

Mori, Ashley

From: Surprenant, April
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 1:20 PM
To: General Plan
Subject: FW: General Plan comments

2019 JUN 19 AM 8 08
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
COUNTY OF HAWAII

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2019 2:12 PM
To: Surprenant, April <April.Surprenant@hawaiicounty.gov>
Subject: General Plan comments

April,

thank you and your team for sharing with us the mini speak out last night.

As a professional that works with multi-layers of code requirements, I want to make sure that the General Plan stays General.

On the Hazard section in particular I noticed language that I am familiar with. One is pertaining to the State Building Code and the County adoption of the Building Code. This is HRS language.

Also language pertaining to Flood Hazard Areas. I think this is National Flood Insurance Policy (?). The language I saw on the boards last night pertains to Base Flood Elevations.

I think it is far better to reference laws that are already on the books, than to re-write it in the General Plan. Something to the effect of "County supports and promotes health safety and welfare in the building stock by enforcing HRS..... (insert reference and summarize)".

The problem with re-writing existing laws is that it can lead to confusion and difficulty in compliance. The General Plan gets revised every 10-15 years. This document must be worded to last that long.

HRS on the other hand can be revised in one legislative session. Federal items will have a different time line.

For example, when I first started practicing on the Big Island in 1999, our Zoning Code Chapter 25 had ADA standards for parking written in it. I'm not sure when the ADA language was inserted in Chapter 25, but as change is the one constant we can count on, the Department of Justice came out with new ADA standards after the Ch. 25 inclusion. So, something as simple as designing a parking lot becomes kind of crazy. At that time, there were some requirements that were more restrictive and less restrictive in Ch. 25. And not in any coordinated way some requirements were more restrictive and less restrictive in the Federal ADA requirements at that time.

That situation was not good for the designer, the enforcer, the project owner, and ultimately the public.

I am not expert in all facets included in the General Plan. But if there were elements in the building portion, I encourage you to find out if there are elements in the other sections that are referencing other laws as well.

Aloha,

