approved
October 29, 1966

STATE OF HAWAII
LAND USE COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting

State Highways Division
Hilo, Hawaii

9:50 a.m. - August 5, 1966

Commissioners Present:	Myron B. Thompson, Chairman C. E. S. Burns Goro Inaba Shelley Mark Robert G. Wenkam Leslie Wung Charles Ota Shiro Nishimura
Commissioners Absent:	Jim P. Ferry
Staff Present:	George S. Moriguchi, Executive Officer Roy Takeyama, Legal Counsel Ah Sung Leong, Draftsman Dora Horikawa, Stenographer

Chairman Thompson opened the meeting with a short prayer, followed by an outline of the procedures to be followed, introduction of Commissioners and staff members, and swearing in of persons testifying during the hearings.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

PETITION OF LILIUOKALANI TRUST (A66-122) TO AMEND THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY FROM AN AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT TO AN URBAN DISTRICT FOR APPROXIMATELY 14½ ACRES, AND FROM AN URBAN DISTRICT TO AN AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT FOR APPROXIMATELY 1¼ ACRES OF LAND AT KAILUA, KONA, HAWAII, identifiable by TMK 7-4-08: Portion 2

Staff report (see copy on file) presented by Mr. George Moriguchi recommended favorable action of the petition since utility services and access facilities were available in the area, and topographic conditions were suited for urban development.

Chairman Thompson requested that he be excused from participating in this hearing since his employment by the petitioner constituted a conflict of interest.

Mr. Robert Belt of Belt, Collins & Associates, Ltd. requested that the boundary be modified to permit a more orderly development than would be possible

under the original boundary which was established arbitrarily on the basis of earlier plans. He added that the treatment plant was presently in operation.

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

PETITION OF W. H. SHIPMAN, LTD. AND KEAAU LAND CO., LTD. (A66-126) TO AMEND THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY FROM AN AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT TO AN URBAN DISTRICT FOR APPROXIMATELY 112 ACRES AT KEEAU, HAWAII

Staff recommendation (see copy on file) was for approval of 47.5 acres of the petitioners' lands as indicated by the limits of the orange line on the map, on the basis of the need for additional houselots to provide for families being phased out of plantation camps and the need of additional urban lands in the Keaau area.

Mr. Moriguchi pointed out the 80% planted in cane and the remaining vacant lands on the map, which left an agricultural strip right in the center of subject lands. He advised that reclassification of this strip would be considered as the next item on the agenda.

Recognizing the need for expansion of the Keeau area, the General Plan proposal is for development of the urban by phasing out the old homes and providing residential homes.

Commissioner Ota felt that prime agricultural lands would be exploited and that there were other areas suitable for the proposed urban development.

Mr. Moriguchi supported the General Plan since it proposed a logical expansion of an already existing urban complex with all of the necessary facilities such as schools, fire station, police station, plus the fact that the new civic center is located in this area.

Mr. L. N. Nevels, Jr. representing the petitioners advised that it was their desire to provide the requisite house lots so that people could move out of their dilapidated homes in the existing Keeau Village. The petitioners would also be willing to accede to staff's recommendation for reclassification of 47½ acres to an Urban District, with the hope that upon evidence of proof of demand for additional urban lands within the next 5 years, they would receive favorable consideration from the Commission.

Mr. Nevels submitted that there were almost no urban lands available for residential use in the Keaau area at the present time.

Commissioner Ota commented that it was almost incumbent on the part of large landowners to prepare a master plan involving their lands, and that without such a plan the Commission would find it difficult to arrive at a sound decision.

Mr. Suefuji, Hawaii County Planning Director, advised that such a master plan had been drawn up as represented by Ordinance 317 of the County of Hawaii, which was a reflection of coordinated efforts of the County and the private landowners. He also added that the Hawaii Planning Commission was in accord with the staff's recommendation. The hearing was closed thereafter.

PETITION OF THE LAND USE COMMISSION (A66-133) TO AMEND THE DISTRICT BOUNDARY FOR SEVERAL AREAS IN THE KEAAU DISTRICT

Staff report (see copy on file) submitted that the Land Use Commission, upon its own motion, was petitioning for boundary changes in the Keaau District, which would change 60.5 acres from Urban to Agricultural, and 43.5 acres from Agricultural to Urban. Mr. Moriguchi reported that the County of Hawaii was generally in concurrence with staff recommendation, although they felt that the 9½ mile camp should be retained in the Urban District.

Commissioner Ota reiterated his earlier comments with reference to the responsibility of the landowners to provide for an orderly phasing out program in a master plan to preclude the untimely eviction of the present tenants.

In response to Commissioner Nishimura's question, Mr. Moriguchi advised that presently there were 92 acres in the urban complex within Keaau town, which were densely developed, and that it would be unfeasible to phase out the whole structure within the urban complex until provisions were made in some other area for expansion. He felt that the 45 acres being considered under the Shipman petition could be considered a step in this direction.

It was also brought out that W. H. Shipman and Keaau Land Co. had engaged the services of Belt, Collins & Associates, Ltd. to prepare a master plan for the Keaau area, and that the County of Hawaii was also following a plan prepared by this same firm for the whole South Hilo area.

Mr. Suefuji reported that the Hawaii Planning Commission agreed with the staff's proposal except for the recommended change of Area #9 known as the 9½ mile camp. For purposes of facilitating rental transactions, and the fact that the owners would be compelled to apply for a special permit of the subdivision if the subject area were reclassified from Urban to Agriculture, the Hawaii Planning Commission complied with their request to retain the area in an Urban District for the next 10 years. Also, under the subdivision ordinance, roads would have to be brought up to County standards which would be impractical for a 10-year period.

Mr. Moriguchi advised that the primary concern here was continuation of the existing use, i.e. to permit present tenants occupancy until such time as they are able to relocate themselves, and that the present uses could be permitted even under a change in land designation. On the matter of the rental transactions, he wondered if some arrangement could not be worked out between the plantation and the tenants. Leaving Area #9 in urban would leave a pocket of urban lands in an agricultural area, Mr. Moriguchi concluded.

Mr. Nevels commented that Shipman and Keaau Land Co. were working on a community lease to enable the present occupants tenancy for a period of not more than 10 years, the expected life of the buildings. He said that the phasing out program involved making available good suitable lands within close proximity to those who may desire to situate themselves in the Keaau area. He agreed that the two firms concurred with the staff's recommendation except for Area #9 in the report.

It was pointed out by the Executive Officer that all of the individual landowners within the subject area of this petition, including Shipman and Keaau Land Co., were duly notified by mail of the hearing being held to reclassify the lands by this Commission, and in fact there were two such landowners present at this hearing.

The hearing was closed thereafter.

ACTION

PETITION OF MAUNA KEA SUGAR CO., INC. (A66-109) TO RECLASSIFY 36 ACRES PRESENTLY IN AN AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT TO AN URBAN DISTRICT IN HILO, HAWAII

Staff memorandum recommended denial of the reclassification involving the 36-acre since denuding these lands of the dense growth of trees can and will probably contribute to flood problems in the lower residential areas.

Mr. Kenneth Griffin, real estate broker, submitted that the developers were proposing a modified cluster type subdivision, after consulting with the Planning Director, which would allow for retention of some of the trees in the wooded areas. This would also permit 6 to 9 acres of the 36 acres to remain in its natural state. Mr. Griffin felt that these lands constituted prime residential areas and would be an asset to the City of Hilo.

Mr. Suefuji stated that flooding of Kaumana Terrace, Bay View and subdivisions surrounding subject lands resulted from waters coming from the mauka area 5½ miles away. Mr. Griffin added that there did not seem to be any appreciable flooding in the area under discussion.

The drainage problem would be taken care of by curbs and gutters in conformance with the County Engineer's requirements, although no detailed drainage system has as yet been drawn up. Mr. Griffin thought that the gutters would empty out into some pipe at the edge of the subdivision.

Commissioner Wenkam felt that the broad panoramic view of the Hilo Bay area would be enhanced by looking through the trees and felt that they should be kept tall and not topped off to 20 or 25' as suggested by Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Griffin also stated that fee simple lands were in demand in the area.

Mr. Moriguchi commented that although the runoff from the wooded area alone did not directly contribute to the flooding of the lower area during the recent storm, denuding the area would intensify the problem because of the topography.

Mr. Suefuji informed that in recommending approval of change from agriculture to urban, the County Planning Commission did not necessarily review the layout plan since the developers would be mandated to appear before the Commission prior to seeking approval of their subdivision plans.

Commissioner Wenkam felt that the question of leaseland versus fee simple lands should not be the concern of the Land Use Commission--that decision should

be based solely on good planning and on the need for urban use of the area in the City of Hilo.

Commissioner Inaba moved that the Land Use Commission grant the applicant the 36-acre boundary change from agriculture to urban based on petitioner's statement and the recommendation of the County of Hawaii, and also because the need has been shown, seconded by Commissioner Burns.

The Commissioners were polled as follows:

Aye: Commissioners Burns, Inaba, Wung

Nay: Commissioners Mark, Nishimura, Ota, Wenkam, Chairman Thompson

The motion was not carried.

PETITION OF ESTATE OF SOPHIE JUDD COOKE (DEC'D) (A66-110) TO RECLASSIFY APPROXIMATELY 4.9 ACRES FROM AN AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT TO AN URBAN DISTRICT AT MOLOKAI

Staff memorandum (see copy on file) presented two alternatives to the Commission involving the above-mentioned petition: (1) Process the original petition, or (2) accept the petitioner's request to withdraw the original petition and process the new petition for reclassification from Agricultural to Rural.

Chairman Thompson commented that the second alternative would require another public hearing since the request had changed from Agricultural to Rural rather than Urban.

Commissioner Ota moved to accept the petitioner's request for withdrawal of the original petition and process the new petition by scheduling another public hearing. It was seconded by Commissioner Burns.

In reply to Commissioner Nishimura's query, Mr. Moriguchi replied that the original request would contribute to the concept of scattered urban development.

The Commissioners were polled as follows:

Aye: Commissioners Burns, Inaba, Mark, Ota, Wenkam, Chairman Thompson

Nay: Commissioners Nishimura, Wung

The motion was carried.

PETITION OF FRANK & BESSIE MONIZ (A66-112) TO RECLASSIFY APPROXIMATELY 6.9 ACRES OF LAND AT KAONOULU, KULA, MAUI, FROM AN AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT TO A RURAL DISTRICT.

Staff memorandum (see copy on file) recommended denial of the petition because of the decreasing population trend in the Waiakoa area and the lack

of supporting data for need of additional rural lands.

In support of the need for additional rural lands in the Kula District, Commissioner Ota submitted that cost of land was an important consideration, and the minimum cost of land per acre in this area would run close to $3,000. The construction of the new highway definitely contributed toward change in land use of subject parcel by separating it from the Kaonoulu Ranch. It was also pointed out by Commissioner Ota that contrary to staff's report, population was on the upward swing in the Kula area. The idea of vast amounts of rural lands and small percentage of development were not indications of population growth or adequate lands in the Kula area. As far as the subject parcel was concerned, Commissioner Ota commented that the terrain was uneven, bounded by two highways, adjacent to an Urban area with urban facilities available, appropriate for half-acre house sites. He continued that subdividing the parcel into 6 lots would not constitute an urban-like concentration, and that the Commissioners should take all of these factors into consideration.

Commissioner Ota agreed that an element of hardship did exist for the petitioner since he had purchased the land from the Kaonoulu Ranch with the intention of subdividing it for houselots, in reply to Chairman Thompson's question.

The mere fact that the petitioner was requesting reclassification of the land from Agricultural to Rural did not preclude the use of it for agricultural purposes; that supplemental income could be derived from agricultural pursuits on subject land, Commissioner Ota concluded.

Commissioner Wenkam agreed with staff that the fact petitioner claims the land is not feasible for ranching, truck crops or other related uses, should not place the land in rural or urban. However, at this particular highway junction, rural and urban uses already existed and it was highly probable that, upon subdivision of subject lands, they would be bought and built upon long before other vacant lots in the Kula area due to its proximity to the already existing residential areas.

Commissioner Nishimura expressed his concern for agricultural lands in Maui and felt that petitioner could come up with a subdivision of 2-acre minimum lot sizes without undue financial hardship.

Referring to Commissioner Wenkam's earlier comment, Mr. Moriguchi stated that even within the Urban District, lands were being used for pasture. Therefore, the Commission should be concerned with the need for urban lands and not so much with the fact that these lands are suitable and located near existing facilities.

It was moved by Commissioner Ota and seconded by Commissioner Wenkam that the petition be approved since the land is appropriate for rural development and on the basis of the petitioner's arguments in his petition. The Commissioners were polled as follows:

Aye: Commissioners Wenkam, Wung
Nay: Commissioners Burns, Inaba, Mark, Nishimura, Ota, Chairman Thompson

The motion was not carried.

SPECIAL PERMITS

APPLICATION OF SHIGE HIRANO (SP66-29) TO CONSTRUCT A SERVICE STATION, GENERAL MERCHANDISE STORE AND RESIDENCE ON AGRICULTURAL LANDS IN GLENWOOD, PUNA, HAWAII

Staff Report (see copy on file) recommended approval of the special permit application since no adverse factors were present.

Commissioner Burns moved to approve the special permit application on the basis of the staff's report, seconded by Commissioner Nishimura.

Chairman Thompson wondered whether the unsuitability of the land for agricultural or farming uses brought out in the staff report should not be deleted since this might set a precedent. Instead it was suggested that the reasonableness of the use requested might be substituted.

Mr. Moriguchi informed that this was just a quotation taken from documented information and that it should remain part of the report.

The Commissioners voted for unanimous approval of the petition.

The hearing was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

****

The hearing was resumed at 2:45 p.m.

ACTION

PETITION OF MAUI COUNTY (IAO) (A66-113) TO RECLASSIFY 15,300 SQUARE FEET OF LANDS FROM THE CONSERVATION DISTRICT TO THE RURAL DISTRICT IN IAO VALLEY, MAUI

Staff maintained its original recommendation for denial of the petition (see copy of report) due to lack of substantiation for the need of additional rural lands and the existence of several inconsistencies involving the proposed use of the subject lands.

During the discussion that ensued, the following points were brought out:

1. It was Mr. Duarte's desire to merely append the subject parcel to his property.

2. It was possible to effect land exchange without reclassification.

3. Mr. Duarte was not willing to exchange lands unless County's conservation land could be reclassified to rural.

4. The benefit to the people of Maui by this proposed land exchange was not obvious.

5. The County of Maui should be encouraged to expand Kepaniwai Park by purchasing this land outright from Mr. Duarte rather than going through a land exchange and using this parcel for the caretaker's home.

6. The Commission's decision should be based on the merits of the reclassification of subject land.

Commissioner Burns moved to deny the petition based on the staff recommendation, seconded by Commissioner Wung. The motion was passed with Commissioner Nishimura casting the only dissenting vote.

PETITION OF HAWAII COUNTY (A66-115) LALAMILO) TO RECLASSIFY 12.1 ACRES OF AGRICULTURAL LANDS INTO URBAN LANDS AT LALAMILO, SOUTH KOHALA, HAWAII

It was moved by Commissioner Wenkam and seconded by Commissioner Wung to accept the staff recommendation (see copy on file) for approval of the petition. The motion was carried unanimously.

PETITION OF HAWAII COUNTY (A66-117) (HILO) TO RECLASSIFY 3.25 ACRES OF LAND FROM AGRICULTURAL TO URBAN AT HILO, HAWAII

Commissioner Burns moved to approve the petition on the basis of staff's recommendation as presented by the staff report (see copy on file), which was seconded by Commissioner Wung and carried unanimously.

PETITION OF EDWIN & ELSIE IGE (A66-120) TO RECLASSIFY APPROXIMATELY 58 ACRES OF AGRICULTURAL LANDS TO A RURAL CLASSIFICATION AT WAIAKOA, MAUI

Staff report (see copy on file) recommended denial of the petition due to lack of evidence of demand for rural lots and the population decline in the Waiakoa area.

Commissioner Ota emphasized the lack of half-acre residential lots in the Kula area and the demand for such lands by people who desire a more spacious lot size than is usually available under an urban classification.

Commissioner Burns moved that the petition be denied on the basis of the staff report, seconded by Commissioner Wenkam. The motion was carried with Commissioner Wung casting the only negative vote.

****

RURAL DISTRICT STANDARDS

The floor was opened for a discussion of the Rural District standards. Chairman Thompson pointed to the fact that the present provisions under the Rural Districting allowed for only a grid-type subdivision of one house per ½ acre. The question was raised as to whether an amendment of the law was in order to afford a more attractive, creative type of rural development, such as a cluster-type subdivision.

Mr. Moriguchi explained that in establishing the Rural District, the law indicated that it shall include small farms mixed with very low density residential lots. However, the actual uses within the Rural District have deviated

considerably from the original intent of the law, as evidenced by the Pukalani Subdivision which is at present primarily in intensive residential use.

Mr. Moriguchi continued that our law was specific in that it specified that the lot sizes in the Rural District shall be ½ acre and not on the overall density of the subdivision.

Commissioner Ota expressed the idea that the foremost consideration should be whether the area was prime agricultural lands within the Rural District. If so, that area considered as prime agricultural lands could possibly be spot-zoned as an Agricultural District and the remainder permitted for intensive residential purposes within a Rural District.

Commissioner Wenkam expressed the view that he was opposed to any attempt to rewrite the Rural District Regulations increasing the density, since he felt that the rural areas were specifically designated for low density residential uses mixed with farm activities. Any change in the regulations would merely place into the rural areas, activities which are primarily urban. He added that the Rural District was established to afford the neighbor islands greater control and flexibility over their lands. Commissioner Wenkam suggested that perhaps it would behoove the Land Use Commission to abolish the Rural District and establish it as a non-conforming use within the Agricultural District, thereby confining urban uses to the Urban District.

Commissioner Inaba commented that the Mauna Loa Development's Volcano subdivision should have been more properly reclassified to Rural rather than Urban. However, due to the restrictions imposed by the rural classification, the developers could not pursue their cluster-type plan under this designation.

Commissioner Burns felt that it was difficult to associate each house with half-acre lots and still come up with an attractive cluster-type plan with open spaces between.

Mr. Roy Takeyama, legal counsel, advised that if the Commission were seeking control within a Rural District, petitioners could be encouraged to take the special permit approach. The only test to be applied here would be the unusual and reasonable use of the lands. The developers could proceed with their proposed plans and keep to the permitted density. He suggested that the Commission make a study of the special permit regulations to see how similar requests could be channeled through this method. This would also require amendment of Section 2.29 (b) of the Regulations concerning guidelines to aid petitioners whenever they are seeking an urban or rural use of lands in either a Rural, or Agricultural, or Conservation District, in determining which avenue they should follow.

In reply to Commissioner Mark's question, Mr. Takeyama advised that conditions could be imposed on special permits as opposed to boundary changes, since the petitioner would be bound by the plans that he submits at the time of the application.

Mr. Takeyama continued that he could not see how a residential subdivision could be considered as an unusual use under a special permit, but that a resort complex could conceivably fall within this description.

Chairman Thompson felt that a legal opinion was in order as to whether the Land Use Commission could impose conditions on special permits. However, he commented that this still did not solve the problem experienced by this Commission in the past whereby developers deviated from the intent of the law for uses within the Rural District. The basic issue here was one of assisting the developers to keep to the proposed plans and still keep within the intent of the law.

Along the lines proposed by Commissioner Wenkam, Mr. Moriguchi felt that by eliminating the Rural Districts and allowing for residential uses in Agricultural Districts under special permits, the Land Use Commission would have control over the actual final development of the land. The Rural District stipulation of "small farms mixed with residential uses" could also be satisfied in this way.

Mr. Takeyama was doubtful that this could be accomplished without changing the test to be applied under the special permit procedure.

Since considerable concern was expressed over the use of rural lands following reclassification, Mr. Takeyama advised that if the special permit procedure had been followed instead by the petitioner, control over the development of the lands could have remained with the Commission since its approval of the permit would have mandated the petitioner to adhere to the development plans as submitted during the hearing.

Commissioner Ota commented that rural districting had its place on the neighbor islands since it allowed for limited animal farming which would not be permitted in an Urban District. He was also of the opinion that eliminating the Rural District and employing the special permit procedure for marginal lands within an Agricultural District would not always be feasible.

Mr. Takeyama agreed that there was a definite need for rural districting and that perhaps the Commission should be more restrictive and selective in approving requests for rural classification.

Chairman Thompson took exception to this and submitted that the Commission had been very selective in granting rural districting and fully aware of the problem of implementing the intent of the law.

Commissioner Mark felt that Mr. Takeyama's suggestion of employing the special permit method with explicit instructions could possibly handle the situation.

As a result of the foregoing discussion,the following are some of the points that were brought out:

1. To maintain the Rural District as presently stipulated in the rules, but to amend and strengthen the special permit procedure to afford stricter controls over rural lands.

2. Request staff and legal counsel to report on a proposal to implement the above intent of the Commission, a sketchy one in September and a detailed report in October.

3. Look into the matter of assisting developers to follow original plans submitted at the time of public hearing, which was the basis for the Commission's reclassification approval.

4. The County could not impose conditions under the County Zoning Ordinances; that conditions could only be imposed under a zoning variance.

In summary, Chairman Thompson outlined the problems confronting the Land Use Commission:

1. Is there any way of holding the petitioner to the development plans and facts presented at the time decision was made?

2. If conditions or circumstances change necessitating alterations in the original plans, how can the regulations be implemented to enable Commission to negate the boundary change and require the petitioner to come in with amended plans for a new decision.

3. The Commission had the responsibility of seeing that State and County funds were expended judiciously.

With reference to the County's jurisdiction over petitioner's lands, Commissioner Mark suggested that perhaps the County Planning Commission might give tentative approval to a plan to be presented to the Land Use Commission, and grant final approval after the boundary change had been effected.

Mr. Moriguchi advised that the County Planning Commission develops a detailed land use map and the developer's plans would have to adhere to this.

Chairman Thompson requested legal counsel to research the possibility of having the County Planning Commission set conditions on the petitioner's plans before they apply to the Land Use Commission, by strengthening the County Ordinances.

CONSERVATION DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

Commissioner Wenkam opened the discussion by expressing his fears and concerns over the administration of the Conservation District. Our regulations provide for procedures to amend district boundaries and within this section it provides for guidelines which the Commission established, namely: "Whenever a petition covers substantial acreage of land and petitioner seeks a use other than that for which it is districted, he should seek a boundary change."

Commissioner Wenkam pointed to three occasions recently where he felt the intent of the regulations had been violated: 1) Waialae-Iki special permit for use of 26 acres of conservation lands for subdivision purposes; 2) Lihue Plantation special permit to grow sugar cane on 372 acres of conservation land; 3) Church College of Hawaii special permit for 100 acres to establish a church college on conservation lands.

Commissioner Wenkam continued that when a major change of land use is proposed involving substantial acreage, the Land Use Law clearly states that the

petitioner should come in for a boundary change. He felt that the intent and essence of the Land Use Law were being injured, and that it was not being administered properly when such changes were allowed to occur under a special permit procedure with the Department of Land & Natural Resources. He did, however, advise that he felt that the uses in all three instances were reasonable and appropriate--he was only arguing from the standpoint that the proper procedure should have been through a boundary change following a public hearing.

Commissioner Ota argued that in the case of Lihue Plantation, if a boundary change had been effected from conservation to agricultural, abuse of the lands could have resulted since there would be no control over agricultural uses in an Agricultural District. Commissioner Wenkam replied that damage could occur by extensive, excessive use of the lands under any circumstances.

Commissioner Wenkam pointed out that in the past the Commission had rejected special permit applications when the requests involved large areas of land and he felt that the Department of Land & Natural Resources should respect our regulations and also do likewise under similar circumstances, especially since the Land Board was not mandated to conduct a public hearing. He thought the Land Board should guide the petitioner to seek boundary change in such instances.

Commissioner Wenkam recommended transmitting a letter to the Department of Land & Natural Resources, with a copy of the Land Use Regulations, pointing out the boundary change procedure whenever substantial lands were involved. He was of the opinion that the Division of Forestry could administer these conservation lands to evaluate whether or not the water shed areas were being observed, in much the same way the Counties administered agricultural lands. He continued that change of land use of substantial areas constituted a change in zoning and that the Land Use Law specifically spells out that urban uses shall occur within the Urban District and agricultural uses shall occur in an Agricultural District. Therefore, granting non-conservation uses in a Conservation District under a special permit was circumventing the intent of the Land Use Law. He thought perhaps the Land Board was not aware of these stipulations in the Land Use Law.

Mr. Moriguchi quoted that portion of the law, Section 19-70, which vested in the Department of Land & Natural Resources the authority to govern Conservation Districts, and that the Department of Land had no choice but to process special permit applications upon receipt.

Chairman Thompson commented that interpretation of the law was the prime consideration here and expressions of opinion from the other Commissioners in this respect were in order.

Commissioner Ota stated that at the time the Conservation District boundaries were drawn, the Commission included the grey areas suitable for limited agricultural pursuits as were areas of asthetic value.

Commissioner Wenkam argued that provisions for residential uses within a Conservation District under Section 19-70 in the Revised Laws should not be construed to include subdivisions, in reply to Mr. Takeyama's reference to the law. At the time of the Conservation District hearings, it was clearly expressed

that permissible uses were cabin communities, casual beach houses, and not subdivisions or plantations or schools.

Mr. Takeyama disagreed entirely with Commissioner Wenkam's contention that the Land Use Regulations stipulated that applicant come to the Land Use Commission for boundary change for lands of substantial nature. If petitioner chose to go before the Land Board for use within a Conservation District and the Department of Land & Natural Resources approved the request, the Land Use Commission had no say in the matter.

Commissioner Wenkam replied that he was not contesting the authority of the Department of Land & Natural Resources. He was only challenging the decision of the Land Board to accept the petition for a special permit involving substantial lands.

Commissioner Burns commented that following the establishment of boundaries, Conservation Districts were turned over to the Department of Land & Natural Resources to administer, urban lands fell under the jurisdiction of the counties. The Commission may not always agree with their decisions, but to superimpose one agency over another did not necessarily insure better administration of the lands. In essence, we would be arguing that the Land Use Commission was more knowledgeable and astute in making decisions.

Mr. Moriguchi pointed out that our own regulations stipulated that "any and all uses permitted by the regulations of the Department of Land & Natural Resources shall be allowed in this district".

Commissioner Mark observed that it was clear that the Land Use Commission had discharged its responsibility within the Conservation District very well, and that if there were any complaints over the administration or uses of these lands, they should be properly taken up with the Department of Land and Natural Resources.

Chairman Thompson summarized that basically Commissioner Wenkam's and the other Commissioners' interpretation and intent of the law differed. Therefore, a clear definition of the intent of the law was necessary before any decision could be reached.

Commissioner Wenkam countered that the Land Use Commission was the zoning power of the State and if any interpretation were going to be made, it should be rendered by this Commission.

Commissioner Wung moved that a letter be sent to the Department of Land & Natural Resources to consider the referral of petitioner to the Land Use Commission whenever petition involved change of land use for substantial acreage in a Conservation District. Commissioner Burns seconded the motion.

Mr. Takeyama cautioned that a letter of this nature might suggest the implication that the Department of Land & Natural Resources was not carrying out its responsibilities and tend to destroy the good rapport established between the Land Use Commission and the Land Board. In other words, it would be akin to advising the Land Board of the proper execution of its responsibilities.

The Commissioners were polled as follows:

Aye: Commissioners Ota, Wenkam, Wung

Nay: Commissioners Burns, Inaba, Mark, Nishimura, Chairman Thompson

The motion was not carried.

Chairman Thompson wondered whether staff might confer with a member of the Department of Land & Natural Resources staff to define the term "substantial" so that both agencies might have some guidelines to follow in determining whether a petition should come in for a special permit or a boundary change. He suggested that this might be accomplished on an administrative level. However, the final decision to accept a special permit application within a Conservation District or refer the matter to this Commission should be left to the discretion of the Land Board, since they would be more knowledgeable and in a better position to determine uses within a Conservation District.

Mr. Takeyama expressed doubt that a determination could be reached over the definition of "substantial" since there was no planning basis, nor legal basis one could be guided by--it was a very arbitrary matter and would depend largely on the circumstances.

Commissioner Wung moved to recommend that the Land Use Commission staff confer with the Department of Land & Natural Resources staff to discuss what constitutes substantial use, which was seconded by Commissioner Burns. The motion was passed with only Commissioner Ota voting in the negative.

SALT LAKE GOLF COURSE

Chairman Thompson felt that the Salt Lake Golf Course involved a jurisdictional matter which had been lengthily discussed under the foregoing heading of "Conservation District Administration" and therefore should be considered as having been covered under that discussion.