RES26-017
Testimony

MISC. COMM. 51

*ZONING & PLANNING (ZON)

***ZONING & PLANNING (ZON) Meeting**

Meeting Date: Feb 5, 2026 @ 09:00 AM

Support: 4

Oppose: 0

I wish to comment: 0

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Kathleen Pahinui	pahinuik001@hawaii.rr.com	96791
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Support	Feb 1, 2026 @ 12:38 PM

Testimony:

Aloha Zoning and Planning Committee Chair Kia‘āina and Committee Members -

I support Reso. 26-17 to amend the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) language in the Land Use Ordinance, which will help prevent issues like those with the Kaukonahua Ranch LLC CUP.

Projects with CUPs should be reviewed, and approvals withdrawn if conditions aren’t met. Applicants shouldn’t be able to agree to terms and later claim they’re too difficult. CUP minor permits, which currently bypass community review, especially need oversight. We must ensure process integrity and hold rule-breakers accountable.

Please pass this resolution.

Mālama ‘āina,

Kathleen Pahinui

Waialua Resident

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Natalie Graham-Wood	ngrahamwood@hotmail.com	96712
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Support	Feb 3, 2026 @ 09:16 AM

Testimony:

I support Res 26-017. My name is Natalie Graham-Wood and I am a resident of Haleiwa.

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Kū‘ike Kamakea-Ohelo	kuike.farmaloha@gmail.com	96795
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Support	Feb 4, 2026 @ 08:35 PM

Testimony:

Written Testimony in Support of Resolution 26-17

Committee on Zoning & Planning

February 5, 2026

Aloha Chair and Members of the Committee,

I write in strong support of Resolution 26-17, which strengthens the City's Conditional Use Permit process by ensuring appropriate levels of public notice, community input, and ongoing oversight for agritourism projects with potentially significant impacts.

Agritourism uses can materially affect surrounding communities, particularly in rural areas, through increased traffic, infrastructure strain, water use, noise, and changes to neighborhood character. Processing these projects through a minor Conditional Use Permit has, in some cases, limited transparency and reduced opportunities for meaningful community engagement prior to approval.

Resolution 26-17 appropriately addresses this by requiring agritourism uses to obtain a major Conditional Use Permit, ensuring that projects with potentially significant impacts receive a level of review proportional to their scale and effect. This requirement includes presentation to the applicable neighborhood board or community association, notice to property owners within 300 feet of the project site, and the holding of a public hearing.

These requirements reflect lessons learned across Hawai'i from other land use contexts, such as large-scale renewable energy and wind projects, where insufficient early community engagement led to prolonged opposition, legal challenges, or the need for later corrective action. Resolution 26-17 reinforces the principle that community input should occur before approvals are granted, not after impacts are already felt.

I also support the provision allowing the Director of the Department of Planning & Permitting to reconsider, modify, or revoke a previously approved permit when new information is presented, circumstances have materially changed, or a project is found to be detrimental to public health, safety, or welfare. This authority is essential to responsible land use governance and ensures that approvals remain aligned with actual conditions and the public interest over time.

Importantly, Resolution 26-17 advances the State of Hawai'i's trust obligations to Native Hawaiians, including the duty to protect land, natural resources, and the long-term well-being of communities. Counties, as political subdivisions of the State exercising delegated land use authority, share in the responsibility to carry out these trust obligations through their planning and permitting decisions. Requiring heightened scrutiny, meaningful public participation, and the ability to revisit approvals where necessary helps ensure that land use decisions do not inadvertently impair trust resources, cultural landscapes, or community stability.

This measure does not prohibit agritourism or responsible development. Rather, it ensures that projects with potentially significant impacts proceed transparently, accountably, and with informed community participation. Well-planned and pono projects should be able to withstand this level of review, and when they cannot, that is itself a signal that closer examination is appropriate, and communities deserve no less.

Mahalo for your leadership and for advancing policies that strengthen public trust, community engagement, and sound land use decision-making.

Respectfully,

Kūʻike Kamakea-Ohelo

Name:	Email:	Zip:
Racquel Achiu	rhachiu@gmail.com	96791
Representing:	Position:	Submitted:
Self	Support	Feb 5, 2026 @ 07:34 AM

Testimony:

Aloha, Racquel Achiu of Waialua Moku (North Shore) I am in support of Resolution 26-017. CUP's , all discretionary permits, need to be updated to address the issues & loopholes that we face today. A few significant points that this resolution introduces are ...

1- Page 2 of the Resolution: "the LUO does not currently provide for the EXPIRATION of an APPROVED CUP"

Establishing an expiration whether a MAJOR or MINOR is critical to hold projects/developers accountable and appropriately acknowledge and address the changes of environment & communities that the projects want to take place in. Not to mention keeping our historical and cultural matters in consideration and protection.

The absence of the expiration component is a large part of why we are faced with so many challenges in addressing older approvals and a developers disregard of matters/concerns for impacts of their projects in an environment that we see changing everyday. Approvals and conditions must adjust to address these situations

2- Also On Page 2, Reconsideration of an approved CUP. This is also a CRITICAL phase of the CUP process. Developers, Property Owners, etc must be held accountable for the intentions they propose in seeking social permits. These permits are seen as endless and forever approvals that they can ride and ultimately, abuse with implementing CHANGES (faulting new demands that time has changed the needs of space or industry)

In MOST cases, once any approval is obtained the scope/details of a project drastically change beyond the original approval with minimum to no consistent oversight.

I look forward to continuing this process and discussion for an effective and strong revision to the CUP process.

Mahalo