

IMPROVEMENTS IMPORTANT TO SYSTEM FIX & RE-DESIGN OPTIONS

improvement themes [items w/dots]	specific suggestions [items w/dots]
DISTRICT STANDARDS AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT Better use definitions & standards for Ag District [F.6]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define in Ch 205 what bona fide ag operation is [F.6.a] • Permissible uses for IAL need to be stronger than in Ch 205 Ag District [F.6.c] • Define bona fide ag as food crops for sale [F.6.a, F.7] • Define bona fide ag as not estate dwellings, tennis courts, pools [F.6.a] • Increase minimum lot size to 10 acres [F.9] <hr/> County authority to determine permissible uses in Ag District [F.10]
Revised standard/criteria for identifying agricultural lands' resource value and lands that can be released for urbanization [F.5]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New benchmarks for judging ag lands that updates LSB [F.4, F.8.a] • Preservation of open space not criteria for identifying as ag land [F.3.a]
RURAL DISTRICT Redefine Ch 205 / new vision for Rural District with broader uses [G.2, G.2.a, G.3]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate Rural & have higher density ag in Ag District OR put higher density ag in Rural [G.1.a]
Delegate to counties regulatory authority over Rural District [G.6, G.6.a]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County ability to texturize rural land uses [G.6.a]
AGRICULTURAL & RURAL PLANNING Identification of lands in Ag District that should be protected for ag & those that are more suited in urban, rural, or conservation district [F.5, F.12]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for counties to complete the IAL process [F.1] • State plans & phasing of implementation to match/complement county LU planning [I.10] • State decision making (re: resources and infrastructure) in accord with state planning framework [I.12] <hr/> Process to reclassify lands in the Ag District identified as suitable in other land use classifications (release non-ag lands) [F.5]
Greater scrutiny for ag, increased consideration of ag resource concerns, higher threshold [F.2]	
INFORMATION & ANALYSIS FOR PLANNING & DECISION MAKING Comprehensive set of shared environmental, social, economic indicators [C.11]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State population and economic projections updated/reviewed regularly in consultation with counties [C.10.a] (and other baseline data like housing study) • Use of thresholds for operations & safety of roadways [C.4] <hr/> Meaningful analysis of infrastructure planning, development, and environmental impact [C.14]
Require state agencies to do Ka Pa`akai analysis on all projects [C.5]	
Move environmental review to post-LUC decision making [H.7]	

IMPROVEMENTS IMPORTANT TO SYSTEM FIX & RE-DESIGN OPTIONS

improvement themes [items w/dots]	specific suggestions [items w/dots]
<p>PLANNING FRAMEWORK</p>	<p>Codify in HRS a uniform county land use planning system that reflects state functions, with counties in primary role in LU planning/decision making [I.6], development follows plan [I.13., I.27]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State requirements for county LU plan and consistency required with state policies [I.5] • Requirement for consistency with state policies • State interests inherently statewide [I.2.a] • County plans have phasing and magnitude in land use plans (to direct location and timing of growth) • State and county infrastructure components in county LU plan [I.19] • Better coordination among state and county [I.28] • Coordinate state infrastructure planning and development with county [D.3, I.30] • State participates in county planning process (GPs, DPs) [D.17] • Policies, plans provide specific and reliable milestones for short- and long-term investment backed expectations • State review of county plans with respect to impact on areas of state concern [D.1, I.27] <hr/> <p>Long-term planning to protect public's interest / public trust resources [I.3], e.g., resource management and infrastructure development plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify what's appropriate/needed to preserve, protect, and develop [I.17] • More frequent boundary reviews (to see if significant resources exist in the districts) [J.2.a] • Boundary review / amendments to: (1) reclassify lands with significant resources in other districts to the Conservation District; (2) undeveloped land within 150 ft of shoreline [J.2] • State plans & phasing of implementation to match/complement county LU planning [I.10] • State decision making (re: resources and infrastructure) in accord with state planning framework [I.12]

IMPROVEMENTS IMPORTANT TO SYSTEM FIX & RE-DESIGN OPTIONS

improvement themes [items w/dots]	specific suggestions [items w/dots]
LAND USE DECISION MAKING & PLAN IMPLEMENTATION	<p>Eliminate duplication with county issues and processes [I.4] Two levels of review and scrutiny to balance decision making [I.15]</p> <hr/> <p>Development consistent with plans rather than individual petitions—county plans guide land use changes [I.13, I.27]</p> <hr/> <p>State decision making (re: resources and infrastructure) in accord with state planning framework [I.12]</p>
PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING / APPEALS	<p>Consolidate points of legal intervention in land use process to reduce delays and uncertainty [E.3, I.16]</p>
STREAMLINING PERMITTING PROCESSES	<p>Speed up processing and ministerial permitting by state/county agencies [E.1]</p>
SUB-SYSTEM ISSUES	<p>Mechanisms for truly affordable housing stock [J.1]</p>

- Combined (single) county/LUC hearings on individual project (DBA, DPs, community level plans) [D.18]
- Better coordination among state and county [I.28]
- Allow for orderly land use district changes, while providing specific and reliable milestones for short- and long-term investment backed expectations [I.9]
- Allow for orderly land use district changes, while providing specific and reliable milestones for short- and long-term investment backed expectations [I.9]
- Coordinate state infrastructure planning and development with county [D.3, I.30]
- Fiscal discipline in CIP investment [D.16]
- Public (rather than developer) should pay for infrastructure [D.15]
- Incentives for desired development (e.g., in designated growth areas) [D.10]
- Thresholds for dealing with unplanned or premature projects (not in plan or phasing) [D.13]
- State review of county plans and activities with respect to impact on areas of state concern [D.1]
- Direct input in land use matters that involves state functions or facilities [D.2]
- Enforcement monitored and implemented by county [B.4.b]
- State CIP to implement LU plans and policies (based on state infrastructure component for county plan) [D.5, I.11]