Docket No. DR15-54 Pu'unoa HOA
Doug Salisbury to: luc 02/12/2016 11:04 AM
Please respond to douglsalisbury

February 12, 2016

VIA EMAIL – Original by U.S. Mail
State Land Use Commission
PO Box 2359
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

Re: Docket No. DR15-54 Pu'unoa HOA
Case: IN THE MATTER OF: To issue a declaratory order that the proposed construction of a homeless encampment and commercial campground on 7.9 Acres of a 22.7 Acre Parcel located at the Hokiokio Place and Lahaina Bypass Road at Maui Tax Map key No. (2) 4-7-003:031 (POR), Lahiana, Maui, Hawaii, in the agricultural district requires a boundary amendment.

Dear Members of the Commission:

As a neighbor and property owner of the West Maui Community, specifically Lots 5, 6, and 12 (a total area in excess of 20 acres), in the Pu'unoa Development immediately adjacent to the proposed homeless encampment and camp-ground where Peter Martin was the original developer of Pu'unoa. I am respectfully submitting this request to the State Land Use Commission to issue a Declaratory Ruling that the LUC has the authority to issue an opinion recommending DENIAL of the Ho'omoana's project.

I am in full support of the efforts before the State Land Use Commission asking the LUC to determine that Ho'omoana's desired transformation of good agricultural land is subject to the formal District Boundary Amendment process put in place for the protection, preservation and promotion of such important agricultural island lands.

Although homelessness is a serious matter, and is most certainly in need of being addressed,

the proposed homeless tent encampment and commercial campground on a parcel that is
located in an agricultural district is just a bad idea. We, as neighbors, are all subject to the
agricultural standards in place for the promotion and preservation of the agricultural lands.
Allowing spot zoning creates a slippery slope toward the erosion of existing boundary district/
zoning and will likely lead to a degradation of the surrounding land uses, encouraging further abuses of spot urbanization within even larger agricultural parcels. Furthermore, the proposed change in use is contrary to the criteria required to support the change. Agricultural lands provide for a diverse workforce, self-sustainability and aesthetics. The approval of such a change would require the new use to promote or positively advance the intentions of the agricultural designation while advancing and increasing the protections for this limited and valuable resource, not run contrary to it. The developer and the County have conveniently rewritten the LUC requirement by arguing that the new use doesn't negatively impact agriculture or the surrounding community. However, an attempt to avoid a negative impact is not the same thing as positively advancing or promoting the agricultural uses; the only reason that the requirements for changed use should even be considered. Bottom line, the goal of protecting good agricultural land should not be overlooked for the convenience and gain of a developer, or as a knee-jerk reaction to an emotionally loaded topic.

I strongly urge the Commission to not only consider the impact of such a zone change for a part of a parcel designated agricultural and the effects it would have on our community, but to also have the foresight to recognize the implications such a change would likely have in creating and

encouraging further abuses of spot urbanization within larger agricultural parcels.

Thank you for your time and consideration on this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Douglas L. Salisbury