

'No' repeated by 7 at Waikane session

By ROBERT W. BONE
Advertiser Staff Writer

At a public hearing that one witness characterized as "a slap in the face" to the community, seven persons last night testified against plans by a developer to subdivide a piece of property in Waikane for housing.

The hearing was the third in as many years held at the request of Windward Partners for a shoreline management permit that would allow it to subdivide land along Kaneohe Bay.

About 50 persons attended the sometimes-emotional hearing held by the city's Department of Land Utilization. No one testified for the permit.

Hearing officer Robert Jones had trouble closing the session against the shouts and protests of several in the group who wanted to directly challenge members of Windward Partners on issues that Jones said were not related to the permit application.

Many in the audience seemed to support witness Guy Nakamoto who said that returning the request for still more hearings on the long-standing issue was "a waste of time."

"This is a slap in the face and an insult to the people," said Nakamoto. "The people have made their wish known overwhelmingly. That should be good enough."

In his emotional testimony, Nakamoto said the developers hope to eventually wear down the agricultural residents' resolve and he suggested a way to resolve any future public hearing on the same issue:

"The next time, you bring lots of rotten tomatoes and rotten papayas and dump on their desk!" he said.

Several others echoed this opinion

and said the city should prevent Windward Partners from coming back repeatedly with virtually the same proposal. At one point, Jones seemed somewhat exasperated as he said, "You can't deny someone's right to appeal something."

Several who spoke either as witnesses or from the audience also said they did not believe Jones when he indicated that if sewage arrangements were later found to be inadequate, future residents would have to move out.

The principal spokesman against the proposed development was David Chinen, president of the Waiahole-Waikane Community Association, who said his organization was committed to defeating the subdivision for a third time.

Blaming the developer for ignoring the needs and desires of the community, he said, "Any urban subdivision will be stopped at all costs."

Sei Serakaku, vice president of the association, said the hearing was a "gutless cop-out" by the City Council. Dorothy "Dee Dee" Letts, representing Life of the Land, said the proposal "frustrates the intent of the Oahu General Plan," and that granting the permit "constitutes an adverse environmental effect."

Berdinius Lam Hoo characterized the new hearing as "blackmail" and asked, "Is there anything new that has come up so that we should approve the application?"

He said the City Council should be present at such public hearings to get the flavor of the testimony.

Others who spoke against the proposal were Bob McGrath of the Kahaluu Neighborhood Board and Rep. Charles Toguchi.

Leave the squatters alone, says Anderson resolution

The state should drop all criminal charges against Sand Island squatters, Sen. D.G. Anderson said in a resolution which he introduced at the Legislature yesterday.

But Gov. George Ariyoshi indicated he was concerned about the "precedent" such an action would set and suggested that the state will go ahead with its prosecution of those who resisted eviction.

Anderson, R-3rd District (Windward Oahu), said the state is partially at fault on Sand Island because it allowed squatters to remain on the public beachfront land for years without trouble.

"Instead of enforcing the law at the inception, when the first house

was erected many years ago," his resolution in the Senate says, the state "allowed the situation to swell to the point where the homes of these people, as well as their lifestyle, had to be devastated."

Because the state didn't enforce the law from the beginning, he said, it should drop charges and offer relocation help to the Sand Island people.

Ariyoshi said a decision on where to go with legal charges is up to the attorney general, but he indicated that he would not favor dropping charges.

"I'm very concerned about the precedent," he said.