

May 30, 2014

Towards a Desired Land Use System for Hawaii

To prepare for the next step of exploring system improvements or change, we felt it would be important to identify what is desired in an ideal land use system and how it should perform to achieve its desired ends. A model of what constitutes an ideal system provides a means to evaluate proposed and potential changes to our existing system.

Towards this end, four questions were posed to Task Force members:

- 1) What should a land use system do or provide for Hawaii?
- 2) What are the State's interests in land use?
- 3) What are the Counties' interests in land use?
- 4) What models or practices do you know of could help us achieve the outcomes desired from an effective land use system?

Our focus at this time is on Question No. 1 which seeks to identify characteristics of an ideal land use system for Hawaii. In analyzing the responses received, we found that members' input could be categorized into:

- Broad land use outcomes/goals, and
- Desired aspects for how the system should perform

Table 1 presents an initial summary of the elements of a desired land use system. Table 2 provides clarifying details and their attribution. We have generalized the main elements to identify common ground, but have retained the clarifying details to acknowledge their importance to the respondent. A separate compilation of the raw responses will also be made available.

At the June 5th meeting, the Task Force will have the opportunity to review, refine, and add to the summary. Once completed, these goals and clarifying details may then be referenced as the Task Force proposes improvements to the land use system.

Responses submitted by:

Department of Transportation, Highways Division (DOT-H) and Statewide Transportation Planning Office (DOT-STP)
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR)
Rep. Cindy Evans (CE)
Sierra Club (SC1, SC2)
Outdoor Circle (OC)
Building Industry Association (BIA)
American Planning Association Hawaii Chapter (APA)

Table 1

INITIAL SUMMARY OF ELEMENTS FOR DESIRED LAND USE SYSTEM

<h2>Hawaii's desired land use system results in...</h2>	
WHAT: land use outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Protection of (significant) natural and cultural resources
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Protection of agricultural / ag resource lands
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Built environment / communities that protect/s natural environment and meet/s societal needs (current and future)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Resilience to hazards
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sustainable natural and built ecosystems/environments
<h2>...and provides for:</h2>	
HOW: system performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fair and open process for land use decision making
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Certainty and predictability in the land use decision making and development process
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sound analysis and informed decision making
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clear policy and planning framework for land use decision making
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Consistency / conformance with policies and plans
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Plan-based, plan-driven land use decisions/development
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Infrastructure capacity concurrent with planned growth
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Efficient / sustainable use of resources
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Effective enforcement of compliance with policies and plans

Table 2

Hawaii’s desired land use system provides:

WHAT: LAND USE OUTCOMES	● Protection of (significant) natural and cultural resources	OC (“Commons”), BIA, SC2, APA
	(Avoid/minimize risk to)	
	○ Streams & ocean water resources	OC
	○ Ground and surface waters	DOA
	○ Potable water sources (critical to survival)	BIA
	○ Near shore waters (critical to survival); coastal waters	BIA, SC1
	○ Reefs	SC2
	○ Historic & archaeological sites	OC
	○ Burial sites/areas; traditional, subsistence & ceremonial gathering areas	SC1, SC2
	○ Views / view planes	OC, SC1/SC2
	○ Open space	OC, SC1
	○ Habitat for species	OC
	○ Wetlands	SC1/SC2
	○ Preserve/protect ecosystems (needed to survive on each island)	BIA
	○ Public recreational resources: parks, trails, etc.	OC
	● Protection of agricultural / ag resource lands	DOA, OC, BIA, SC1, SC2, APA
	○ Adequate ag lands for food production, agriculture for food	OC, SC1
	○ Important agricultural land economically viable for agricultural production	BIA
	○ Sufficient land for ag industry, food security	APA
	○ Avoid/minimize risk to agricultural resources	SC2
○ Minimize impermanence syndrome on agriculture lands from anticipated urbanization	DOA	
○ Protect viable ag lands for large & small farming, orchards, livestock operations	SC2	
○ Differentiates needs in ag vs. conservation environments	CE	
● Built environment / communities that protect/s natural environment and meet/s societal needs (current and future):	BIA, OC, DLNR	
○ Land use pattern has areas suitable for urbanization now & in future; land for urban use & reserve for forecasted pop growth	BIA, APA, CE	
○ Balance struck between lands preserving and protecting and lands encouraging development on	BIA	
○ Land use pattern reflects/incorporates impacts on physical, cultural, social, economic environment	CE	
○ Protect character of communities	SC1	
○ Housing and communities for existing residents	SC1	
○ Differentiates needs in rural vs. urban environments	CE	
○ Great communities balancing work and play	CE	
○ Communities built and laid out for public’s health, safety, general well-being	DLNR	
○ Maintain quality of life	SC1	

Table 2

Hawaii’s desired land use system provides:

WHAT: LAND USE OUTCOMES	○ Affordable housing for residents (genuine, truly affordable for Hawaii residents)	OC, SC1/SC2
	○ Range of housing products at different price points	BIA
	○ Healthy urban design models	OC
	○ Avoids unsustainable development practices of urban sprawl, suburban areas far from existing infrastructure and town centers, car dependence	OC
	○ Adequate infrastructure & facilities	OC, BIA
	○ Efficient use of existing infrastructure & services	SC2
	○ Public infrastructure costs manageable; public infrastructure & services at sustainable levels	SC2
	○ Transportation	
	○ Highways / roadways	APA, DOT-H
	○ Efficient & safe roadway system	DOT-H
	○ Multi-modal transportation system	DOT-H
	○ Avoids car dependence	OC
	○ Airports	DOA
	○ Water	
	○ Avoids unsustainable development practices of high water consumption	OC
	○ Ensure supply of potable water	BIA
	○ Urbanization linked to ability of ecosystem to provide potable water for planned urban use	BIA
	○ Wastewater	SC1
	○ Solid waste	SC1
	○ Energy security, local energy production	SC1/SC2, OC
	○ Schools	APA, DOA
	○ Libraries	DOA
	○ Parks	DOA
	○ Civil defense	SC1
	○ Hospitals	SC1
	○ Economic development, economy	APA, CE
	● Resilience to hazards	
	○ Avoids natural or man-made hazards--flood plains, unstable land, steep slopes/ ridgelines, areas susceptible to sea level rise	SC1, SC2
○ Planning for resiliency for natural hazard mitigation and climate change impacts	SC2	
● Sustainable natural and built ecosystems/environments		
○ All development in harmony with ecology of environment; no adverse impact on sustainability of land	DOT-STP	
○ Balance struck between lands to preserve / protect and lands for development	BIA	
○ Debate around ‘sustainability’ and what we need to exist in island state	BIA	

Table 2

Hawaii’s desired land use system provides:

HOW: SYSTEM PERFORMANCE	● Fair and open process for land use decision making	
	○ Fair and open process for development	DNLR
	○ Open process for redesignation	APA
	○ Fair and predictable process to redesignate	APA
	○ Gather and reflect collective will of people on how communities to be designed	OC
	○ Allowing public input on land use decisions affecting:	SC2
	○ Public trust resources	
	○ Public and traditional access	
	○ Publicly funded infrastructure and services (CIP & O&M)	
	● Certainty and predictability in the land use decision making and development process	
	○ Fair and predictable process to redesignate	APA
	○ Certainty in the development process	SC2
	○ [TOOL]>Screen out lands not appropriate for development at State & CO level	
	○ [TOOL]>Specific, reliable milestones that set short- and long-term investment-backed expectations	DLNR
	○ Allowing for orderly changes to meet built and natural environment challenges	DLNR
	● Sound analysis and informed decision making	
	○ Better and informed decision-making, data driven, direct and indirect impacts on physical, cultural, social, economic environment, centralized location for envtl / social indicators	CE
	○ Cumulative analysis to aid LU decision-making (micro- and macro-)	CE
	○ Accounts for direct and indirect impacts of development	OC, SC2
	○ Additional scrutiny / realistic evaluation of projects at county level re: public cost, project viability, environmental impacts	SC2
○ Process for urban change based on rational analysis	APA	
○ System meets current and future environmental and built challenges	DLNR	
○ Long term planning is key to long term protection of public trust resources	OC	
● Clear policy and planning framework for land use decision making		
○ Framework to ensure that public’s health, safety, well-being accounted for in public and private decision-making	DLNR	
○ Planning framework respected by legislative/executive/administration	DLNR	
○ Inclusive of constitutional provisions that set state planning policies	DLNR	
○ Provides objectives and policies (likes Hawaii State Plan)	CE	
○ Differentiating needs of rural vs. urban environments, agriculture vs. conservation environments	CE	

Table 2

Hawaii’s desired land use system provides:

HOW: SYSTEM PERFORMANCE	• Consistency / conformance with policies and plans	
	○ Internal consistency of policies	
	○ Compliance with laws protecting natural resources	SC2
	○ Avoid impermanence syndrome for ag lands	DOA
	○ Consistency between policies & plans	
	○ (Plans) implement HI State Plan (state policy), consistency with...	APA
	○ State interest stated as counties go through GP, DP, SCP planning	BIA
	○ Implement plans that conforms to overall state directions regarding where growth is allowed and discouraged	OC
	○ Compliance with laws protecting natural resources	SC2
	○ County CIP investments consistent with statewide planning framework	DLNR
	○ State decision-making re: resources tied to statewide planning framework	DLNR
	○ Consistency between policies, plans & implementation, including timing of planned growth	
	○ County CIP investments consistent with statewide planning framework	DLNR
	○ State decision-making re: resources tied to statewide planning framework	DLNR
	○ Land use choices that protect Commons , don’t undermine environmental protection	OC
	○ Urbanization linked to ability of ecosystem to provide potable water for planned urban use	BIA
	○ Compliance with laws protecting natural resources	SC2
	○ Implement county plans	APA
	○ Public doesn’t subsidize development unless genuine affordable housing provided	SC1
	○ Urbanization allowed only in accord with phasing & magnitude of development in county plans	DOA
	○ To minimize impermanence syndrome/protect ag)	DOA
	○ Discourage premature urbanization (project needing plan amendment considered later under specific & limited circumstances)	DOA
	○ (Reasonable) coincidence of infrastructure availability & capacity with planned urbanization (in county system)	DOA
	○ To minimize impermanence syndrome/protect ag	DOA
	○ Specific, reliable milestones that set short- and long-term investment-backed expectations	DLNR
	○ Allowing for orderly changes to meet built and natural environment challenges	DLNR

Table 2

Hawaii’s desired land use system provides:

HOW: SYSTEM PERFORMANCE	• Plan-based, plan-driven land use decisions/development	
	○ Identify areas for urbanization now and in future; future expansion area identified in advance to allow competition in delivery of housing types	BIA
	○ Direct development where allowed and discouraged based on public’s best interests	OC
	○ Direct development to appropriate areas and avoid/minimize risk to agricultural, natural, and cultural resources and hazards	SC2
	○ Urbanization allowed only in accord with phasing & magnitude of development in county plans	DOA
	○ To minimize impermanence syndrome/protect ag)	DOA
	○ Discourage premature urbanization (project needing plan amendment considered later under specific & limited circumstances)	DOA
	○ Implement county plans	APA
	○ Implement plans that conforms to overall state directions regarding where growth is allowed and discouraged	OC
	○ Avoids areas located far from infrastructure and town centers	OC
	○ Case-by-case regulatory system is counter to state’s interests	
	• Infrastructure capacity concurrent with planned growth	
	○ (Reasonable) coincidence of infrastructure availability & capacity with planned urbanization (in county system)	DOA
	○ To minimize impermanence syndrome/protect ag	DOA
	○ Ensure adequate infrastructure to support planned growth or density in urban areas	BIA
	○ Urbanization based on ability of ecosystem to provide potable water for planned urban use	BIA
	○ County CIP investments consistent with statewide planning framework	DLNR
	○ State decision-making re: resources tied to statewide planning framework	DLNR
	○ Allowing for orderly changes to meet built and natural environment challenges	DLNR
	• Efficient / sustainable use of resources	
	○ Sustainability – ability to exist within an island state—focal point of debate	BIA
	○ Managing water consumption and supply	OC
	○ Urbanization based on ability to protect ecosystems so there is enough potable water for planned urban use	BIA
	○ Public infrastructure costs manageable	SC2
○ Public doesn’t subsidize development unless genuine affordable housing provided	SC1	
• Effective enforcement of compliance with policies and plans		
○ Compliance with laws protecting natural resources	SC2	
○ Utilize and enforce conditions and incentives for proposed development	SC2	