

STATE OF HAWAII
LAND USE COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting

County Board of Supervisors Chambers
Wailuku, Maui

April 14, 1966 - 2:25 P.M.

*minutes approved
June 17, 1966*

Commissioners Present: Myron B. Thompson, Chairman
C. E. S. Burns
Robert Wenkam
Shelley Mark
Jim P. Ferry
Leslie Wung
Goro Inaba
Charles Ota
Shiro Nishimura

Staff Present: George S. Moriguchi, Executive Officer
Roy Takeyama, Legal Counsel
Ah Sung Leong, Draftsman
Dora Horikawa, Stenographer

A short prayer by Chairman Thompson was followed by the usual introduction of Commissioners and staff members, swearing in of persons testifying during the hearing, and a brief explanation of the procedures to be followed.

PETITION OF ALEXANDER AND BALDWIN, INC. (A65-106), TO AMEND THE URBAN DISTRICT BOUNDARY AT KAHULUI, MAUI, identifiable by Tax Map Key 3-8-07: 02

Staff recommendation was for favorable consideration of the petition since adequate proof had been submitted of the need for urbanization of an additional 12 acres, and the lands were suitable for development for urban purposes.

Commissioner Wenkam asked whether petitioner had entertained the idea of revising the urban line more approximate with the master plan for Maui, and Mr. Moriguchi replied that this had been done, that the petitioner had closely followed the master plan.

Mr. Richard Cox of Alexander and Baldwin stated that the staff had adequately covered the pertinent points. He submitted an additional map showing how the proposed area would tie in with the other developments, pointing out the various existing uses.

Mr. Cox solicited comments from the Commissioners with respect to Alexander and Baldwin's desire to proceed with construction of the 32.5 acres of the 10th increment presently in an Urban District.

Commissioner Ferry advised that this matter would fall under the jurisdiction of the County, inasmuch as it involved urban lands, and that it would not be prudent for the Commissioners to make any comments.

Since there was no further testimony, the hearing was closed.

PETITION OF HONOKAI DEVELOPERS (A65-101), TO AMEND THE URBAN DISTRICT BOUNDARY AT HONOULIULI, OAHU, identifiable by Tax Map Key 9-1-15: 8

Staff memorandum presented by Mr. Moriguchi (see copy on file) maintained the original recommendation made at the time of the public hearing for denial of the petition, since the petitioner had not served to prove that additional urban lands were required, and on confirmation of the fact that sufficient urban lands were available.

Commenting on the hardship factor, Commissioner Burns wondered when the project was started and how much money had been expended. The only expense incurred to date was for the sewage treatment plant, Mr. Moriguchi advised, which was installed around 1962 to serve the existing subdivision in addition to the subject area in anticipation of receiving approval.

Chairman Thompson pointed to the statement in the staff memo referring to the availability of sufficient urban lands in this area. Mr. Moriguchi replied that this was a direct quote taken from the City Planning Commission's recommendation which reads as follows: "Although there are sufficient lands for urban purposes in the Ewa District (i.e. Makakilo City) this is the only fee simple residential subdivision in the immediate area."

Mr. Vincent Yano of Honokai Developers presented additional testimony in support of the petition. At the time the developers submitted the 50-acre plan to the City Planning Commission, the whole area was zoned Rural Protective. Subsequently, the Land Use Commission reclassified it in the Agricultural District. The sewage treatment plant was a City Planning Commission requirement even before the developers could proceed with Unit 1-A. Mr. Yano stressed that he certainly did not mean to imply that they "gambled" \$170,000 for a sewage plant to take care of the entire 50-acre subdivision. They were mandated by the City to submit detailed subdivision plans for the entire area before tentative approval could be granted. Although the City did grant tentative approval for the entire subdivision, the developers were advised to seek actual approval on an increment basis at the time their plans materialized. This was the reason they did not have approval for the subject parcel under petition.

Commissioner Ferry felt that the amount of \$170,000 for the sewage plant was in line with expenditures required to serve the needs of 250 lots.

Chairman Thompson raised the question of flooding in the 1-A increment resulting from an over-flow of the stream following a big rain. Mr. Yano replied that this was handled by adequate drainage.

Referring to the slow rate of sales in the 1-A increment, Commissioner Ferry submitted that during the latter part of 1959 to the middle of 1961, there was a depressed real estate market, and that some weight should be given this factor

since petitioner was granted approval in 1960. Secondly, the growth of the leeward area has only begun, primarily due to the investment that the government has begun making. One of the stifling growth factors was the lack of proper access, and this was being resolved by construction of better highways. With the projection of 1,185,000 people for 1980 for Oahu alone, it was easy to conceive that a good portion of the increase in population would locate in the leeward area.

Commissioner Ferry continued that staff was not presenting a true picture by drawing comparisons such as that described in page 2, item 4, of the memorandum. Other factors that should be considered in making such comparisons would be the availability of financing, the promotional budget, the number of developed lots, etc.

Commissioner Ferry confirmed that the H-I highway would be completed within the next 10 years.

Commissioner Nishimura observed that the amount of urban lands submitted as being available in the general area was deceiving, in that much of this land was owned by the federal government. Mr. Moriguchi commented that the federal government did develop its own residential subdivisions. He also pointed out that Makakilo is available with a potential for 25,000 persons.

Pursuing the matter a little further, Commissioner Ferry commented that facilities for an additional 25,000 persons in the Makakilo area were hardly sufficient to meet the needs of the 450,000 additional residents anticipated for the Island of Oahu by 1980.

Commissioner Wenkam pointed to the fact that this Commission had previously turned down reclassification of Fort Barrette which had the same potential as the subject area under consideration. To argue for approval of this petition on the basis of population expansion, he felt, was invalid since this would only accommodate such a small percentage of the needs. He felt that the proposed urban reclassification in the Makaha area, on which the Commission will be acting on today, would more than adequately meet the requirements of the population growth within the leeward area.

Commissioner Wenkam continued that he was arguing against this petition because it was typical of the scattering of developments which, to some extent, was responsible for bringing about the establishment of the Land Use Commission. To condone the continuation of this subdivision merely because it had already been started, was akin to agreeing that two wrongs make a right. This was an undesirable projection of an urban area into the center of an Agricultural District and open spaces, and did not contribute to a well-planned and well-organized community.

Mr. Moriguchi submitted that the Commission had denied any number of requests involving indigent citizens wishing to subdivide agricultural lands, even though hardship had been advanced as the major factor. Therefore, in order to be consistent, this fact should be given due consideration.

In addition, a study made by Harlan Bartholomew had recommended keeping the subject area in agriculture and this Commission had seen fit to accept this recommendation and had modified the urban line to its present location.

Commissioner Ota commented that petitioner's lands were not in productive use and some improvements had already been installed. Also, this was one of the few fee simple lands available in the rural area on Oahu.

Commissioner Ferry wondered whether any of the petitions turned down in the past on the neighbor islands abutted an urban area, and Mr. Moriguchi replied that they did not.

Commissioner Ferry then asked if a similar situation had occurred on the neighbor island with all things being equal, would there be much reason to deny extension of an Urban District. Chairman Thompson requested that the discussion be confined to the subject petition without making references to precedents set. Also, circumstances differed on the neighbor islands and on Oahu.

Commissioner Wenkam referred to the hardship factor presented by the petitioner and commented that Fort Barette had also suffered similar difficulties.

Commissioner Ferry replied, as a matter of clarification, that there was a major difference between Fort Barette and the Honokai development. At the time of purchase, Fort Barette had already been zoned agricultural, whereas petitioners had received approval for the subdivision in 1960 and committed their investments.

Commissioner Ferry moved that the application be approved since sufficient justification had been presented by the petitioner for a boundary change from an Agricultural District to an Urban District, seconded by Commissioner Nishimura. The Commissioners were polled as follows:

Ayes: Commissioners Inaba, Ota, Burns, Nishimura, Ferry.

Nays: Commissioners Wung, Wenkam, Mark, Chairman Thompson.

The motion was not carried.

PETITION OF CAPITAL INVESTMENT CO., LTD. (A65-100), TO AMEND THE URBAN DISTRICT BOUNDARY AT MAKAHA, OAHU, identifiable by Tax Map Key 8-4-02

Mr. Moriguchi presented the staff memorandum recommending a modified urban-conservation line, involving 1,370 acres (see copy on file). The modifications and the recommended urban boundaries were pointed out in detail on the map.

Commissioner Burns questioned whether staff's recommendation for approval included the 20% slopes.

Mr. Moriguchi conceded that it did--that denial of the 20% slopes would restrict the development to such an extent that it would be economically difficult for the developers to proceed with their plans. It was also pointed out that staff had recommended urbanization of the remaining Class E lands since most of the prime agricultural lands had already been absorbed in the plans.

In reply to Commissioner Ota's request, Mr. Moriguchi pointed out the proposed uses on the map such as the resort complex, commercial areas, open spaces, residential area, etc. There were provisions for a total of 5,400 dwelling units

if the petition as requested by Capital Investment Co. were approved.

Mr. Moriguchi advised that the modified urban-conservation line was discussed with the petitioner and agreed upon, although petitioner did point out the fact that the City and County had planned on allowing construction on lands over 30% slopes.

Commissioner Wenkam stated that the beauty of the islands was largely dependent upon keeping the hillsides free of developments. However, he felt that construction on slopes up to 30% in this instance was feasible due to the vastness of the area and the tremendous open spaces which allowed for greater flexibility, and that he supported the staff's recommendations.

Commissioner Ota expressed bewilderment over staff's inconsistency in recommending denial of the Honokai petition, acted on earlier, for 32 acres adjacent to an Urban District on grounds that sufficient urban lands were available; and then to recommend approval of this petition involving thousands of acres.

Mr. Moriguchi replied that staff recognized this very point might be brought up. Staff had viewed the Makaha petition from the standpoint of the overall general plan for the island, and the State General Plan's proposal for this area was for a major resort complex, based on future tourist expansion. The petitioner had submitted substantial data along this line. The Honokai petition was for an isolated appendage to an Urban District that should not have been there in the first place, and the State General Plan did not include this area for urban purposes.

Referring back to the statement made earlier by staff, Commissioner Ferry agreed that economic hardship was involved if construction were disallowed on the gentle slopes. However, one could not deny that staff was arguing from the economic standpoint. Yet, in the Honokai petition, the economics involved did not warrant staff's consideration. Commissioner Ferry wondered how this could be rationalized.

It was stressed by staff that economics was not the basis for recommending approval of the Capital Investment petition--that if sufficient justification of need for the complex had not been submitted by the petitioner, staff would have argued against the proposal.

Chairman Thompson agreed that the question raised by Commissioner Ferry required clarification, with respect to the rationale for the Honokai petition. He advised that there were 24 hours in which to reconsider the Honokai petition, but for the moment discussion should be confined to the subject petition.

Commissioner Ferry stated that he was completely in favor of the proposed subdivision by Capital Investment Co. On the basis of 5 persons per unit, the 5,400 units would accommodate 27,000 persons, which would take care of only a fraction of the projected population increase by 1980.

Commissioner Wenkam moved that petition be approved as recommended by staff, which was seconded by Commissioner Ferry. The Commissioners were polled as follows:

Ayes: Commissioners Burns, Ferry, Inaba, Mark, Nishimura, Wenkam,
Chairman Thompson.

Nays: Commissioners Ota and Wung

The motion was carried.

Chairman Thompson called for a 5-minute recess.

The meeting was resumed at 3:45 p.m.

RECONSIDERATION OF THE HONOKAI DEVELOPERS' PETITION (A65-101)

Chairman Thompson announced that a reconsideration of the Honokai petition was in order based on the conflicting rationale presented on this and the Makaha petition. It was also pointed out that whatever the decision was during this reconsideration, it would be absolutely final.

To enable Chairman Thompson to make the move for reconsideration, Vice-Chairman Burns was requested to chair this portion of the meeting.

Commissioner Thompson moved to reconsider the Honokai petition, which was seconded by Commissioner Ferry. The motion was carried by the following votes:

Ayes: Commissioners Wung, Inaba, Ota, Nishimura, Ferry, Thompson,
Chairman Pro-tempore Burns

Nays: Commissioners Wenkam and Mark

The floor was opened for discussion.

Commissioner Wenkam commented that population increase should not be the only consideration for justification of boundary change. Emphasis should also be placed on proper planning, proper location, community services available in keeping with an orderly community.

In answer to Commissioner Thompson's query, Mr. Moriguchi advised that the H-I Highway ended at Barbers Point and cut off before the Honokai development. Completion date for the H-I Highway, according to the Bureau of Public Roads, was set for 1972, and 1974 for the whole defense highway system.

Commissioner Wenkam suggested that perhaps the petitioner could come in and apply for boundary change when the highway system was completed and as the need arose.

Commissioner Ferry argued that if this Commission were to operate as a functional body, it was necessary to look 10 years into the future. He added that the Department of Transportation has moved with acceleration on the road construction project to alleviate the inadequacy of the highway system in the leeward area.

Commissioner Ota submitted that equal emphasis should be placed on good planning and conservation of prime agricultural land. He stated that the Makaha petition involved prime agricultural lands with easy accessibility to water. The Honokai lands involved rocky, uneven terrain, without access to water, with absolutely no agricultural value. He stressed that one of the main purposes of the Commission was the conservation of prime agricultural lands. Yet, the Makaha petition was approved for boundary change while the Honokai development was denied.

Commissioner Ferry remarked that an argument in favor of granting the Honokai petition was the existence of facilities and that this would constitute a normal extension of an existing Urban District.

Referring to the existing facilities, Mr. Moriguchi pointed out that when the petitioners were mandated by the County to install the sewage treatment plant, they had not received approval for the subject parcel. Therefore, the plant could have been built on an increment basis, but instead the petitioners chose to "gamble" in anticipation of receiving approval for the whole development. By the very action of this Commission in pulling the urban line back, they recognized that urbanization of this parcel would constitute spot zoning. In addition, marginal lands did not necessarily have to be reclassified into an urban zone.

Commissioner Thompson wondered what drain it would place on the county and state if this development were approved. Mr. Moriguchi informed that bus services for the children, fire and police protection will need to be provided.

Commissioner Ferry agreed with staff that land that is not in productive agricultural use need not necessarily be put into urban. However, the reason the Puna area, where small lot sizes were zoned agricultural, fell into this category was that there was no physical development on those lots. He contended that had there been a multitude of homes existing on the lots, this Commission would have seen fit to zone this area as urban. He continued that the Honokai development presented an entirely different situation, in that homes were already existing in the first unit and families were living there.

Mr. Moriguchi argued that this was merely conjecture, that even if there had been homes in the Puna area, this was no assurance that the Commission would have zoned it in the Urban District. The criteria for urbanization was not to extend an already existing urban use but rather on the basis of whether this constitutes a good Urban District and is contiguous with facilities ordinarily related to a community. He reiterated that Harlan Bartholomew had concurred with staff's findings.

In reply to Commissioner Thompson's comment that when the Land Use Commission classified the subject area in the Agricultural District, they did not have knowledge of the population expansion, Mr. Moriguchi stated that this should not lead to urbanization anywhere, that instead it should follow a well-developed plan.

Commissioner Ferry moved that the Honokai Developer's petition be granted because ample proof had been submitted, seconded by Commissioner Nishimura. Commissioner Wenkam argued that he did not believe proof had been provided for need of subject parcel, that there were sufficient urban lands in the Waianae area.

The Commissioners were polled as follows:

Ayes: Commissioners Inaba, Ota, Nishimura, Ferry, Thompson, Chairman
Pro-tempore Burns.

Nays: Commissioners Wung, Wenkam, Mark.

The motion was carried.

PETITION OF BERNICE P. BISHOP ESTATE (KAPAKAHI RIDGE) A65-97, TO AMEND THE URBAN DISTRICT AT WAIALAE-IKI, OAHU, identifiable by Tax Map Key 3-5-19: 13 and 3-5-24: portion of parcel 1

Staff memorandum, presented by Mr. Moriguchi (see copy on file), recommended denial of the original petition in its entirety and advised the petitioners to come in with an entirely new petition submitted in accordance with the latest plans of the Trustees of the Bishop Estate.

Commissioner Inaba moved to deny the original petition in its entirety on the basis of staff's recommendation which was seconded by Commissioner Wenkam.

Mr. Takeyama, legal counsel, advised that a request for amendment had been made by the petitioner and it was in order to act on this matter before moving on staff's recommendation.

Chairman Thompson reminded the members that the Land Use Commission, in the past, had made it its practice not to extend a boundary for a petition; however, had exercised its prerogative to bring it down. The Makaha petition was the only exception, but it was pointed out that this was done at the time of the hearing.

Mr. Takeyama stated that the petitioner was within his legal rights to come in and request for an amendment to the petition, in this case involving 12 plus acres. The Commission could vote to either deny or approve the request for amendment, and act on the petition separately. In reply to Chairman Thompson's question, Mr. Takeyama advised that there was nothing in the rules and regulations to prohibit the Commission from granting the request for amendment.

Mr. Takeyama continued that approval of the amendment did not remove the necessity for another public hearing. If the request is approved the petitioners would have to come in with a new petition which would be duly advertised. This would put into motion the proceedings for a new hearing. However, if the request for amendment to the petition is denied, the Commission would be acting on the original petition as submitted by the petitioners. If it followed that the Commission voted for denial of the original petition, the petitioners would have to submit substantial grounds of change in condition before they can attempt to file another petition for the subject parcel.

Commissioner Inaba moved to deny petitioner's request for amendment to the original petition, seconded by Commissioner Nishimura. The motion was passed with the following votes;

Ayes: Commissioners Inaba, Mark, Nishimura, Wenkam, Wung.

Nays: Chairman Thompson, Commissioner Burns.

Excused: Commissioner Ota

Chairman Thompson then announced that the Commission was now in a position to act on the original petition as submitted.

Commissioner Nishimura moved that the petition be denied as recommended by staff, seconded by Commissioner Wenkam. The Commissioners were polled as follows:

Ayes: Commissioners Wenkam, Inaba, Wung, Nishimura, Mark, Chairman Thompson.

Nays: Commissioner Burns.

Excused: Commissioner Ota

LALAMILO HOUSE LOTS

Mr. Moriguchi reviewed that during the previous meeting on March 25, 1966 at Kona, staff had been instructed by the Commission to investigate whether there might be substantiating evidence to indicate Commission's intent when the permanent boundaries were established for the subject area. However, staff was not able to locate any concrete evidence in this respect. Therefore, it was the staff's recommendation that this Commission, on its motion, initiate a boundary change for the subject area, along with the Honokaa lands, sometime in the future.

Following a brief discussion, Commissioner Wung moved that the Commission initiate a boundary change for the Lalamilo House Lot area, which was seconded by Commissioner Nishimura, and the motion was passed unanimously.

NEXT MEETING DATE AND PLACE

Tentative meeting schedule was presented by staff. It was pointed out that this was to inform the Commissioners of tentative dates and to give them an opportunity to voice their preferences.

Staff-recommended date of May 13, 1966 for the next meeting was changed to May 6, 1966 to be held in Hilo. The action items were eliminated.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 97

Chairman Thompson referred to Senate Resolution No. 97, a certified copy of which had been distributed to each Commissioner. This involved a request for the State Land Use Commission and the Department of Planning and Economic Development to study the feasibility of the arrangements for the conveyance of lands in rural or agricultural districts as outlined and to report their findings and recommendations to the Legislature not later than 20 days preceding the convening of the 1967 session of the Legislature.

Chairman Thompson expressed concern over the fact that the already limited staff time would be taxed with this additional responsibility. However, it was determined that staff would find time to complete its findings before the next Legislature.

LETTER FROM MAUI COUNTY ATTORNEY GENERAL (KAANAPALI BATCHING PLANT)

Chairman Thompson referred to a letter received from Mr. Kase Higa, Maui County Attorney, regarding the application for a special permit by Pioneer Mill Company involving a concrete batching plant at Kaanapali, Maui. In effect, the letter suggested that no further action be taken in this matter, but that the County Attorney would be willing to pursue this matter further if the Commission felt strongly enough and if the legal counsel could find adequate legal grounds.

Commissioner Burns advised that, as an officer of Pioneer Mill Company, he would have to abstain from making any comments.

Chairman Thompson wondered how it was possible that Pioneer Mill Company had not consulted with its attorneys prior to negotiating with the Kahului Railroad Company.

Commissioner Burns thought that this might have merely been a letter of agreement between the two firms; whereas, had it been funneled through the legal office, they might have checked into the matter of proper zoning for such an installation.

Commissioner Wung moved to accept the letter from the Maui County Attorney and take no further action on this matter. Commissioner Wenkam seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously. Commissioner Burns abstained from voting.

ALLISON PETITION

A point for clarification was brought up by Mr. Moriguchi on the Allison petition. He wondered whether the Allison petition was acceptable as submitted despite the absence of signatures of a few of the landowners involved in the petition.

Mr. Takeyama, legal counsel, suggested that the Land Use Commission, on its own motion, could initiate petition for those people who did not sign the petition so that the whole area might be considered as one contiguous parcel. He further advised that this action would not imply that the Commission was in favor of the petition, but was merely to clear the way for a public hearing. If this is not done, Mr. Takeyama advised that the Commission could not consider those 3 or 4 parcels on which there was no request for boundary change, at the time of the hearing.

Mr. Moriguchi stated that the request from the petitioners was for reclassification of the entire area, in response to Chairman Thompson's question.

Mr. Takeyama further clarified his earlier suggestion with the statement that it was specifically provided in the law that the Land Use Commission could, on its own motion, initiate a boundary change. This provision was set up to enable the Land Use Commission to open up other lands.

Commissioner Wenkam felt that a broad discussion on the reasonableness, the moral implications, etc., should precede any motion by the Commission.

Chairman Thompson stated that the motion was merely to expedite and facilitate proceedings for the hearing, and that interested parties could voice their feelings at the time of the hearing.

Commissioner Inaba moved that the Land Use Commission initiate a boundary change for those people who did not sign the Allison petition, which was seconded by Commissioner Ota. The motion was carried with the following votes:

Ayes: Commissioners Inaba, Ota, Burns, Nishimura, Chairman Thompson.

Nays: Commissioners Wung, Wenkam, Mark

LITIGATION

Mr. Takeyama, legal counsel, advised that he was meeting with Judge Felix in Hilo tomorrow to discuss the case of Tamura vs. Land Use Commission. He was also appearing in court next week on the motion to dismiss appeal of the Nuuanu Valley Community Association.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Minutes of the meetings of October 1, 1965 and October 2, 1965 were adopted as circulated.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.