideration in how they will be managed,
22 maintained and brought into compliance. But I think the
23 Department of Planning needs to look at this and say, there
24 are different forms that this is taking. Some of them are
25 not bad. Some of them can be controlled, others can't.

1 And, so I think this is where there is a lot of confusion
2 because it's not one brush paints all.
3 Chair Hansen: Please summarize, sir. Are you
4 done? All right. Thank you. Any questions, Commissioners?
5 [no response] Seeing none, is there anyone else wishing to
6 testify at this time? Please come up.
7 Ms. Richardson: My name is E Kuulei
8 Olsen-Richardson. I'm speaking for Waimanalo as an
9 individual, and I just joined the neighborhood board, and
10 I'm excited. I think I've been to Kaneohe, Kailua and now I
11 just joined it because I'm excited that they really hear the
12 community. I got involved, and I joined the board because
13 there's a problem. In 1965, I moved into the Waimanalo area.
14 I have seen the area where it’s being bought out and you say
15 I'm going to raise some flowers, so that ag land. This is
16 all ag land in the back in Waimanalo. And then all of a
17 sudden they did something wrong. But I see something picking
18 up right now, and I'm really really concerned about this one
19 property, and I don't understand all the words for what you
20 do like change in conditional use permit, minor AG-2 zoning,
21 which means that this property, it's 41-539 Makakalo Street
22 and what they did. Zobel owned that and all the horse
23 community was in this property. It's a horse community, and
24 we would like to leave it that way, but the owner, the new
25 owner, Zobel, had all the horses and then this new owner

1 gave one 1/3 of the property to the church, 1/3 to the
2 Salvation Army to house transitional men and then the other
3 third of the property goes to landscaping. I mean, we just
4 got told all of this in the April 11th Board, and I'm like
5 "okay". But now I have kakaaina, I'm eligible for Hawaiian
6 homes right next to that. So, I'm going to have
7 grandchildren going. We have transitional men, we have drug
8 problem. We have the most in homeless. I'm a retired
9 teacher, so it's very hard. We need to take care of our
10 people. But I'm concerned about when Zobel had it for
11 horses, and now there's no horses. As of the 15th, right
12 now there's seven horses left out of the 98. What does that
13 mean? We don't have any horses in there.
14 So, what does AG-2 land and what does conditional
15 use permit. I think the problem when I saw (inaudible) all
16 of this, there is no enforcement. Why do you give a
17 conditional permit when they didn't even come to the Board
18 first. Like I do the parade, the Kaneohe parade. Well, I
19 better do all these things or I'm not going to have a parade
20 here in Kaneohe. This is my 25th year. They have procedure
21 for me to follow. How come we don't one for you, for these
22 people? This is crucial because you're changing our
23 Waimanalo community. I just wanted to stay rural. I don't
24 know to start because I'm new. Sounds interesting what
25 everyone is saying. And, you know, we have the vacation
1 rentals and I know all the people that have. Was called
2 Ohana before. I don't know what's best but I know some
3 people that have that because it helps support them. But I
4 would like for some kind of enforcement or I need to some
5 knowledge as to about this property. Salvation Army is not
6 the kind of people. It's right next to our gym. They're
7 going to our gym and Waimanalo gym is being renovated and
8 they're going to practice. We have soccer there. We have
9 the children, the summer fun. I'm astonished, so that's why
10 I joined the Waimanalo Neighborhood Board, and I was only
11 here to listen, but I think it's very interesting. I just
12 need help too. How do we get this thing back to the
13 original state that we've been in, calm and collect. But I
14 love it. So, thank you very much for listening. I'm just
15 concerned, and I'm going to do something with this.
16 I have to reteach my new topic. Thank you very much,
17 though, for letting me say something.
18     Chair Hazama: Okay. Commissioners, any
19 questions? [no response] Okay. Thank you very much. Thank
20 you. Okay. Anyone else wishing to testify at this time?
21 [no response] Okay. Seeing none, Chair proposes to leave
22 public testimony open at this time for the purposes of
23 continuing the public hearing for subsequent Planning
24 Commission meeting basically to allow the Kaneohe
25 Neighborhood Board to finalize their testimony to us. Also,

1 you know, the complexity of this plan and just the sheer
2 amount of volume, we are not basically able to update these
3 Plans in the required, I guess, by charter, 5-year time
4 frame. So it's taking us quite a bit longer to actually
5 update and renew these Plans. So, I guess, my feeling is
6 that this Plan will probably carry us for the next 10 years
7 before we even touch it again.
8
9 That being said, there are several projects that
10 are listed on the technical report. On pages 414 through
11 419 that require, I guess, changing of the community growth
12 boundaries. The subsequent meeting. I guess, Commissioners,
13 my intent is to allow--Because the amount of information
14 provided in the current SCP is very minimal to the
15 Commissioners, we don't have all the details regarding the
16 projects. And from hearing testimony today, these projects
17 have been, I guess, in the works or being worked with the
18 Department for many, many years. I guess, as far back as
19 2007 and 2008. So, I will give, with your indulgence, at
20 the subsequent Planning Commission meeting the opportunity
21 for the projects to present more detailed information to the
22 Commission in order for us to make an informed decision on
23 whether, in fact, we support the current changes or deem
24 that additional revisions to the SCP draft are necessary.
25 But I do intend at the subsequent Planning
26 Commission public hearing to come up with a final decision

1 Member Sodaro: I have questions of the Department
2 but, I guess, on another point of order. So the public
3 hearing is one part but, I guess, how would you like to
4 organize giving the Department comments through other
5 sections or can we continue the discussion for them to take
6 forward to the next meeting.
7     Chair Hazama: Yeah. I guess, whatever discussion
8 points or questions that you have, and especially I would
9 ask the Department questions now especially if they have to
10 provide us with additional information. Now would be the
11 time to ask those questions of the Department so that at the
12 next public hearing they will have sufficient time to
13 provide responses to us.
14     Member Sodaro: Noted. Thank you.
15     Chair Hazama: Okay. So, at this time,
16 Commissioners, do we have any questions of the Department
17 that you would like to discuss or any additional
18 information.
19     Member Sodaro: Chair, you want to go by section
20 or by Commissioner?
21     Chair Hazama: Staff, you want to go by sections,
22 questions by section or you can take everything from--
23 Mr. Young; whatever the Commission's pleasure is.
24     Member Sodaro: Thank you, Raymond. Thank you,
25 Chair. I had a question maybe broadly. So a few of the
1 sustainable community plans have come before us ahead of the
2 General Plan update, and I was wondering is some of the
3 language that we have seen--and, I have two points. I'll
4 give an example, consistent with the other sustainable
5 community plan that have come through us, specifically the
6 Koolau Loa Plan. Because a number of the issues for Koolau
7 Poko are similar to Koolau Loa, and since we're proceeding
8 ahead of the General Plan update. One example would be so
9 the cemetery language that is being asserted in this plan,
10 cemeteries are not unique to this sustainable community plan
11 is the same wording consistent with the sustainable
12 community plans that have come before us for other areas.
13 And, I think there's three. You could correct me, and will
14 they be proposed in in the sustainable community plans
15 To come forward or is this unique language to the
16 sustainable community plan?
17 Mr. Young: Thank you, Commissioner Sodaro.
18 First of all, I'd like to address your comment about the
19 General Plan. I've done some researching in the General
20 Plan, but essentially what's being proposed in the General
21 Plan does not directly affect what's going on in the
22 regional plans. The General Plan is a broad statement.
23 Perhaps except for the TVUs since we are deferring to the
24 General Plan, the rest of the General Plan is broad policies
25 regarding population, cultural, economics, and that sort of

1 stuff. Whereas the regional plans are actually taking that
2 to a greater depth in refining some of those policies. So
3 whatever happens in the community plans or the development
4 plans, it's already being reflected in the General Plan
5 except for that one exception.
6 Now with respect to the cemetery issue, this is
7 the only plan that actually has language specific to
8 cemeteries. What we've been trying to impress upon the
9 community and of course yourselves, is that cemeteries under
10 all of the other plans is basically an open space use. For
11 the Koolau Poko because it's such a big issue and it's the
12 only plan prior to the Hawaiian Memorial to come up as an
13 issue is the only plan that has language that deals with how
14 to keep cemeteries consistent with the open space
15 atmosphere. For example, like modest sized structures,
16 keeping the structures to be consistent with the character
17 of open space, qualities and that sort of stuff. This is
18 the only regional plans that deals with cemeteries at that
19 level.
20 So, again, going back to your comment about
21 whether or not much of the stuff in our regional plans is
22 consistent across the board. Yes. For the common issues
23 relating to open space, mountain area shorelines and
24 residential uses, much of those things are consistent across
25 the all SCPs. There may be differences because you have

1 SCPs, and you have development plans. So, in that sense you
2 have direction for growth in the development plans, whereas
3 under SCPs the intent is to retain the existing, well
4 maintaining the existing infrastructure and keep it as a
5 sustainable plan so that there is no big or major growth
6 going on those areas. And that's a reflection of the what
7 the community wants.
8 Member Sodaro: Okay. So then to the TVUs, so
9 this is much more refined specific language being proposed
10 for the TVUs in this plan. Is this for shadowing to the
11 General Plan or is this language that we should expect to
12 also see presented because TVUs are island-wide?
13 Mr. Young: We had similar language in other plans,
14 for example, like the North Shore Plan. But in that one the
15 community recommended that we include what they call a lodge
16 to deal with those pressures. So, that one did not really
17 take that position of deferring to the General Plan.
18 It kind of came to a heated discussion over the last few
19 years where there's no consensus one way or the other and at
20 that time during the North Shore Plan, the General Plan
21 wasn't being updated. So, after the North Shore Plan was
22 adopted by Council that's when the General Plan started its
23 process of updating. And we see that we cannot come to a
24 consensus based on what we've been seeing. So, we thought
25 it made sense to--since it's an island-wide issue to defer

1 it to the General Plan to make those kinds of forward
2 movement. Of course, again, the General Plan will end up
3 before you and City Council. So it's possible that none of
4 that ever gets resolved. But we have to take some forward
5 movement on it instead of keeping it back and like what the
6 Koolau Loa Plan is happening there is, there is no forward
7 movement for the last three years now. It has been at City
8 Council. So we thought the last election would have, you
9 know, brought us some resolution of that issue but no it
10 hasn't. So, it has come back as a new Bill, which again
11 there is no forward movement and another election cycle is
12 coming up. I'd rather not see that happen to this Plan.
13 Chair Hazama: Although I see the dilemma that
14 Commissioner Sodaro raises is that you put this language in
15 this Plan in hopes that the General Plan will have
16 complimentary language. What happens if the General Plan
17 language changes the, how do you guys go back to these SCPs
18 and change--If these SCPs are adopted before the General
19 Plan, how does the Department then go back and change the
20 SCP when the General Plan language is changed?
21 Mr. Young: Well, the intent is whatever the
22 General Plan comes up with if it's inconsistent
23 With the regional plans, the regional plans are indented to
24 be revised to be consistent.
25 Chair Hazama: So, you have a vehicle other then
1 the normal periodic update of the SCP then to go back to the SCP and change it?
2 Mr. Young: Yes. There is a provision in the rules that allow for individual or the Director to make
3 those adjustments. Of course, going back to the community on that specific issue, going back before the Planning
4 Commission and onward to the City Council to make those adjustments. Already the North Shore is ready for another
5 update. It has been over five years since that Plan was adopted. But like you said, these Plans take beyond five
6 years and perhaps a 10-year cycle would be more practical.
7 So, these are the kinds of questions that hopefully we can resolve as this Plan and other Plans move forward.
8 Member Sodaro: Okay. Thank you. If I recall correctly from the Koolau Loa Plan we received a comparison, a
9 community growth boundary map. Since Chair Hazama is extending the discussion into another meeting, could I ask
10 for the same for this Plan?
11 Mr. Young: Comparison map of--
12 Member Sodaro: How is the boarder is changing.
13 Mr. Young: There is no changes to the boarders as the Plan is being proposed.
14 Member Sodaro: Okay.
15 Mr. Young: I think what you're referring to are those third party proposals like DeReis and Hawaiian
16 Memorial and Wailele O Koolau.
17 Member Sodaro: That brings some clarity that (inaudible) testimony about boundaries changing.
18 Mr. Young: So what we can do is create a new map showing those projects, if they're proposing a boundary change. But Hawaiian Memorial is not proposing a boundary change. I think Wailele O Koolau, yes, because some of those uses would extend beyond the current boundary which limits the residential use. So that one would probably have to have a map change. So is DeReis, that's adjustment there too.
19 Member Sodaro: I'm not asking for a map. I just want a clarification if there were changes it be shown comparatively. But they're not.
20 Mr. Young: No, there isn't any.
21 Member Sodaro: Okay. Thank you. I had a question. So the technical report addresses homelessness, but I don't find language in the special needs section of the residential that actually states homelessness or homeless shelters or anything like.
22 Mr. Young: Homeless or houseless, it really covers under the policies relating to affordable housing. So, the City has an affordable housing policy.
23 I'm not sure if it was bedded before you folks but - I think it's still being finalized yet. I'm not sure if City
1 Council has adopted that but essentially we're looking at
2 304--
3 Chair Hazama: There have been references to that document, but the Commissioners yet to see it anything.
4 Mr. Young: Yes. I don't think it has been adopted yet, but essentially homelessness is supposed to be addressed under that affordable housing policy.
5 Member Sodaro: I guess my sentiment is that the technical-- Not only here, but clearly on the county level, homelessness and the state policies are trying to address homelessness. So I was just wondering why there would be dedicated language in the technical reports speaking about counting and providing us the homeless counts on this side like 250 some people. But while it lists different kinds of shelter it doesn't actually incorporate addressing homelessness in our land use policy document. So, that is something that we could assert as language. We could put homelessness into the special needs housing.
6 Mr. Young: Yes. I don't see why we would object to that; yes. I think the technical report covers all types of issues as best as it tries to. And at this point the community did not recommend any language insertions with respect to homelessness into the Regional Plan. And, of course, it's another one of those that is an island-wide issue. And I don't recall seeing homeless provisions in
1 other plans either. It's just being covered under.
2 Member Sodaro: Maybe that's why we're short
3 housing for homelessness. It's not at our highest level of land use planning. I guess that's my sentiment.
4 Mr. Young: Yes. From our prospective it is a subset of affordable housing.
5 Member Sodaro: Okay.
6 Chair Hazama: Okay. Commissioners, any more questions?
7 Member McMurdo: I did have one question.
8 Chair Hazama: Yes, go ahead.
9 Member McMurdo: On page 412 of your Technical Report with regard to TVUs, you mentioned that neither the proponents or opponents of TVUs and BAs actually object to the present language. Is that actually correct? I'm wanting to make sure.
10 Mr. Young: Let me pull that up.
11 Member McMurdo: So, if it stays as is, you're saying both proponents and opponents won't object to the language?
12 Mr. Young: And that was page--
13 Member McMurdo: 4-12.
14 Mr. Young: Is it Section 4.2.3?
15 Member McMurdo: Just before that, 4.2.2, but the last part. Just before 4.2.
Mr. Young: Okay.

Member McMurdo: It's the second to the third bullet point under your observations.

Mr. Young: Oh, I see. It says "both proponents and opponents of TVUS & B&Fs propose Koolau Poko SCP language changes to support their point of view neither actually object to present.--Okay. Essentially this is trying to reflect on what the community sentiments were. This is not intended to support one way or the other any policies regarding TVUS or B&Fs in the Plan itself.

Member McMurdo: Okay. But I'm just asking whether--For example, the Kailua Neighborhood Board, do they object to the current language or are they okay with the language as is?

Mr. Young: From what I seen their testimony, they're proposing replacement language.

Member McMurdo: Right. But will they be unhappy if the language does not change?

Mr. Young: Well, I guess you would have to ask them that.

Unknown male from the audience: Cross everything out.

Mr. Young: My guess is they would oppose keeping the same language as we had proposed in the Revised Plan.

Member McMurdo: That's all I wanted. Thank you.

Chair Hazama: Okay. Any other questions, Commissioners?

Member Sodaro: In the park section, stated it has Kailua Beach and new management plan it's referenced a couple of times. Who is that, what is that the Kailua Beach and new management plan?

Mr. Young: I'm not really familiar with that plan, but we tried to incorporate all recent plans that have been completed into our plan. We made reference to it.

Member Sodaro: And that was one of the questions, is I didn't know if it comes with as an action because it does reference it and state that those, whatever stated, and that is what the recommendations for the park.

Mr. Young: I think I would need to research it and see what was recommended in that management plan and see how we picked it up in our own plan. And I can get back to you on that.

Member Sodaro: And forward that to the Commission.

That would be great.

Mr. Young: Yes.

Member Sodaro: Thank you. And then I had a question about the Oahu Regional Transportation Plan. In the transportation section it states that the ORTP is being updated, and I want a clarification if the capital projects are listed here are those carry over unrevised ORTP or is that what's on the draft ORTP. And the reason why I ask, just so you know, is that a number of those projects that are listed have been generational projects at this side has been fighting. And, so I just want to really understand especially the widening of Kahana Highway and Haiku Road, which my understanding from the side of the island is where the county starts. And so there are a couple other very controversial capital state projects, and I'm just trying to understand why so much was lifted from the ORTP. It says it's being revised to 2040.

Mr. Young: Yes, you are correct. What was in our revised plan is actually one generation of the ORTP behind. So the current generation projects to 2040. And if it's in the Commission's pleasure, we can update our proposed plan to incorporate the latest ORTP. And with respect to some of those improvements, yes, they no longer get into that level of detail with respect to Kahana widening. They just talk about increasing capacities rather than the specific language. So, if the Commission so desires we can revise the sections that state what the ORTP improvements are to the 2040 improvements.

Chair Hazama: I guess my only comment is that the ORTP changes all the time.

Member Sodaro: That's why--

Chair Hazama: So what might be listed as priority projects now, will probably drop off and there will be different projects later.

Member Sodaro: Yeah. So, I mean it makes sense to reference to the ORTP. What I was questioning is why it was down to detailed projects. And there's a paragraph that states because of the population forecast, that these would be likely not to happen. So, yeah, rather then creating, I guess, the dated reference I just wanted to understand. You could reference the plan, but it doesn't have to reference the projects of the moment.

So, do we need to take action for the Department to make that change or is that--

Mr. Young: If you want to see the current--Yes, I would prefer if you made a ruling that we would like--The Planning Commission would like to see the latest ORTP reference improvements into the plan rather then the 2035.

Chair Hazama: Yeah. We can add that as a recommendation to the findings. Okay.

Member Sodaro: So, unless we take action this draft--We would only be making recommendations for the drafts--

Chair Hazama: Correct.

Member Sodaro: So despite planner, what Raymond said, you wouldn't make any changes to the draft based on any action here today.
1 Mr. Young: I guess, there's a couple of ways you can do this. You can ask that we make a supplement, we add to the draft so that when you make your recommendation, you send it up to Council with the supplemental change that you are recommending, or you would take your action on the plan as drafted with these changes that you would like to see as a recommendation to the City Council.

8 Chair Hazama: Yeah, correct. Questions? (no response) Okay. Page ES-5, in regards to wastewater; page ES-5, the plan mentions--I'm going to call it a moratorium connections for the wastewater treatment systems.

12 Mr. Young: What page is that, ES-5?
13 Chair Hazama: ES-5.
14 Mr. Young: Okay.
15 Chair Hazama: Section H.4.3.
16 Mr. Young: Okay. Is that the first bullet on page--

18 Chair Hazama: Yes.
19 Mr. Young: Okay. Delay for the sewer connections?
20 Chair Hazama: Yeah.
21 Mr. Young: Okay.
22 Chair Hazama: You mentioned that you want to delay further sewer connections, but you don't specify a time frame. So, how long are you planning on delaying these connections?

23 Mr. Young: It does refer to this Kaneoha, Kaihua wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities final EIS dated May 2011. If you would give me some time to look into that plan, I mean that EIS, which I don't have before me, and get back to you at the next meeting, we could perhaps discuss that in further detail.

7 Chair Hazama: Okay. On page 4-12, you mentioned, I guess, individual cesspool systems as not being desirable. So, we may look at possibly placing some requirements for any new improvements or projects not to actually be able to employ those systems. You can strengthen the language, I guess, in it if that's your intent to say, "hey, these systems are not desirable."

14 Mr. Young: Again, you could either ask that we incorporate revised language as part of the supplement.

16 Chair Hazama: Yeah. We recommend it. So--Okay.
17 Mr. Young: Yeah.
18 Chair Hazama: On page 3-4 and also 3-14, in regards to the Haiku Stairs access, is that the City's position as far as reopening access to the stairs or is that--I mean, is that consistent with the City's current position?

23 Mr. Young: Right now the stair property, I guess has couple owners. One is the Board of Water Supply and the other one further up is DEHL. As we were preparing this plan we didn't get specific direction from the administration that this area or this stairway and the surrounding Haiku--I think it's called, it's a recreational area that was set aside, but did not get direction that it be excluded or removed from the plan even though there's controversy going on.

7 So, until that actually happens from our side, we decided to leave it in because we're, I guess, we're optimistic that there could be something done to alleviate the concerns of the neighbors and still maintain reasonable access. Because this is an amazing resource, open space, mountain access. Perhaps we could find as part of the resolution, a private operator or private/public partnership to take over the trail or the stairs and perhaps provide a different access that doesn't impact the neighbors and actually make something like this perhaps a profitable venture for private or public partnership. To make this accessible and to make it work.

19 Chair Hazama: I think at a minimum we should ask for input from the landowners because I would hate for us to put something in the plan and then have to go back--That's not their policy or that's not their stance.

22 Mr. Young: Yes. As far as I know from speaking with the Board of Water Supply they're satellited with this problem, which they didn't want. It's only because they're the landowner. They have it on their budget to take a look at this. So, I expect some kind of study to come out from the Board of Water Supply dealing this issue sometime soon.

4 Chair Hazama: Okay. Page 317, regarding golf courses. You mentioned that there should be no new golf courses in the region. How does the Department enforce that when the golf courses by state statute are allowed on certain zoned properties?

9 Mr. Young: Well, essentially this is a reflection of the communities desires with respect to new golf courses. 11 So, unless they're in the conservation district, we have our zoning codes and other permitting processes to vet those new courses out. So, if this is inconsistent with the plan, we would recommend probably not supporting it. The same thing if there's a golf course being proposed in the conservation district, it would probably come across our desk for review and because assuming this plan, this language about no new golf courses are adopted by City Council, we would also recommend that we would not support new courses.

20 Chair Hazama: But aren't golf courses allowed by state statute on AG-1 land?
22 Mr. Young: AG-1--
23 Chair Hazama: That was the issue we had with the solar panels remember. Corp counsel said that there's certain uses already allowed on AG-1 land. And, I think
1 golf courses were one of them.

Mr. Young: Okay. I'm more familiar with the state
3 AG district with respect to golf courses, and it's not
4 allowed without some, either a special use permit or a
5 boundary amendment. For AG-1 that's a county zoning, so
6 it's considered outdoor recreation perhaps. So that would
7 still need a county permitting. It'll still go through the
8 county permitting process.

Chair Hazama: The permitting I understand. I
guess, if the state statute says it's an allowed use, how
does the City get to enforce the moratorium on that zoned
land, I guess, that's my question.

Ms. Sokugawa: Okay. Kathy Sokugawa for the
14 record. The state law, Chapter 205, allows golf courses
also in the state AG district. So the counties can also
regulate and further restrict. So the counties do. So, in
Honolulu, I don't think we even allow golf courses. So you
19 have to go change the zoning to preservation. Even it's in
19 the state AG district and that means you need council
20 approval. And, in fact, if you don't even get to your
21 grading permit by a certain number of years after you get
22 your zoning, you need to go back to council.

Chair Hazama: But if it's in the state ag
24 district, though, wouldn't the SUP be required?

Ms. Sokugawa: Off the top of my head, I don't

1 would have to review the conditional use permits against the
2 regional plan policies and again we can say that this is a
3 policy, it's not regulatory. And if it makes sense that a
4 special needs housing needs the kind of heights to make the
5 project successful, I think we would defer to the zoning
6 requirements.

Chair Hazama: So, you're basically saying the
8 comment of the 2-story limit is just a comment--
9
Mr. Young: It's a guideline.

Chair Hazama: It's not specific to the zoning, I
11 guess.

Member Lim: If you get a height limit in a
13 sustainable community plan, you're saying it doesn't count?

Mr. Young: No. I does count. It's a guideline
15 but the actual implementation of the height regulation is
16 covered under zoning.

Member Lim: You can't just leave it out?

Mr. Young: Well, the overall effect of the design
19 parameters so to speak is being covered in the SCPS and the
20 DFs. So, it gives them an overall picture of what we would
21 to see as the plan is implemented. But there are going to
22 be special cases like special needs housing or other forms,
23 you know, like churches that sort of thing that will need to
24 exceed those regulations. And the zoning code makes special
25 provisions for that. For example, like the director can

1 think they're allowed in state AG district. They're allowed
2 in state rural districts.

Chair Hazama: Okay. Thank you. The plan mentions
4 the need in the region for a special needs facilities.
5 However, also asks for height limits within the rural
6 district, two stories approximately. However, a lot of
7 these special needs facilities actually try and find A-2
8 lands in order to kind of make their projects, you know,
9 workable or able to pencil. So, I think if you restrict
10 them to 2-story height limit that would impose undue, I
11 guess, restrictions on them. In other words, you're saying
12 like, yeah, I understand you need elderly care facilities.
13 We need these facilities in the region, and they're much
14 required because our population is aging. But if you impose
15 a 2-story height limit on these facilities you're might not
16 be able to attract--They need developers willing to actually
17 build them.

Mr. Young: Okay. First of all, this is not
19 regulatory. This is guideline. And, I think when you refer
20 to A2 land, you mean AG-2 lands or apartment zoning?

Chair Hazama: Yeah, apartment zoning.

Mr. Young: Okay. With respect to heights, the
23 underlying zoning would be the one that would regulate the
24 height. And then if they were to come in, for example, like
25 a conditional use permit for a special needs housing, we

1 make adjustments under the conditional use zoning process,
2 or they can make it under variances if it shows that they
3 meet the three tests of hardship. So, we will deal with
4 these case-by-case through the zoning code, even though the
5 regional plans gives you an overall picture of what is
6 intended in terms of design, height, density, that sort of--

Chair Hazama: I guess, we're just trying to
8 prevent conflicts in the future because these plans are
9 going to be here for at least ten years and realizing that
10 the other organizations like the LUC looks at these plans
11 too. So, like Commissioner Lim said, if we put stuff in
12 there, people are going to read it, they're going to try and
13 interpret it not knowing that you guys have all these
14 variances and exceptions that you can kind of disregard that
15 statement. Down the road these things create conflicts or
16 can create discrepancies. So, my example was well you say
17 in the rural thing that there's a two-story height limit.
18 Now I got an elderly care facility that's on A-2 land that
19 wants to go 6-stories high. We're talking about maybe like
20 six, seven years from now, this is going to happen. So, we
21 mean we got to be careful on what we put in there and how we
22 word it, I guess, is our point.

Mr. Young: Yes.

Member Lim: If they came in for a rezoning, don't
25 they have to comply with the sustainable communities plan?
Mr. Young: The sustainable communities plan would provide a position on how to treat that rezoning proposal.
Member Lim: My understanding is you got to comply on the rezoning, comply with the general plan, the SCPs. The statement that says two-stories; regardless of what the zoning was going to say.
Mr. Young: Generally you're correct. So, if the zoning--
Member Lim: My point why put it in there.
If you want to say low rise, that's okay, but don't say two-story.
Mr. Young: Okay. You got a point.
Member Lim: I know you want to propose low rise and not high rise area. But if you put regulatory language in the plan and say it doesn't count, it actually does count in some cases. (inaudible) language creates confusion.
Mr. Young: Yes. In certain respects the plan has a lot of broader language but then depends what the community wants it out of too. So sometimes we have to deal with both sides of the coin, so to speak. Communities want specific language. In fact, they want mandatory type language. Corp Counsel has told us it's not a good idea because it's not a regulatory document. And on the other hand we have more broad language, but the community feels it's too broad. So we're kind of like have to juggle and balance those two competing issues.

Chair Hazama: Okay. I guess my last point and I'll turn it over. The issue of the limiting the commercial property size to 90,000 square feet regarding big box commercial. Currently, current zoning does not support this restriction correct?
Mr. Young: Yes. There's no way in our zoning code that has that kind of restriction.
Chair Hazama: And I kind of understand a little bit of where the community was coming from, but personally I still feel if you're going to do something like that especially across the region, its better handled under an SDD if you want to do that, a special design district limitation rather than imposing that restriction across an entire region. In my mind it also limits competition, and I don't think the SCPs should be in a position to do something like that. Like I said, if they wanted within a certain area or region then that's better handled under an SDD. That's pages 2-9, pages 3-44 and 3-53.
Mr. Young: May I make a point of clarification.
The 90,000 limit actually shows only in the regional town centers of Kailua and Kaneohe and not across the entire region.
Sink, only in those two town centers.
Chair Hazama: Okay. They could set up special design districts for those two town centers then?
Mr. Young: Yeah, I don't see why we would have an objection to that. It requires another process. We'd have to come up with I suppose a special area plan perhaps or some kind of--
Chair Hazama: Somebody else could come in commercial districts outside those areas and possibly build something greater than 90,000 square feet, right? And it'll be allowed.
Mr. Young: Yeah, that could happen, it's just that the town centers would be the ones where the mark. It would probably support something like that.
Chair Hazama: But that's for the market to determine, right? You know that's not for zoning to determine. Any other questions?
Member Sodaro: Raymond, I'm looking at the 23 Modified Ramsayer, page 3-64, it's regarding the industrial land, all new language. There's a sentence I don't see it on the land use map, but it says a light industrial site in Waimanalo should be considered. So address parking and maintenance needs. Is there a contemplated light industrial or site in Waimanalo that's just not joined because of the scale of a map?
Mr. Young: We refer to the Waimanalo Business Plan, which was completed several years back where they were talking about something like that to handle the large trucks and corporation yard type uses, base yard types uses. So, that one talked about setting up such a site somewhere in that old quarry site area, which is owned by DHHL. So, that's in concept with the DHHL plan for Waimanalo is staring to look at those things, those issues. So I don't think the specific base yard is part of the DHHL plan. So we are still trying to implement something like, somewhere in Waimanalo to take care of those concerns. Apparently they're being asked all over the plan in the ag district. So, that's why we thought it was important to keep it in this plan or least bring it up in the plan as one of the directions we want to move toward.
Member Sodaro: So, this would help support someone's proposal coming forward to address the need?
Mr. Young: Yes, yes.
Member Sodaro: Okay. So is there light industrial land in Waimanalo? I don't see it on the--
Mr. Young: I don't--
Member Sodaro: It would be represented in the land use map if there was, right?

Mr. Young: Yeah. I don't think so.

Member Sodaro: Okay, okay. I guess since we're kind of putting out what I think some of our recommendations would be the Department on the next meeting. I noticed in the military revision section there's a lot about noise, not noise abatement, but noise. I guess what was interesting is that this side has a legacy of unexploded ordinances also in the Koolau Loa, Koolau Poko district, but it was absent from the plan, and I was just wondering—did it come up at all in any of the community meetings, encouraging the military to address some of those issues historically?

Mr. Young: It may have come up but I wasn't available at that time because I'm like the third planner assigned to this project. Yeah, point well taken.

If there is some areas that we would want to deal with unexploded ordinance, I would have to find out where those areas are and discuss it with our management and see how we can address those. If you want to, again, it's your choice to have what's included as part of the supplement or move it on as part of your recommendation to City Council.

Regarding the noise, yes, you're right. We talked about the noise impacts but, of course, the source originally is from Kaneohe Marine Core, and that's where the

biggest problems are. Has to do with noise operations, aircraft, maintenance and firing ranges and all that sort of stuff. The military is working with the community closely to address those issues, and we kind of describe it more like it's a--Because there's no regulations the Department of Health has for noise generating from military operations, it's something that would be directly dealt with by the military. So, the community, the legislatures, they have these meetings with them to deal with their operations. So, hopefully this new (inaudible) plan that they're putting forth would be more responsive to their concerns, and I think Senator Tokuda was at one of these meetings that I went to and Laura Thielen. So, they would be working on these issues directly with the military. Militaries is an important economic driver for all of Oahu and especially for the region. So, we think it's important for them to remain part of our lifestyle, part of our economy, part of our community. The plan kind of recognizes that and welcomes them into the community, but also addressing what some of those impacts we are facing. So, hopefully they can work it out. I don't think the plan is the vehicle to work out those issues.

Member Sodaro: It is the vehicle?

Mr. Young: It is not.

Member Sodaro: Thanks Raymond.

Chair Hazama: Okay. Any other questions, Commissioners? [no response] Okay. Out of abundance of caution and being advised by counsel, are there any objections from the Commission to continuing public hearing for this matter to our August 3rd Commission meeting? [no response] Seeing no objections, any abstentions? [no response] No abstentions. Okay. At this time then this meeting is continued to August 3rd at 1:30 at Mission Memorial Auditorium [sic]. So, at this time this current section of the hearing is adjourned. Thank you very much.

[bangs gavel]

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned by Chair Hazama at approximately 5:30 p.m.
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