

LAND USE COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING

Board Chambers

Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii

10:00 A.M. - September 19, 1962

Commissioners

Present:

Edward C. Bryan  
Stanley C. Friel  
Wayne D. Gregg  
Yuichi Ige  
Franklin Y. K. Sunn  
Roger T. Williams

Absent:

Edward Kanemoto

Ex-Officio Members

Present:

Frank Lombardi

Absent:

E. H. Cook

Staff

Present:

R. J. Darnell, Executive Officer (XO)  
W. M. Mullahey, Field Officer (FO)

The public hearing was called to order by Chairman Bryan, followed by a short opening prayer.

Notices of the public hearing published in the newspapers were read and made part of the record.

---

PETITION OF MAMORU AND AIKO TAKITANI (A(T) 62-13), FOR CHANGE OF TEMPORARY DISTRICT BOUNDARY TO RECLASSIFY CERTAIN PROPERTY NEAR ULUMALU, MAKAWAO DISTRICT, MAUI, FROM AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT TO AN URBAN DISTRICT CLASSIFICATION: Described as TMK 2-8-01: 7 & 24.

The Chairman asked if the applicant or someone representing the applicant were present.

Mr. Maurice Takasaki introduced himself, stating that he is the agent for the owners. Mr. Takasaki was sworn in by the Chairman.

Chairman Bryan called upon the XO to outline the subject in question. The XO stated that Mr. Mullahey would present the matter.

Mr. Mullahey gave a brief description of the property and pointed out the location of the area involved on the map.

The Chairman then asked Mr. Takasaki, agent for the petitioners, to elaborate on his clients' request.

Mr. Takasaki stated that the original intention was to subdivide into 884, 6000 sq. ft. residential lots. The original plan was then revised, increasing the lot size to 10,000 sq. ft. to provide better marketability. Mr. Takasaki stated that the revision was presented to the Maui County Planning and Traffic Commission, who then revised their original recommendation for disapproval, to recommend approval of the subdivision on the basis that water is available in the area.

Mr. Takasaki stated that there have been no detailed plans drawn for the proposed subdivision. He then outlined the history of the petitioners' interest in the land, stating that the owners had invested some \$100,000 in clearing, fertilizing and planting macadamia nut trees; and now felt that further investment in the agricultural enterprise was not up to expectations. The owners felt that the only way to recoup their losses was to offer the land for residences, these lots being primarily oriented towards retirees. Mr. Takasaki recited the attributes of the area, such as the rainfall, location in relation to build-up centers on Maui, and the lack of dust in the area. He stated that he felt that there is no comparable area for this purpose on the Island of Maui, and that his development, if approved, would provide the start for the rejuvenation of the Ulumalu area, which he characterized as a once-thriving community.

In answer to questions from the Commission Mr. Takasaki stated that the land was originally purchased for agricultural purposes, and that some 9,000 macadamia nut trees had been planted, and subsequently had not yielded in an economical fashion. He was asked if the University of Hawaii Agricultural Extension Service had been consulted prior to the planting of the trees; and if so, what was their recommended crop based on the soil analysis. Mr. Takasaki replied that the Agricultural Extension Service had not been contacted, but a subsequent study by them revealed that the soil was not suitable for this type of crop. He stated that the trees had been planted some four years ago, and that water was available nearby. The land was originally cleared for pineapple, but that he did not know if there were any existing pineapple fields in the area. The only crop tried on the land by the owners was macadamia nuts.

The Chairman then asked the XO to read any pertinent communications.

The XO read the following communications:

1. Letter from the Land Study Bureau regarding the petition, dated September 11, 1962 and read as follows:

"Soils are dominantly of the Haiku family, eroded phase. Crop yields are consistently low and fruit qualities of pineapples grown on these soils are very poor. The Pauwela soils found to a lesser degree are also low in productivity.

"Generally speaking for these requests, all of the lands involved are not desirable lands for agricultural uses. Soils are either low in productivity or difficult to farm."

2. Letter from the Maui County Planning and Traffic Commission, dated July 11, 1962, recommending denial of the petition for two reasons.
  - a. Questionable supply of water
  - b. Remoteness of the area
3. Letter from the Maui County Board of Supervisors, adopting the report of their Public Works Committee, recommending that the Board of Supervisors "do not concur" with the Planning Commission's recommendation for denial of the petition.
4. Second Letter from the Maui County Planning and Traffic Commission, reversing their original recommendation of July 11, 1962, and recommending approval of the petition, stating that the water supply for the subdivision would be a problem between the subdivider and the Board of Water Supply.

At this point a discussion was started centering around the intent of the words "do not concur" that appeared in the Public Works Committee's report to the Board. The Chairman stated that he thought that the words used indicated that they could not approve or disapprove the subdivision, but at the same time did not recommend that the Land Use Commission approve the petition.

Mr. Harry Kobayashi, Chairman of the Maui County Public Works Committee, requested to be heard on the subject. Mr. Kobayashi was sworn in and resolved the argument over the word usage in the report. He stated that the words "do not concur with the Planning Commission's report", mean that the Board, through its Public Works Committee, does recommend approval of the subdivision. Mr. Kobayashi stated that this was discussed thoroughly in the Committee and on the Board floor, and he would like to make the clarification part of the record of the hearing.

The Chairman asked Mr. Kobayashi if it would work a hardship on his Committee to indicate the intent, as clarified, in writing to the Land Use Commission. Mr. Kobayashi replied in the affirmative, saying that the Board's intent is clear that they recommended approval and then listed a number of reasons why the petition should be approved.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Kobayashi for his clarification and then asked for the staff's report.

The Field Officer was sworn in and read the staff report which recommended denial of the petition for the following reasons:

1. Development is already taking place in Kula around the built-up centers of Pukalani and Makawao, with the major urban facility concentration in the Wailuku-Kahului area, along with resort activity planned or existing in West Maui, Kihei, Maalaea, and Hana.
2. Creation of an isolated urban area in Ulumalu would place a tremendous burden of service on the taxpayers.
3. Unsuitability of land for agriculture was not intended to be the prime criterion for the establishment of urban areas.

4. Section 1 of Act 187 was explicit in considering the instant case where it cited as one of the evidences of the need for public concern and action was scattered subdivisions with expensive, yet reduced public services.

The Chairman then asked if the Commission had any questions of the FO.

In answer to several questions posed by the Commission the FO stated that, after checking with the Maui Master Plan prepared by Community Planning Associates in 1959, there appears to be no study that places the number of vacant lots existing on Maui. The petitioned area is 2 miles, more or less, from an improved road.

The Chairman referred to the last paragraph of the staff report and said that the wording seems to infer that when the boundaries are drawn in July of 1963 that the staff would recommend inclusion of the petition. The FO stated that such was not the intention of the staff; however, any petition or protest will be considered by the Commission at the time of the setting of the final boundaries.

The FO stated that the nearest existing school was at Pauwela, some four miles distance, and that this was an elementary school.

The XO then asked Mr. Kobayashi of the status of the school at Kaupakalooa; and received the reply that that school had been closed some time ago and that the elementary school at Haiku (Pauwela) was new with all the modern facilities. Mr. Kobayashi further stated that the population of Haiku-Pauwela was slowly diminishing due to the Libby McNeil and Libby closing, and in order that the school be fully utilized, new population must come in to bolster the area.

Chairman Bryan entertained questions from the audience.

Mr. Kobayashi stated that the presently unimproved road along the west boundary of the petition, referred in the staff report as a 'jeep trail' would be improved by the subdivider to provide primary access to the development; also regarding the proximity of this land to urban centers, such as Haiku, Wailuku, etc., as to lands to the east, towards Hana are all owned by the plantations, leaving the petitioners property virtually the last large chunk of land left for development in this area.

Mr. Ohata asked to be heard, stating that he would like to clarify on one point in the staff report, where it stated that the county had this area zoned for agriculture. Mr. Ohata said that this was not the case. Maui has nine maps for zoning within and adjacent to seven urban or urbanizing areas on Maui; and any area outside of the areas mapped was under "interim zoning" which permitted residential as well as agricultural uses. This compares to Rural Protective on Oahu.

Commissioner Lombardi asked Mr. Takasaki if his proposed subdivision were to have the improvements in place when it was sold; he stated that his concern was with the so-called "paper subdivisions" of the Big Island, and did not want the same thing to happen here. Mr. Takasaki replied that, before final subdivision approval is granted by Maui County, all off-site improvements must be in place.

Commissioner Friel asked Mr. Takasaki if he or the owner had made a survey of the market potential for the proposed subdivision. Mr. Takasaki replied in the negative, but said that he had quite a few people interested on Maui and should have

no trouble in selling the lots. He stated, "The only thing that we are concerned about is the selling price; the idea is accepted by local people and on the mainland."

There being no further questions, the chairman ordered that all documents, communications, etc., offered as evidence in this hearing be made part of the record; and ordered the hearing closed.