

STATE OF HAWAII
LAND USE COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting

Kamehameha III School Cafetorium
Lahaina, Maui

June 26, 1970
7:00 p.m.

Approved 9-11-70

Commissioners Present: Wilbert Choi, Chairman
Goro Inaba, Vice Chairman
Alexander Napier
Eddie Tangen
Tanji Yamamura
Stanley Sakahashi

Commissioners Absent: Shelley Mark
Sunao Kido
Leslie Wung

Staff Present: Ramon Duran, Executive Officer
Ah Sung Leong, Planner
Walton Hong, Deputy Attorney General
Dora Horikawa, Stenographer

Persons planning to testify before the Commission were sworn in by Chairman Choi.

HEARING

PETITION BY MAUI LAND & PINEAPPLE CO., INC. (A70-250) TO RECLASSIFY 659 ACRES FROM AGRICULTURAL AND CONSERVATION TO URBAN AT HONOLUA, LAHAINA, MAUI

The Executive Officer read the staff report recommending that only that portion of the petitioner's request situated makai of the haul road between the existing Honokohau Urban District and the State owned parcel be reclassified from Agricultural to Urban, so that the petitioner may proceed with the first stage of his resort development program and include the proposed golf course.

Mr. Colin C. Cameron, President of Maui Land and Pineapple Company stated that in order to best serve the interests of the community and the company he represents, a high quality residential resort development on a large scale is necessary. Thus, rezoning the subject area would enable them to properly finance and control the development of a total of 1,000 acres on a continuing basis and avoid a piecemeal, inflexible approach. General design studies are now being conducted for the golf course and hotel. Rooms for the luxury hotel at Kapalua Bay may range from \$35,000 to \$45,000 per unit. Also under consideration are resort condominiums, off-site improvements, and primary housing developments. With regard to

housing, a 33 acre tract has been set aside for the first increment to accommodate the immediate needs of their employees. The Hawaii Housing Authority has been contacted for possible participation under the federal and new State Housing Programs.

Mr. Jim Bell of Belt Collins and Associates, consultants for the petitioner, continued that some 270 to 300 dwelling units will be constructed in the primary housing area and will include a mix of single detached units, duplexes, townhouse apartments, a park and other amenities. The possibility of moving the school from the site shown on the County General Plan to the proposed primary housing area was discussed with the County Planning Commission and general concurrence was indicated.

Mr. Cameron stated that on a potential mortgage of \$22,500, the monthly carrying costs, including taxes, would amount to over \$200 per month over a 30-year period at 8½% conventional mortgage. However, with the interest subsidy under Section 235 of the Housing Act, the same mortgage would be reduced to just over \$100 per month. Approximately 35% of the housing units will be needed to accommodate Maui Pine's employees and the remaining 65% will be available for housing other workers.

In regard to pineapple production, Mr. Cameron advised that the private growers were bound to about 15,000 tons of fruit a year before their contracts were continued by his firm. By utilizing lands which are fallow or which had reverted to pasture use, they hope to return to the previous level of 25,000 tons and possibly even attain 30,000 tons of fruit per year. He indicated that over 1,000 acres of the company's lands at Kula will be made available for pine production.

Mr. Bell observed that the total request was approved in concept by the Maui Planning Commission through resolution; that it conforms to the Maui General Plan; and that it conforms to the State's water development plan and its highway realignment plan. He pointed out the different aspects of the proposed development and noted that the shoreline areas are necessary for a desirable golf course development.

Commissioner Tangen questioned whether the petitioner's employees were consulted on the relocation of their homes and whether a determination was made as to their actual needs, to which Mr. Cameron replied in the negative. Commissioner Tangen wondered what it would cost the employees to move to the proposed housing area in view of the fact that a 6,000 square foot lot would cost \$9,000 at \$1.50 per square foot. Mr. Cameron replied that this is one of the reasons why a conventional subdivision is not being considered and State participation is being sought. He stated that a 3-bedroom unit at the Governor's Housing Fair was represented to sell between \$13,000 to \$15,000. However, he was not prepared to say what the final costs would be.

In answer to Commissioner Tangen's question regarding the future of the agricultural employees at Honolulu, Mr. Cameron stated that no regular employee would lose his job because of the acreage taken out of pineapple production.

In response to a question by the Executive Officer regarding water development, Mr. Bell stated that the developer does not propose to provide

all of the costs for a water system. However, Mr. Cameron testified that if the State does not implement its water development plan, then water will be developed by the petitioner. Questioned regarding the school and park sites, Mr. Cameron assumed that they will have to be acquired.

In reply to Commissioner Tangen's question regarding the agricultural value of the land for the housing area, Mr. Cameron said that for tax purposes, it ranged from \$1,500 to \$2,500 per acre. Commissioner Tangen then asked the price of raw land which the petitioner would be willing to make available to the workers. Mr. Cameron replied that the price has not been determined since an exchange of land with the State is contemplated.

With regard to parking provisions for the general public in some of the beach areas, the developer's planners felt that automobiles are not desirable inside a high quality resort development. However, there will be a parking area developed in conjunction with the proposed public park at Honolua Bay.

Mr. George Mahoe, resident and property owner in the area, voiced his concern over drainage problems which may be created by the proposed resort.

The Chairman pointed out that this point will have to be covered by the County Engineer and would be but one of many battles the petitioner would have to go through before actual construction can be initiated.

Since there was no further testimony, the hearing on this matter was closed.

ACTION

SPECIAL PERMIT REQUEST BY HAWAIIAN TELEPHONE CO. (SP70-81) TO CONSTRUCT A COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT BUILDING TO SERVE THE KONA AREA AT KEAHUOLU, NORTH KONA, HAWAII

Mr. Leong briefly described the area under consideration and presented the staff's analysis and its recommendation for approval of the special permit, subject to the conditions established by the County.

Commissioner Inaba moved that the special permit be approved as recommended by the staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Yamamura and was unanimously carried.

MISCELLANEOUS

SENATE BILL 1139-70, SHORELINE SETBACK

Mr. Duran advised the Commission that Senate Bill 1139-70 was signed by the Governor as Act 136 on June 22, 1970. He stated that the staff prepared a report which was circulated to the Commission earlier, explaining the legislative intent of that part of the act that provides for the establishment of shoreline setbacks throughout the State. He stated that the bill provides that the Land Use Commission shall establish a shoreline setback of between 20 and 40 feet. The report also contained a summary of each part of the law.

Chairman Choi observed that no money was allocated to pay for the land in the setback area and he reasoned that the bill condemns property without reimbursement. Mr. Duran explained that the shoreline setback is similar to any yard setback requirement in any zoning ordinance and that there are variance procedures and non-conforming provisions in this act that protect the property owners' rights upon appeal to the county. However, Chairman Choi offered that it seemed unlikely that a landowner would get a variance from the county after a State agency establishes the setback line.

Mr. Duran encouraged the Commission to initiate public hearings for the establishment of a 40-foot setback, consistent with the recommendation of the County Planning Directors. This would also urge the counties to expedite the establishment of their rules and regulations to administer the setback area.

Chairman Choi and Commissioner Tangen requested that Mr. Walton Hong, deputy attorney general, determine the intention of the Legislature and what is expected of the Land Use Commission and report back at the next Land Use Commission meeting.

COMMISSION LETTER TO EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Chairman Choi questioned the Executive Officer regarding receipt of a letter from the Commission that resulted from an executive meeting. The staff was not present nor aware of the meeting. Mr. Choi explained that all Commissioners were present except Commissioners Mark and Kido. The letter dated June 18, 1970 dealt with 10 items the Commissioners wanted implemented by the Executive Officer regarding his conduct and the administration of the staff office. Mr. Duran commented that it appeared that many of the items involved the administrator of the Department of Planning and Economic Development which is Dr. Mark, and that he discussed this matter with him and Dr. Mark suggested that this letter be discussed at the next meeting on July 10 at which time he will be present.

Nothing significant was discussed and it was agreed to reconsider the letter at the next meeting.