

WINDWARD PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF HAWAI'I

MINUTES
MARCH 5, 2026

A video recording is made part of these minutes, which can be viewed on the YouTube County of Hawai'i Planning Department channel at <https://youtube.com/live/JUvT2RCojqY>

Timestamps are provided for reference in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 92, Hawai'i Revised Statutes. In the event the video recording becomes unavailable at the above-mentioned URL address, the public can contact the Planning Department for assistance.

At 9:01 a.m. Chairperson Louis Daniele III announced an attendance delay with Commissioner Lauren Balog and stated that the meeting would begin at 9:10 a.m. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:05 (no audio during this segment till 01:11)]*

The Windward Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, March 5, 2026, at 9:11 a.m., in the County of Hawai'i, Council Chambers, located at 25 Aupuni Street, Hilo, Hawai'i, with Chairman Louis Daniele III presiding. This meeting was streamed live on YouTube.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Louis Daniele III (Chairperson), Lauren Balog, Thomas E. Fratinardo, JoNelle Fukushima, and Chantel Perrin (Vice Chair).

COMMISSIONER ABSENT AND EXCUSED: Kanoe Wilson.

ALSO PRESENT: William Jarrett, Esq. (Counsel to the Commission), Jeffrey Darrow (Planning Director), Jean Campbell, Esq. (Counsel to the Planning Department), and Planning Department staff.

Approximately nine members of the public were in the audience.

Chairman Daniele called the meeting to order at 9:11 a.m., with a quorum present. He made housekeeping announcements, including reminders to silence cell phones, the location of the public restrooms, and the procedure for signing up to provide public testimony. Commissioners and staff were introduced. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 10:17]*

MEETING MATERIALS

At 9:12 a.m. Chairman Daniele asked the Commissioners to confirm that they had reviewed all materials, including written public testimony related to the applications. Each Commissioner verbally confirmed. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 12:19]*

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

At 9:12 a.m., Chairman Daniele announced that the approval of the February 5, 2026, minutes was deferred to the next regular Commission meeting. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 12:47]*

STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON AGENDA ITEMS

At 9:13 a.m., the Commission addressed this item, with approximately seven members of the public present. Chairman Daniele explained that in-person speakers would be heard first, followed by Zoom participants, and that testimony could be provided at the that time or when the agenda item was called. He reminded everyone to keep comments respectful, stated personal attached would not be permitted, and noted that individual testimony is limited to three minutes. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 13:21]*

No in-person or Zoom testimony was received for this agenda item.

NEW BUSINESS

1. APPLICANT: LAURA OLSON, DAVID OLSON AND CALLA OLSON (PL-SPP-2025-000111)

Application for a Special Permit to establish and operate a one-bedroom bed & breakfast with a maximum of 5 guests and a micro-wedding venue with a maximum of 10 guests on a 3.003-acre property within the State Land Use Agricultural District. The subject property is located at 92-8486 Tiki Lane, on the east (Naalehu) side of Tiki Lane, midway between Keaka Parkway and Walaka Drive, Hawaiian Ocean View Estates, Ka'ū, Hawai'i, TMK: (3) 9-2-095:016.

At 9:15 a.m., the Commission considered this item with approximately seven members of the public present. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 15:09]*

Jessica Andrews provided the staff presentation. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 16:31]*

Chairman Daniele opened the floor for questions from the Commissioners. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 21:42]*

Laura Olson, the applicant, provided a presentation. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 26:30]*

Chairman Daniele opened the floor for questions from the Commissioners to the applicant. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 29:26]*

Action: Vice Chair Chantel Perrin moved the application for Special Permit (PL-SPP-2025-000111) to establish and operate a one bedroom bed and breakfast with a maximum of five guests and a micro-wedding venue with a minimum of ten guests on an approximately 3.003-acre parcel of land in the State Land Use Agricultural District be approved based on the Planning Director's findings, recommendations and conditions.

Commissioner Thomas Fratinardo seconded the motion. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 32:02]*

Staff member Christian Kay called a point of order to verify whether there was any public testimony on this agenda item. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 32:38]* Chairman Daniele asked if there was any public testimony. There were no testifiers, either in person or via Zoom. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 32:45]*

Chairman Daniele restated the motion and opened the floor for discussion and comments from the Commission. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 33:04]*

With no comments or discussion, a roll call vote was taken. The motion carried with five ayes (Perrin, Balog, Fratinardo, Fukushima, and Daniele) no noes, and one absent and excused (Wilson). *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 33:33]*

The hearing on this item concluded at 9:34 a.m.

Chairman Daniele requested a motion to enter executive session before considering Item #2 on the agenda. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 34:17]*

At 9:34 a.m. Vice Chair Perrin moved, and Commissioner Fratinardo seconded that the Commission enter executive session to consult with its attorney regarding questions and issues pertaining to the Commission's powers, duties, privileges, immunities, and liabilities pursuant to Hawai'i Revised Statute §92-5. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 34:51]* There were no comments or discussion on the motion. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried with five ayes (Perrin, Fratinardo, Balog, Fukushima, and Daniele), no noes and one absent and excused (Wilson). *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 35:31]*

The Commission entered executive session at 9:35 a.m.

At 10:26 a.m. Chairman Daniele called the meeting back to order and noted that the Commission had previously entered executive session to consult with its attorney regarding questions and issues pertaining to the Commission's power, duties, privileges, immunities, and liabilities pursuant to Hawai'i Revised Statute §92-5. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:26:32]*

At 10:27 a.m. Chairman Daniele called for a recess [SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:27:08]. The hearing reconvened at 10:34 a.m. [SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:34:19]

**2. PETITIONER: BRANDY CAMACHO
PETITION FOR DECLARATORY RULING REGARDING
USE PERMIT NO. 15-000056**

Request for a Declaratory Ruling on the applicability and legal effect Condition No. 3 (access easement) of Use Permit No. 15-000056, which allowed the construction of a new telecommunication facility, including a 150-foot tall steel monopole and related facilities within a 1,600 square-foot portion of a 2-acre parcel situated in the County's

Agricultural-1 acre (A-1a) zoning district. The project site is located between 31st Avenue and 32nd Avenue, about 2,160 feet southeast of the Paradise Drive intersection, Hawaiian Paradise Park Subdivision, Kea'au, Puna, Hawai'i, TMKs: 1-5-017:084 and 1-5-017:118.

The Commission began considering this item at 10:34 a.m., with approximately six members of the public present *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:34:23]*

Chairman Daniele stated that before any staff presentation, the Commission needed to address the petition for a declaratory ruling, either accepting or denying it. He noted that a motion would be required for acceptance or denial. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:36:28]*

He introduced Deputy Corporation Counsel William Jarrett to explain the procedural process. Mr. Jarrett explained that he represents the Commission and not any applicants, petitioners, or members of the public. He stated that his role is to protect the integrity of the process. Mr. Jarrett noted that, under Planning Commission Rule 3-1, a petition for a declaratory ruling is within the Commission's discretion, meaning the Commission may accept or deny the petition. He emphasized that this is a preliminary matter that must be decided by the Commission before any presentations or testimony can be heard. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:37:25]*

Action – Accepting or Denying Petition for Declaratory Ruling: Vice Chair Perrin moved that the Petition for Declaratory Ruling regarding Use Permit No. 15-000056, located at 15-1839 32nd Avenue, be accepted for review and that a Declaratory Ruling be issued following presentations by the Petitioner, the Planning Department, and public testimony. Commissioner JoNelle Fukushima seconded the motion. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:39:43]* A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried with five ayes (Perrin, Fukushima, Balog, Fratinardo, and Daniele), no noes and one absent and excused (Wilson). *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:40:37]*

Chairman Daniele stated that, before proceeding, there is another preliminary matter to address. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:41:06]* Deputy Corporation Counsel William Jarrett noted that a petition for standing in a contested case hearing had been filed by Horizon Tower Limited Partnership III, by Horizon Tower III, LLC. He explained that this is a preliminary matter that the Commission must address before proceeding to the presentation by the petitioner. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:41:48]*

Commissioner Fratinardo moved that Condition No. 3 was complied with; however, Chairman Daniele advised that the motion was not needed at that time. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:42:13]*

Action – Petition for Standing in a Contested Case Hearing: Vice Chair Perrin moved that the Petition for Standing in a Contested Case Hearing filed by Horizon Tower Limited Partnership III, by Horizon Tower III, LLC be deferred until after disposition of the underlying Petition for Declaratory Ruling. Commissioner Fratinardo seconded the motion. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:43:04]* A roll call vote was taken, and the

motion carried with five ayes (Perrin, Fratinardo, Balog, Fukushima, and Daniele), no noes and one absent and excused (Wilson). *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:43:43]*

Planning staff member Christian Kay stated that there would be no formal PowerPoint presentation from staff. The documentation provided in the background report, along with subsequent testimony received after the report, would serve as the staff's presentation. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:44:16]*

Brandy Camacho, Petitioner for the Petition for Declaratory Ruling regarding Use Permit No. 15-000056, addressed her petition to the Commission and provided additional information regarding the request. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:45:19]*

Chairman Daniele opened the floor for questions from the Commissioners to staff and the petitioner. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:47:43]*

Chairman Daniele opened the floor for public testimony when the agenda item was called. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:58:59]*

Two individuals provided testimony in-person:

1. Eric Robinson *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 01:59:41]*
2. Patrick Wong *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:04:39]*

There were no Zoom testifiers for this agenda item.

Chairman Daniele allowed petitioner Brandy Camacho to respond to concerns raised by the testifiers. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:11:36]*

The Commission questioned the petitioner, including discussion regarding license and easement. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:15:00]*

Vice Chair Perrin asked Ms. Camacho whether she had read the license, to which Ms. Camacho responded that she had reviewed it. Vice Chair Perrin then inquired whether her concern was based on the document being a license rather than an easement and whether it would resolve her concerns if it were an easement. Ms. Camacho explained that a license and an easement are legally distinct. Commissioner Perrin further pressed whether she had read the license, and Ms. Camacho confirmed that she had.

Vice Chair Perrin referred to the license and read a portion highlighting language on the transfer or granting of an interest in the property, including by easement or other legal instrument. Ms. Camacho responded that a license can be revoked at any time, whereas an easement runs with the land, emphasizing this key legal distinction. Vice Chair Perrin stated that the document indicated transferability; however, Ms. Camacho maintained that while a license may be transferable, it can still be terminated, and therefore an easement is necessary.

Ms. Camacho noted that the applicant secured an easement on January 30, after the fact. Vice Chair Perrin referenced that the process had been in motion since 2015 and stated that prior owners, as well as Ms. Camacho, should have been notified. Ms. Camacho emphasized that the discussion should remain focused on Condition No. 3, while Vice Chair Perrin suggested that the property sale may have been influenced by the circumstances. Ms. Camacho stated that the matter before the Commission was specifically Condition No. 3.

Ms. Camacho stated that Condition No. 3 is a binary requirement that requires an easement and is either satisfied or not. She stated that a license does not meet that requirement, regardless of its contents, and noted that the applicant demonstrated the ability to secure an easement through the January 30 filing. Vice Chair Perrin maintained that the license was inclusive and contained relevant provisions; however, Ms. Camacho reiterated that regardless of its contents, it is not an easement.

Vice Chair Perrin questioned whether the license was recorded with the land and referenced the portion indicating transferability, noting the timeline dating back to 2015. She further suggested that due diligence should have been conducted at the time of purchase. Ms. Camacho asked whether Vice Chair Perrin was asserting that the license addressed her public safety concerns regarding the potential collapse of the tower onto her property. Vice Chair Perrin responded that such matters are stated in the license. Ms. Camacho expressed concern that the discussion was going off topic and reiterated that the matter at hand was Condition No. 3, which she described as a clear requirement that must be satisfied prior to the issuance of any permit. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:15:08]*

Commissioner Fukushima stated that, in her understanding, although the document is not a physical easement, it contains all the elements of an easement in its design, with the physical portion serving as the accessible area for vehicles to enter and perform maintenance. She suggested that the license itself can function as an easement. Ms. Camacho responded that it is not an easement, but a license.

Commissioner Fukushima explained that after reviewing the document, she considered it from Ms. Camacho's perspective, distinguishing a physical easement from a lease, but noted that under the law, the lease elements and use could constitute an easement. Ms. Camacho reiterated that a license is not an easement.

Commissioner Fukushima clarified that access is different, while access allows vehicles to traverse the property, she believed the license grants both access and other elements, effectively functioning as an easement. Ms. Camacho commented that a license can be revoked and emphasized that it does not run with the land and can be modified or canceled. Commissioner Fukushima argued that the lease appears to run with the land, but Ms. Camacho disagreed. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:19:30]*

Chairman Daniele requested that Planning Director Jeffrey Darrow speak on the matter, and Commissioners asked additional questions. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:22:24]*

Chairman Daniele allowed petitioner Brandy Camacho to respond to statements made by Planning Director Jeffrey Darrow. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:29:39]*

Chairman Daniele noted that the matter of the petition for standing filed by Horizon Tower Limited Partnership III depends on whether the Commission accepts or denies the petition for declaratory ruling. He stated that deferring a decision on the petition for standing would be appropriate and asked the petitioner if they wished to proceed. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:32:02]* Counsel Eric Robinson responded that Horizon Tower Limited Partnership III is amenable to either deferring the petition or, depending on the outcome of the petition for declaratory ruling, withdrawing it. Chairman Daniele confirmed that the matter would be deferred. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:32:46]*

Chairman Daniele announced that the Commission would enter executive session and requested a motion. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:33:44]*

At 11:34 a.m. Commissioner Fratinardo moved, and Vice Chair Perrin seconded that the Commission enter executive session to consult with its attorney regarding questions and issues pertaining to the Commission's powers, duties, privileges, immunities, and liabilities pursuant to Hawai'i Revised Statute §92-5. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:34:15]* There were no comments or discussion on the motion. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried with five ayes (Fratinardo, Perrin, Balog, Fukushima, and Daniele), no noes and one absent and excused (Wilson). *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:35:08]*

The Commission entered executive session at 11:35 a.m.

At 11:50 a.m. Chairman Daniele called the meeting back to order and noted that the Commission had entered executive session, during which it consulted with its attorney regarding questions and issues pertaining to the Commission's power, duties, privileges, immunities, and liabilities pursuant to Hawai'i Revised Statute §92-5. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:50:45]*

Action – Ruling on Petition for Declaratory Ruling: Vice Chair Perrin moved that the Commission issue a Declaratory Ruling on the Petition for Declaratory Ruling (Rule 3-1) regarding Use Permit No. 15-000056, stating that the applicant complied with Condition No. 3 of the Planning Commission's January 21, 2020 order by having filed and obtaining a license satisfying the Commission's requirements, and that the petitioner's request to void the Use Permit and stay construction is outside the scope of Declaratory Ruling. Commissioner Fratinardo seconded the motion. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:51:18]*

Chairman Daniele opened the floor for discussion and comments from the Commission. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:52:10]* With no comments or discussion, a roll call vote was taken. The motion carried with five ayes (Perrin, Fratinardo, Balog, Fukushima, and Daniele) no noes, and one absent and excused (Wilson). *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:52:28]*

At 11:53 a.m., Eric Robinson, on behalf of the petitioner Horizon Tower Limited Partnership III, by Horizon Tower III, LLC stated that the petitioner respectfully withdraws its petition for standing in a contested case hearing. Chairman Daniele accepted the withdrawal. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:53:21]*

This hearing item concluded at 11:53 a.m. *[SEE HEARING TRANSCRIPT – EXHIBIT A]*

At 11:53 a.m. the Chairman called for a recess [SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 02:53:44], and the hearing reconvened at 12:32 p.m. [SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:32:18]

At 12:32 p.m. Chairman Daniele reconvened the meeting. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:32:18]*

OLD BUSINESS

3. Discussion of Planning Commissioners' suggestions for future amendments to the Planning Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure.

The Commission began consideration of this item at 12:32 p.m., with no members of the public present. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:32:26]*

Chairman Daniele opened the floor for public testimony when the agenda item was called. There were no testifiers, either in person or via Zoom. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:32:52]*

Action: Vice Chair Perrin, seconded by Commissioner Fukushima, to continue further discussion regarding the proposed amendments to the Planning Commission's Rules to the next Commission meeting. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:33:26]*

Planning staff member Christian Kay raised a point of order and asked whether the motion was to continue the discussion to the next meeting. Chairman Daniele responded that it was for a continuance. Mr. Kay clarified that no motion was necessary unless the Commission wished to continue the item to the next meeting, noting that the matter was already on the agenda and could be discussed. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:33:46]* Following the clarification, Vice Chair Perrin withdrew the motion to continue the discussion. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:34:06]*

Chairman Daniele opened the floor for discussion and comments. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:34:10]*

Staff member Christian Kay noted that at the last hearing, staff Maija Jackson indicated the Planning Department would provide the Commission with a list of suggested amendments to the Planning Commission rules. He explained that the list is still being compiled and that nothing formal was available to present today, but the Commission could provide suggestions now or defer the matter to the next meeting. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:34:12]*

Vice Chair Perrin, commented that, in reviewing the Planning Commission rules, she found limited guidance regarding electronic submittals of testimony. She suggested adding definitions and provisions for remote testimony, hybrid meetings, and electronic attendance, noting that Zoom is now widely used for public testimony and participation. She also suggested considering a timeline for submission of materials to allow Commissioners adequate time for review. She noted an instance when an entire binder of materials was submitted at a meeting, requiring the start to be delayed by half an hour and prolonging the process. She recommended establishing a deadline for written testimony to ensure Commissioners can review it without delaying the meeting. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:35:14]*

Jean Campbell, Deputy Corporation Counsel, on behalf of the Planning Department stated that many boards and commission face similar challenges. Under the Open Meetings Law, the Commission cannot require a deadline for submission of testimony. She noted that a suggestion could be made requesting that testimony be submitted by a certain time, but by law, individuals may provide testimony up until the start of the meeting or during the meeting. She acknowledged the difficulties this can create for the Commission but explained that the only legal option is to take a recess to review materials submitted late. Vice Chair Perrin expressed appreciation for the clarification. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:36:55]*

Vice Chair Perrin commented on updating how meetings are accessed, noting that technology is an important consideration. She suggested adding language under "Conduct of Public Hearing" to indicate that members of the public may testify in person or remotely when electronic meeting platforms are available, as this is not currently listed. She also asked whether there is a way to limit duplicate testimony. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:38:13]*

Planning staff member Christian Kay responded that the Chair has the authority to limit duplicative testimony, and a statement to that effect is typically made at the beginning of each meeting. He stated that codifying or adding specific information related to online meetings into the rules could be considered. He noted, however, that many requirements are driven by the State Sunshine Law (Open Meetings Law), and any changes to the law would necessitate updates to the rules. He added that the rules could generally refer to the State Sunshine Law, allowing for adaptation as the law changes. He explained that announcements related to online or virtual meetings are included in the agenda, which

accommodates the increasing prevalence of online participation. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:38:52]*

Vice Chair Perrin asked whether applicants are allowed to provide a rebuttal after presentations and if this is addressed in the rules. Planning staff member Christian Kay stated that there is no specific procedural rule for this, and that the Chair generally has discretion to manage the meeting. Vice Chair Perrin noted that rebuttals can help address misinformation in testimony, since applicants may not have access to those providing testimony. Mr. Kay added that some guidance for such situations is included in the meeting script and stated that while the Commission could consider codifying this in the rules, in practice the Chair has authority to conduct the meeting as appropriate. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:40:22]*

Commissioner Fratinardo asked whether the joint meeting with both Commissions regarding the rules would be held in July. Planning staff member Christian Kay stated that the Planning Commission rules discussion has been tentatively added to upcoming hearings as a placeholder, but he is not aware of a scheduled joint meeting at this time. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:42:05]*

Commissioner Fratinardo suggested that the Commission consider reviewing the rules in sections (e.g., the first four rules) prior to each meeting and proceeding in a piecemeal manner. Planning staff member Christian Kay stated that he has not yet discussed with Maija how the rule review process will be conducted and will raise the topic with her. He added that the Commission could have a discussion about the anticipated process at the next meeting. Commissioner Fratinardo asked whether Commissioners should forward questions regarding the rules to Maija. Mr. Kay confirmed that questions could be sent in advance but also encouraged raising them during the full Commission discussion at the meeting. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:43:01]*

Chair Daniele commented it would be very helpful to have the department's suggested rule changing they are working on as it would give a little bit of direction on kind of what the department is thinking. Vice Chair Perrin added that Chapters 1, 2, and 3 lay the foundation of the rules. She emphasized the importance of ensuring that, with evolving technology, the rules encompass all available tools and platforms, such as Zoom, and address how they are utilized by the Commission. Chair Daniele also stated that it is likely that Rule 11 would be eliminated altogether. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:45:52]*

Deputy Corporation Counsel William Jarrett stated that, based on the record from the last joint meeting with the Leeward Planning Commission, the next joint meeting is scheduled for June, although a specific date has not been set. He noted that the meeting is expected to be held in Hilo. He added that a draft will be prepared in coordination with the Planning Department and Maija prior to the meeting, and if the draft is not ready in time, the joint hearing may need to be continued. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:46:43]*

Vice Chair Perrin stated that before deciding to remove any items, the Commission should review all items, as was discussed at the previous meeting, to ensure decisions are not made prematurely. Chairman Daniele added that the outline would help distinguish the Department's perspective from that of the Commission and provide a roadmap, noting that this review process is not conducted on a daily basis. Planning staff member Christian Kay reiterated that the next several meetings include a placeholder for discussion of Planning Commission rules. He noted that as the Commission reviews the rules, there will be opportunities to provide additional information to help shape the Department's proposed rule amendments. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:47:28]*

Action: Vice Chair Perrin moved, seconded by Commissioner Fratinardo, to continue further discussion regarding the proposed amendments to the Planning Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure to the next Windward Planning Commission meeting. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:48:49]* With no comments or discussion, a roll call vote was taken. The motion carried with five ayes (Perrin, Fratinardo, Balog, Fukushima, and Daniele) no noes, and one absent and excused (Wilson). *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:49:23]*

This hearing item concluded at 12:49 p.m.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Report on Special Management Area (SMA) determinations, minor permits action issued by the Planning Director.

At 12:49 p.m., Chairman Daniele introduced this item, noting that the Special Management Area (SMA) determination and minor permits for February 2026 report had been emailed to the Commissioners. There were no questions regarding the report. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:49:45]*

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Daniele announced that the next regular meeting of the Windward Planning Commission was tentatively scheduled for Thursday, April 2, 2026. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:50:04]* Planning staff member Christian Kay announced that the April 2, 2026, hearing tentatively includes five agenda items: a Special Permit, an amendment to an SMA Use permit, and three County Council–Initiated code changes related to the Pāhoa Village Design District and Special Districts in Pāhoa Village. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:50:25]*

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, Vice Chair Perrin moved, and Commissioner Fukushima seconded, to adjourn the meeting. *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:50:56]* A voice vote was taken, and the motion carried with five ayes (Perrin, Fratinardo, Balog, Fukushima, and Daniele), no noes, and one excused and excused (Wilson). *[SEE YOUTUBE TIMESTAMP 03:51:07]*

Chairman Daniele adjourned the meeting at 12:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melissa Dacayanan-Salvador

Melissa Dacayanan-Salvador (Apr 3, 2026 09:12:20 HST)

Melissa Dacayanan-Salvador
Secretary

ATTEST:

Louis V. Daniele III

Louis V. Daniele III (Apr 6, 2026 07:47:32 HST)

Louis Daniele III, Chairman
Windward Planning Commission