

WAIPIO

Donald Wolbrink: The City has included in their master plan a major urban area of about 2,000 acres in this locale. In our discussion with the Planning Director of the City Planning Department, he had said that he would go along with the idea of urban above the future defense highway if this be approved. We are recommending to you that approximately 550 acres of plateau land mauka from the future defense highway plus the gulch area along Waikele Gulch be put in urban classification providing an area for urban growth in this central plateau. This will mean nearly 900 acres would be provided for urban growth in the central plateau. A problem which may come up in connection with provisions for urban expansion in this area (this is a problem which the commission has looked at in other circumstances such as Hawaii Kai, the town site that is under development out here above Barber's Point), is the problem of starting a new area and providing adequate services for it on a capacity and size that is feasible and can be warranted. In this particular case there has been no initiation of development of utilities and services. Everything that has been done has been on paper but there has been no program commitment of construction or initiation of construction of any such facilities. When we examined the facts in this particular case concerning the future urban growth, there were matters where a kind of commitment we are talking about would be involved, matters of involvement. There is the problem of access, the problem of water supply and the problem of sewage disposal. The facts concerning any discussion of course are not up to the commission to approve - this involvement must be the point that must be proven by others. However, in examining this case the provisions for sewers, or something that is on an incremental basis, treatment plants built as a unit type and expanded. Water supply in this central plateau probably would be developed in incremental basis, both in terms of source capacities, and in terms of storage to meet the incremental growth development. We are inclined to think that in fact the provisions of those services incrementally as the areas grow are not as big a problem as might be thought when first mentioned of it. What I'm really seeking is the possible idea which was discussed with Fred Lee of making this entire plateau urban at the present time versus the idea of making a portion of it urbanize. We believe that logical and economical development probably should take place on an incremental basis without imposing a burden or hardship.

Now to speak on the more particular point of the allocation of lands for urban uses on this island in reference to needs and at the same time in reference to the use of prime agricultural land for urban purposes. This major conflict is one, which I refer to, occurs only on this island. We are not faced with it to a large degree on other islands, but we are faced with this concept to a large extent on this island. Within the areas which were defined previously as the civilian urban scheme (about 35,000 acres, and of that about 4,000 is actually vacant now), we have about 31,000 acres of urbanized land on this island. We are proposing on this map that about 21,000 acres be included within the proposed urban limits beyond the 31,000 acres now actually occupied. This does not include any military urban. There is provision on this map within the proposed urban limits for expansions within the next 10 years and of course, subject for review in the next 5 years, which is about 67 percent of the present occupied urban. Our conclusion is that this does represent a general provision for urban growth for the next 10 years and even more particularly in view of the fact that these boundaries will be examined in 5 years. One detail is that this 550 acre parcel is shown here from gulch to gulch with a straight line parallelling the highway. Our final refinement of this to you will have some waves in it to fit the contours - the same 550 acres with some adjustments to the contours. We do feel that there must be a reasonable provision for urban growth in the central plateau and we feel that this provision is ample. We have reviewed in some detail since our last meeting with you the soil characteristics of this area. Within that 550 acres is approximately 500 acres of prime agricultural land. The land quality going up to the slope tends to be a little lesser than down here near the defense highway. We thought we had alternatives in this area that we might propose certain parcels along the Army boundaries for urban in lieu of an area parallel to the future highway; but on a comparative basis have cast that out because that would not provide the opportunity for overall sound community development that does prevail by initiating development on this plateau. We do visualize that an urban development initiated mauka from the defense highway now is successful, which could and should grow on up to the top of the plateau. If not, we would then recommend to you now that the entire plateau be included in urban.

WAIPIO

R. Darnell: I was not able to figure out whether this was to be an expansion of Wahiawa or as a separate city. D. Wolbrink: A separate city, separated by the Army lands and the plateau.

R. Darnell: The way it was presented by Fred Lee the other day was that Wahiawa needs a state of expansion because the ^{density} ~~vacancy~~ ratio is quite low. I think before going into this area at all, if there is a potential growth in Wahiawa, Wahiawa itself (this is the central town) should grow in this direction. In other words I would rather recommend that before this area be used up, this zoned area be used up first. There are two areas, makai and mauka, actually leaving the east range of Schofield in urban. This is the golf course and then you have what amounts to a very, very narrow strip of agricultural land. I gather this is to be zoned agricultural according to the plan here which would be virtually an island of agriculture built ~~bounded~~ by urban uses or military activity. In other words I believe that however much area is needed should progress from the golf course area south of Schofield and as close to downtown Wahiawa as possible. One good reason I think is that commercial interest and commercial status in Wahiawa is very badly supported.

E. Bryan: I wonder Mr. Sunn if you could cover the difference between the proposal of the consultants and the master plan of the City and County, and make whatever comments you want. Then when you are finished maybe Mr. Ige might have some additions to make. For the benefit of the other commissioners I might say Mr. Sunn, Mr. Ige and myself spent most of one day with the Oahu maps, part of it with the City Planning Commission and its staff.

F. Sunn: Yesterday, of course previously we had gone over this with Bartholomew, Fred Lee in his discussion report yesterday together with the City Planning Commission pointed out that there were only 7 areas that he would like to comment on. He felt in general all the lines as drawn were in compliance with the City and County master plan or very closely.

of
(Mr. Sunn continues and takes up the otherside/ tape which begins I believe on Waipio and goes as follows.)

This 2,000 somewhat acres up here was cut down. This area was deleted mauka of the defense highway and some 2,000 acres was approved in this master plan, and also approved by the County. Now Fred Lee pointed out yesterday that if this small area

would be used as a pilot for development he would much sooner see it close to the existing highway, closer to the existing facilities and water lines than to be some distance away. He did give some indications that he agree with some thought in regards to the Waihole district being a dividing line. This may be or may not be a valid argument. I'm not too sure about that.

E. Bryan: I might say that this was the other subject of this telephone call from Mr. Lee. He said that the letter forthcoming will include a recommendation of conservation for Kawaiui Swamp, and Waipio town as included in their master plan.

F. Sunn: Which means all of this some 2,000 acres. I think they would have to take that stand because this is their approved master plan. From the standpoint of the developers certainly they would like to see the entire thing approved so they could plan accordingly and then, develop in increments as they saw fit. They feel that the quarrel of their development is the community center that is centered in the middle and even makai of the Waihole ditch. There were actually 3 points that bothered me and I think bothered some of you in our discussion on Waipio. That is why I posed 3 questions to them and they gave very good answers to all 3 questions.

The first question was with regard to the need for additional lands for Oahu Sugar Company as a cutback. Remember in our talks with Burns he pointed out that with successful plantations you needed somewhere between 9,000 acres to 13,000 acres and eventually it would be cut down to 10,000 after you develop considerable holdings in this Halawa area. Oceanic listed these reasons which are very good as to why they feel that consideration of Oahu Sugar Company's development should not necessarily be considered that seriously: (1) Oceanic is already leasing 1200 acres of land to Oahu Sugar Company; (2) that any need that Oahu Sugar has for additional lands results from conversion of its land from agricultural to urban use; it is pattenly unjust to require one landowner to leave his lands in agricultural use for the convenience of an adjoining landowner who is urbanizing his lands; (3) that Oahu Sugar Company has said that it intends to and will satisfy its needs by use of other areas; and (4) if the commission must make a choice between permitting urbanization of Oahu Sugar's agricultural lands and Oceanic agricultural lands, the matter should be given preference because Oceanic proposed development is the only one which will offer fee simple ownership to the public; all other developers are

offering leaseholds. Oceanic offers the public the choice of either. Oceanic plans for development is complete. Other developers are only complete as to minor parts of their entire proposed development. Oceanic plans are for an integrated whole community, not merely another dead subdivision. The priority of time of obtaining tentative approval of the paper subdivision is not valid, logical, wise criterion to use in making a judgment as to the best use of Oahu's lands. Quality of a plan and a contribution of the proposed development to the welfare of the State is a better criterion.

My second question to them was whether or not, and I think some of you had expressed the same thing, they would develop this entire planning city or whether they would just start and find that sale resistance was so high they would stop and you would have another isolated group of housings right in the middle of nowhere. They listed these reasons: (1) they said prior to adoption of the interim boundaries by the land use commission, all of Waipio lands were zoned rural protective. If Oceanic was not determined to create a new town along the line outlined to you, if it were interested in a small money making subdivision it could have subdivided its lands and have an orthodox great subdivision long before the interim boundaries became effective. It is Oceanic determination to create a new high quality satellite city that has prompted it to spend more than \$500,000 in planning for this project. Planning of this ^{SCOPE} slope is unnecessary, uneconomic, and foolhardy unless the 2,000 acres are to be fully developed. (2) The Waipio project has been embodied in Honolulu's General Plan, however, no zoning has been granted. If the project area is included in this urban district by your commission, Oceanic must still obtain appropriate zoning from the city government. This must be done in increments, if the plans fail Oceanic will be unable to obtain additional zoning after the first increment. This would prevent development of any sprawling ordinary subdivision. This is true because Oceanic has pledged itself to the City Council to carry through its plans. Failure to do so will result in denial for further zoning. Oceanic hereby makes the same commitments to you. Despite our inability to see what will happen in the future there is no reason to believe that the Oceanic project will fail. It controls land that has not been sold and resold by speculators prior to the development and therefore, cost status is lower. As a subsidiary of Castle & Cooke it has the financial ability to carry out its plans and commitments and it is developing

lands that will set a terrain and topography that makes it inexpensive to development in contrast to development of hillside lots. It has retained architects to design homes that are attractive, large and low priced. If 1960 survey of the Oahu market of homes in the \$1500 price range shows that a large market does exist, and that production of such homes will fill an urban need. Updated in 1961 and 1962 the survey shows that this market still exists today.


In my third question I tried to point out from our standpoint that we have received many communications both from Rowland Darnell and the University of Hawaii in which the so-called soil experts claim that these lands are very prime agricultural lands and should definitely be retained. They tried to indicate that we should retain this breadbasket area for agricultural uses if at all possible. We are torn here between two things: whether to retain it for agriculture or whether this development would be something that Oahu and the State can look toward this as shining examples. You can do this may be in other areas.

E. Bryan: Did you ask this question among the questions that you had posed to them?

F. Sunn: Yes, and they gave a very good answer although quite lengthy. They pointed out as far as the University is concerned, their statement can be accepted generally. However, there are many other statements that you can take out of cuttalking sessions of their own reports which point out that you are going to have to use flat A and B lands for development of urban and industrial areas sooner or later. The point is our desire should be considered to use the land to its best advantage whether it be prime agricultural lands or otherwise. As far as Waipio is concerned I think we are faced with making two decisions as to what to do, whether we accept the consultants recommendation of this area and what Don points out is well taken. This area could be developed. The only problem is that from the 12% point they don't know whether or not they will ever have this other area approved. They might have to replan this entire thing, and this may not be the most desired terrain for development from their standpoint; and taking all the wasted areas and water problems into consideration, there may be some real problems. Don feels that maybe they won't. You can start from the top and work down. The argument is both ways.

The City feels that we should definitely approve this whole 2,000 acres and this is certainly what Oceanic would like to have the land use commission do, because then they can plan the development of this project properly. Certainly there will be an economic effect on other developers in this entire area, or of the entire island because of their particular development. Whether or not this Waihole Ditch is something that should be considered I don't know. Maybe Ed knows better than anybody as to whether or not this Waihole ditch will be able to service the land makai, whether this is a valid line because there is just so much water that can be drawn through here, if it is being utilized, which means you don't need it for long.

E. Bryan: I'm sure you can argue both ways about Waihole Ditch. The water that is going through there now is being pumped up and used for their more recent developments that we saw along the Kunia foothills; that is how far that water comes and I suppose you can argue and it would be just as valid. To say anything below the Waihole Ditch way up the Koolau foothills would be sacred for that reason. I could argue both sides of that question certainly very easily.

Y. Ige: As far as this area is concerned I don't know. I would go along with this gentlemen. I think that the vested rights of these particular individuals should be considered very well because to me that is going to be one of the biggest questions. These people have a vested right. In other words this area over here I don't see any reason why the State should, if there is any suit or sort coming up because of the vested rights, be in the soup. Rather than that, some person was saying if you leave that in urban than this person has the right to have fee vested right. If he wants to develop, then he can develop that land and get his permit from the city & county. I would like to see this in urban as the  and consultants are recommending. In this area, I think Mr. Summ has covered the whole thing. I would like to see this whole area included. As far as agricultural goes, this company owns both ends of the land. It doesn't make any difference. They have studied the whole situation and whether this is agricultural B land, or Agricultural A land, because the land is owned by one owner and it is not owned by any individual it does not make any difference in this particular instance whether this is agricultural or prime agricultural B land. If/it is the expenses involved or the economics saying that this area should be in urban then I think I would go along.

I would like to pose this question to HB&A. Was this area determined because of this application, or without considering this application would you have gone with this urbanization in this district; was your consideration based on having this an urban

district because of this application?

D. Wolbrink: I think our reasoning for urbanization here is valid with or without this application. The reasons that we have proposed that this be urban are: there is a center of activity here, there is a climatic location, there is a high plateau, and as far as this particular spot is concerned topographically it is an entity that can be developed as a unit. So our proposal for urbanization here is not because of this application, but rather because of our recognition of a need for urban uses in the central plateau.

Y. Ige: Then I would follow the staff's recommendation that this area be recommended for urban rather than this/area. ^{CONSIDERATION'S} But if the consideration was given because of this area here having been applied for zoning (eventually it was decided on this area, I don't know, but in either event because of the general master plan of the city & county which they have studied, and because of Oceanic Property in their talk had stated that they have spent about 4 or 5 years in the study, I would much rather go along on the recommendation of this area than of this recommendation. Another area that Sunm brought out is this area that the City & County wants to follow the plans that they have set along that line. Cut out that urban area.

W. Gregg: On this Waipio thing where Harland Bartholomew has drawn their line up there for 550 acres. Is Oceanic Property apprised of this and have they asked about that, and what they thought about chopping it up like that?

D. Wolbrink: Yes. I just talked about this informally with Fred Simpich, about 10 days ago or so. I told him that we were considering the feasibility or advisability of recommending to the commission an area mauka from the new defense highway. His response was that he wouldn't consider it too great a problem the fact that there will be one mile of access road required from the present highway over to this site. I pointed this out to him in the beginning if he were to initiate development in this area he would have to build a mile of road to get to it. He didn't consider that as serious. He did say that he thought very possibly he would have to have this entire plateau because for financing and programming purposes they wouldn't be able to proceed with what they have in mind without assurance now that when they needn't it, they would be able to use the entire plateau. We discussed informally that if possible some kind of a conditional agreement whereby they would prove themselves in the first increment, and if they had proven themselves, they would be able to go on to the rest of the plateau.

W. Gregg: That is what I wanted to know. Then this proving themselves, have all these other developers ever been asked to prove themselves by piecemeal stuff? No, but they would have to develop and reassured of more area than that, or they wouldn't start, and that is what he had said in essence.

D. Wolbrink: Our thinking in suggesting that urban development be entirely in this area is that as far ahead as we can see the development would occupy this upper plateau. The defense highway would either be built, or will be built five years from now as first reviewed, it will be virtually a fact. This area or plateau will have access from the new highway. In making this recommendation to this Commission that development be initiated up here, we are taking the position that urban development as far as we can see will be in this upper plateau, and will not at any time come down into this lower area. That has been our basic thought in our recommendation to you initially for the development up here, and not as a first increment to be subsequently expanded to this direction. I did not cover that before and it has been important to us in considering where to locate this expansion in the plateau.

W. Gregg: Has any mention/made that it might cost more to develop as you
been
go up, than it would cost in relation as you go down, because the land is steeper and I believe it gets rougher in topography, doesn't it as you go up?

D. Wolbrink: This is a fairly gradual rise all the way up. There are some little fingers here. The difference between this area and this is not particularly great. This plateau down here is the largest.

W. Gregg: When they speak of low cost housing, wouldn't they put it where it is cheap for development initially? I think that the actual land development in this area will not be appreciably different from the high topography up here.

F. Sumn: Mr. Chairman, couldn't we take these 3 points up separately. First in Maile, then Kawaiinui, then Waipio. They are the only 3 areas of disagreement with the County.

ACTION FOR WAIPIO

Commissioner Ige motioned to follow the recommendation of the city & county for the development of Oceanic Property's 'new town'. Seconded by Commissioner Chun.

4 approvals.