

Meeting of the Planning Commission  
Minutes  
January 31, 1973

2

The Planning Commission held a meeting on Wednesday, January 31, 1973 at 2:07 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex. Chairman Rev. Eugene B. Connell presided.

PRESENT: Rev. Eugene B. Connell, Chairman  
Roy R. Bright  
Thomas H. Creighton  
Antone D. Kahawaiolaa  
Fredda Sullam

STAFF PRESENT: Robert R. Way, Planning Director  
John Grant, Deputy Corporation Counsel  
Henry Eng, Staff Planner  
Ian McDougall, Staff Planner  
Charles Prentiss, Staff Planner

ABSENT: James D. Crane  
Thomas N. Yamabe II  
Paul Devens, ex-officio

Public hearings for the following related matters were held simultaneously. Publication was made January 21, 1973 in the Sunday Star-Bulletin/Advertiser. Comments from letters received in opposition to the proposal are included in Testimony AGAINST the request.

1. KANEOHE--General Plan Amendment (240/C1/25)

Applicant: HKH Ventures  
Ownership: Harold K. L. Castle Foundation and Henry H. Wong  
Location: Kaneohe, Oahu  
Tax Map Key: 4-5-34: 1, 6, 12  
Area: Approximately 11.61 acres  
City and County Zoning: R-3 and R-4 Residential District  
Detailed Land Use Map Designation: Park and Cemetery Use  
State Land Use Designation: Urban  
Existing Use: Vacant

Request: Applicant requests that lands designated for Park and Cemetery use on the Kaneohe-Kualoa Detailed Land Use Map be redesignated to Residential use and that the Koa Kahiko Street extension be deleted.

Mr. Ian McDougall of the staff presented the Director's report concerning the request for a General Plan/DLUM amendment. It is the applicant's intent to develop 51.4 acres for housing. The project will consist of 311 units and will house approximately 1,088 persons. The units are expected to be priced between \$48,000 and \$56,000. The justification for this amendment is the need for housing. At the same time, however, the fact is that at this

point in time, there is no immediate overall solution to this problem. Therefore, some weight must be given to the additional units being proposed in this location even if they will not directly add to the inventory of moderately priced housing. Additional factors to be considered are:

- (a) There is no reasonable evidence that the designated use of this land is no longer warranted.
- (b) The existing residential character of the abutting area, topography, location and access lead to a conclusion that residential use is the most appropriate alternative use of this land.
- (c) The housing problem is of such a magnitude that some consideration must be given to the construction of new units.

In addition, there is evidence that the planned Koa Kahiko Street extension to Mokulele Street is not essential to meet the traffic needs of the area.

The Director recommends that the requested amendment be approved. Further, that approximately 4.4 acres presently designated for Park use be changed to School, thereby recognizing its actual use.

2. KANEOHE--Planned Development-Housing (72/PDH-7)

Applicant: HKH Ventures  
Property Owners: Harold K. L. Castle Foundation and Kaneohe Ranch  
Location: Near Hawaiian Memorial Cemetery--Kaneohe  
Tax Map Key: 4-5-34: 1, 6, and 12  
Area: 51 acres (approximately)  
Present Zoning: R-3 and R-4 Residential District  
Proposal: 311 dwelling units

Request: Designation of Planned Development-Housing District.

Mr. Henry Eng reviewed the Director's report of the project. In summary, the site plan is acceptable. It provides for the preservation, in its natural state, of a substantial area of the site by the clustering of units. The unit design is readily adaptable to many slope conditions and will reduce the required grading which is proposed only for road areas, service drives, and parking. The units are appropriately scaled near schools, commercial facilities, and major highways.

Approval is recommended subject to conditions contained in the report.

No questions were raised by the Commission on either report.

Public testimony followed.

TESTIMONY AGAINST

1. Mrs. Joan B. Yim, Resident of Pikoiloa, Kaneohe (Submitted testimony dated January 31, 1973)

YIM: I would like to speak regarding the proposed policy change from Park and Cemetery to Residential Use for the land in question. Mr. Way in his memorandum to the Planning Commission dated January 17, 1973, stated: "The applicant responds to the first issue by attempting to substantiate the need for the type of housing units being offered in Kaneohe and indicating that (a) there is an over-abundance of cemetery land in the area; (b) that the topography makes cemetery and park development impossible; and (c) that alternate park sites serve this area."

The slope of the subject designated park are 25-30%. This may not be feasible as a graded play area site, but it is presently a beautiful green belt, wooded area, bordering the school and playground. In effect it is a "natural park"--an eye-pleasing reminder of the once rural character of Kaneohe. Perhaps this is what was in mind when the area was set aside as park land under Ordinance No. 2473 adopted July 29, 1964, for the slope was as evident then as it is now.

The slope adjacent to Kaneohe Elementary School Playground is not as great and there is a possibility of expanding the playground area in this direction. At present, the Kaneohe Elementary School Playground area is a little over 3 acres, whereas the minimum standard for a neighborhood park is 4 acres.

In order for land to be used as a park does not necessarily mean active recreation. There is such a thing as passive recreation, nature trails, animal preserves, etc. Now, too, is the time to move for acquisition as it is still unimproved residential.

As to point (c), the major alternate park site is Kaluapuhi Neighborhood Park (Souza Dairy). It is intended to serve the 5,100 residents within the area bounded by Kaneohe Bay Drive, Kokokahi, Namoku Street, and Kamehameha Highway. The proposed Planned Development Housing is within this service area. Thus the 5.8 acre site will be servicing 6,888 residents. I would like to quote from page four of the above cited memorandum: "This population would exceed the General Plan Standard of one acre per 1,000 population for neighborhood parks."

Nowhere in the report can I find reference to the fact that there is no park area available for the residents on the mauka side of Kamehameha Highway from Likelike to the Pali Golf Course. Are they not also included in this service area?

The report goes on: "However, the Department of Recreation indicates Kaluapuhi Neighborhood Park, Kaneohe Elementary School

Playground, Castle High School basketball courts coupled with the proposed PDH recreation facilities will provide the needed recreational facilities for the residents in the neighborhood."

First, the Kaneohe Elementary School Playground. As was already pointed out, it is under minimum size and is used also by the large and growing population in the Halekou/Mahinui area. These people don't like their children playing in the cemetery (nor do the cemetery people), and so they encourage their children to use the overpass across Kam Highway to the school playground.

In addition, there are no comfort stations and very little maintenance. The City owns the land, but the upkeep is left to the DOE which looks upon this as a low priority item. Therefore, it is mostly the Little League parents who clear away brush and attempt to keep the ball fields in good condition.

Secondly, the Castle High School basketball courts are accessible to us only by way of Mokulele and Kaneohe Bay Drive. There is heavy use of these courts by organized groups and students. In addition, the area has three tennis courts (blacktop) areas and at present are the only public courts in Kaneohe. It will be some time before we get the 10 courts promised at Kaneohe Regional Park (a good driving distance from our subdivision, by the way).

And finally, the PDH recreational facilities will be completely private and not open to the residents of Pikoiloa, including open space area.

In regard to the Planning Director's recommendation that "...approximately 4.4 acres presently designated for Park use be changed to School, thereby, recognizing its actual use", I would like to ask why the lower slope of this area which is already a grassy area, cannot be used for picnic tables or just as a general open area. I don't believe the school would be able to build anything down there.

In conclusion, Pikoiloa was built by many different developers-- each promising park land. The older homes are over 20 years old and the last major subdivision is 8 years old. Why should we delete park land or any open space in an already fully developed subdivision when the future impact as to such action has not been sufficiently researched?

I have a few questions regarding the PDH and its recreational impact. On page 6 of the Director's report is a letter dated August 4, 1972 from the Department of Parks and Recreation. The note under (c)2 states that there is a proposed park site at Castle High School, "In the event the Department of Education converts this high school facility for intermediate use, we will request that the athletic field be opened for community use." They have it in there as supporting evidence for the reason they don't need this park land. At the December meeting of the Kaneohe Community Council, Mr. Waters, the new District Superintendent, stated that Castle will remain a high school and that a new intermediate school will

be built, at which time he went on to discuss the various sites. In addition, when the park area was designated as such on the DLUM, the PDH concept was probably not thought of, or at best, not well known in Hawaii. They were thinking in terms of park land for a subdivision. In the cited report, it is pointed out that the PDH represents an increase of density of 80% over conventional subdivision, 35% over cluster provision.

Finally, the Director states that these changes appear to be in the general public interest, and we the residents, would like to question that.

2. Mr. Lionel Low, Resident of Pikoiloa, 45-409 Nakuluai Street (Submitted testimony, undated)

LOW: In early November 1964 when the homes at 45-409, 45-413, 45-417 and 45-421 Nakuluai Street were under construction, a large landslide occurred causing extensive damage to the hillside and necessitating reconstruction of several houses. In addition, the developer found it necessary to regrade the slope at his cost (at a cost of about \$46,000.00 for the 45-417 site). The City Inspector was involved at that time. Thompson had to remove all the adobe dirt (which expands and moves when wet) and pack it with red dirt. Is there not a possibility that the site in question might have the same soil problem causing another landslide? Have sufficient authoritative studies been done to determine the stability of the hillside?

What will happen when all the trees and plants now anchoring the soil are graded away? Even now when there is heavy rain, the run off is red with mud. With new construction underway, this will be increased. If the drains are able to cope with all the mud without flooding the existing homes in lower Pikoiloa, what will this do to an already polluted dying Kaneohe Bay?

With all the heavy construction equipment and vibrations caused by their movements, the earth will move somewhat. Several houses in this area have cracked ceilings which the original builder Centex has refinished once and some twice already. Blasting in the quarry near the dump and even the helicopters flying overhead can be felt easily in any of the homes in this part of Nakuluai Street. What will happen to our homes when the massive construction planned begins?

We ask the City and County to request a survey on the landslide question by the United States Corps of Engineers.

3. Mrs. Catherine Low, 45-409 Nakuluai Street (Presented testimony of Mrs. Ellen L. Akaka)

"As residents of the Pikoiloa subdivision, we are protesting the proposed changes because we are not satisfied that sufficient study has been done on the possible flooding of Kawa Stream or on the creation of an adequate silting basin.

Based on our personal experience of periodic flooding during periods of heavy rainfall due to an inadequate silting basin, we are particularly concerned with the creation of a silting basin at Kawa Stream. There is a basin on our property at 45-442 Ohaha Street which can adequately handle the run-off during normal rainfall. However, since 1965, we have been flooded at least six times because the silting basin is not equipped to handle the amount of water running off the slope during heavy rainfall. Rather than running into the basin, the water is diverted by it and cascades over the slope and into the yard. Had it not been for the help of many neighbors digging trenches to divert the flow of water in another direction, our home would have been inundated with silt and water. Instead, one section of our yard has had to be replanted periodically.

In a period of several years, the section of our yard most affected built up twelve inches. The City and County maintains there is little they can do to solve the problem. In attempting to prevent future flooding, and at our own expense, we have constructed a retaining wall hoping to divert the water and we have regraded our yard removing approximately ten yards of soil. We will not know, until the next heavy rainfall if our measures have been successful.

In addition to our experience, I would like to quote from a July 21, 1972 letter from the U.S. Corps of Engineers to the Planning Director: "From our viewpoint, possible environmental health problems would be those resulting from floods on Kawa Stream and interior drainage problems. We feel that with careful planning and implementation these problems can be avoided."

In view of the above, we pose the following questions:

- a. Have sufficient studies been done of existing silting basins within the subdivision to determine their effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) during heavy rainfall? If not, why not?
- b. Who will assume responsibility for maintaining the interior drainage system of Kawa Stream? If it is the City and County, their past record of maintenance has been extremely poor. We acknowledge that this is no doubt due to lack of funds and personnel; however, the fact remains that the record is poor.
- c. What are present drainage problems and how are they being resolved? We are aware of prior flooding problems in the Kawa Stream area and we would like these problems to be reviewed.

In addition, the Kawa Stream Flood Project Unit 1A is still in the design stages. The study acknowledges that a flood problem exists. Won't a change in the stream cause any appreciable increase in flow, particularly during heavy rainstorms? Shouldn't the flood project be completed before any additional run-off problems are created?

We are greatly concerned that with the above questions not fully answered, all of these things point to a possible repeat of the

Keapuka tragedy. As residents who would be affected, we are entitled to a more extensive study done under conditions of heavy rainfall and not under the "norm."

4. Mrs. Bettye J. Harris, Resident of Pikoiloa Subdivision (Submitted testimony dated January 31, 1973)

HARRIS: I strongly oppose the rezoning of the Harold K. L. Castle foundation and Henry H. Wong properties for the purpose of building housing because of the traffic situation that will be created in this area.

According to the development plan, the total amount of 311 units will be the maximum and this will mean upward of 600 additional cars added to this community. The proposed plan is to open Mokulele Drive up to join Kam Highway. On the surface this sounds adequate but, no study can be made without the actual road being in existence. The only available information on how many cars will be actually using the extension has to be approximated at this time.

On the map, Mokulele Drive is shown to continue across Kam Highway to join up with Likelike Highway near the proposed water recreational area. Therefore, Mokulele Drive will become a major access road. What consideration has the City and County given to the traffic that will cut through the Pikoiloa Subdivision by way of Mokulele Drive once the extension is completed? Will Mokulele Drive be designated as a four-lane thoroughfare? It does have the width.

Because of the way the school district is set up, approximately half of our subdivision attend Kaneohe Elementary School; and the others attend Puohala. Plus, we have Castle High School and also traffic leading out of the area for King Intermediate School. Consequently, we have heavy foot traffic on Mokulele Drive as well as cars leading to these three schools in particular. What are the plans of the City and County to protect the children walking to and from school? From Nakuluai to Kaneohe Bay Dirve, there are no sidewalks.

As a parent with children in three different schools, I would like to recommend that the Commission defer their decision on this matter because the information from the Transportation Department states that Mokulele Drive should provide adequate access. They did not say it would.

5. Mr. and Mrs. Hideo Tsukayama, 45-407 Pailaka Pl., Kaneohe (Submitted letter dated Jan. 30, 1973)
6. Mr. and Mrs. P. O. Crowell, 45-341 Mealele St., Kaneohe
7. Mrs. Shirley Kanai, Resident of Pikoiloa (Submitted letter dated Jan. 31, 1973)
8. Mrs. Nola C. Brannum, 45-405 Nakuluai St. (Submitted letter dated Jan. 30, 1973)

9. Mr. and Mrs. William N. Rodenhurst, 45-418 Nakuluai St. (Submitted letter, undated)
10. Mrs. Robert Kihune, 45-448 Ohaha St. (Submitted letter dated Jan. 31, 1973)
11. Mrs. Thomas H. Cornette, Jr., 45-175 Ohaha Pl., Kaneohe (Submitted letter dated Jan. 31, 1973)
12. Mr. and Mrs. John D. Bennett, 45-340 Mokulele Dr. (Submitted letter Jan. 26, 1973)
13. Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Cooley, 45-410 Nakuluai St. (Submitted letter dated Jan. 31, 1973)
14. Mr. Charles White, Resident of Pikoiloa

Letters in OPPOSITION were also received from the above-named individuals. Their objections relative to flooding, drainage, adverse soil conditions, inadequate park and school facilities, and traffic have been covered in previous testimony. An additional concern is the proposed cost of the units (\$48,000-\$65,000) which they feel is beyond low-moderate income levels, and does not meet existing housing needs of their community.

Recognizing various questions and concerns posed by the opponents, the Chairman called upon representatives from the Parks Department, the Traffic Department, and the Engineering Section of the Department of Public Works for clarification.

1. Parks Department - Mr. Toshiaki Kimura

KIMURA: In regards to what the second speaker said on recreational needs, the department is well aware of the deficiency in this area. About six months ago, the Department of Recreation came before you in regards to a General Plan Amendment for Kaluapuhi Neighborhood Park. Right now we cannot come to a price agreement. However, the department is planning to acquire this approximately 5.79 acres. Land acquisition costs are approximately \$425,000. Construction, relocation and all the other items will total approximately \$700,000 for this Kaluapuhi Neighborhood Park.

Besides this, about three months ago, we met with the representatives of the Kaneohe Community Council. This was in regards to the improvement of the Kaneohe Elementary School. This is located just adjacent to the proposed PDH development. At this time, we tentatively agreed that possibly the Recreation Department could work with the DOE in improving this site. However, because of our tie up in costs, we have not actually sat down and discussed this problem with the DOE.

With regard to the subject site, as you are all aware, the topography is very rough. Although its designated on the DLUM as Park use, the development costs would be exorbitant. Therefore, on October 5th, we wrote a letter stating that we do not have a plan for this proposed subject site.

The second speaker brought the prospect of a passive recreation nature of this area. Directly across the subject site, we are

presently working with the Soil Conservation group for a 290 acre Kaneohe Reservoir Park. This will not only fulfill our passive recreational aspect but also our active. We plan to put in some active recreation in there. The exact acreage is not available now.

SULLAM: Concerning the construction phase itself, do you feel that it has been explored as far as providing proper recreational facilities?

KIMURA: Yes. Because of the topo conditions, its going to be a high development cost. Usually we come up with an active recreational area of about 3% or 4% slope category. This is going to be much higher than that. In order to bring it down and terrace it to this level, that cost is too much.

SULLAM: What I mean is I don't think there is included in here a tot playground, for let's say in the steeper areas, there could be hiking. I'm talking about the development itself.

KIMURA: We did not include anything in this development.

SULLAM: I'm looking under the portion which is going to be your purview as far as criticizing the development, seeing whether it has the proper recreational facilities.

KIMURA: Actually, we just make comments with regard to the site itself and what the site could provide. We felt such a proposal would meet our recreational needs. We felt it should be constructed and maintained by the home association.

WAY: Maybe the question could be put another way. Is your department satisfied with the provision of recreational facilities within the planned development?

KIMURA: Yes, we are.

WAY: It meets the needs there.

KIMURA: It meets the needs for the subject proposal, yes.

WAY: Henry, would you point out the facilities that are being provided within the PD itself.

ENG: There is a provision for a recreation pavilion, a swimming pool, and within each of the clusters, a tot lot for each 25 units.

SULLAM: Thank you. I wasn't aware of that. That's what I was looking for.

KIMURA: Correct me if I'm wrong but I understand that this subject proposal is approximately 51 acres. Out of this total, 40 acres or so will be in open space?

ENG: I don't know the exact figures but I think probably about

35 would be maintained in open space. The buildings and the roads would cover approximately 17 acres.

CHAIRMAN: Further questions?

CREIGHTON: Have you had enough experience with PDs to indicate to you whether the recreational activities within a project like this would take place within its own confines? What I'm getting at is, granted that there are good recreational facilities being proposed in this plan, will there be additional tax on recreational facilities outside of the site itself?

KIMURA: I don't know that I can answer that.

CREIGHTON: I know its a tough question. In effect, I think what your testimony says is a deficiency in the area, that deficiency will probably remain for sometime until you make further plans, but that this PD would not increase the difficulties that present residents have. Am I correct in saying that?

KIMURA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: How soon will the department be able to indicate the citizens in the Kaneohe area when these parks will be put in? In other words, when is the fiscal situation going to be such that you can put these parks in?

KIMURA: The Kaluapuhi Park will be in the 1973 fiscal year. We plan construction in 1974.

CHAIRMAN: What about the school site?

KIMURA: We still have not discussed this with the DOE people.

CHAIRMAN: Is there a timetable when that discussion will begin?

KIMURA: Within the next couple of months. There is a possibility that this site could be improved with maybe baseball playing.

2. Department of Public Works, Engineering Division - Richard Nishizawa

NISHIZAWA: I will answer any questions you might have.

CREIGHTON: There were two questions raised within your purview; one was the stability of the soil whether any landsliding might take place as has taken place in adjacent areas, apparently, and secondly, the drainage and possibility of increasing flood problems which apparently also exists in adjacent subdivisions.

NISHIZAWA: Regarding the question on slides, I'm not qualified to give you any answer specifically on drainage. I think the consultant for the developer did submit a thorough report. I believe

no mention of slide problems in the area was contained in that report.

On the drainage and flood problems of the area, the consultants for the developer did submit a drainage study and report which we reviewed and found to be satisfactory. According to the report, I believe the aggravation created by this development would not amount to more than 1%. Also, the natural waterway would be retained in its original state. There would be no diversion of runoff from other basins. As far as the problems downstream of this area, we are aware. We have started on a program to provide flood protection. Fiscal '72, we had appropriations in the budget which we used to complete engineering plans for what we call Kawa Stream, Unit 1-A which is from the contour upstream to this proposed development. Section 1-B, from that section down to Kaneohe Bay Drive, we're asking for an appropriation to do the plans. Construction will be contingent on getting a couple of million dollars for the project. We're also hoping to get some state assistance on this project. Right now our CIP program I think calls for a timetable of fiscal 1977.

CREIGHTON: What work is included in this 1-A section?

NISHIZAWA: 1-A right now is almost entirely unlined, a partly dredged out and eroded waterway. We plan to put in a concrete rectangular section channel. The bridge at the culvert at Na Moku Street will be replaced with a more substantial and larger opening. The total plan is to complete and line the entire waterway from Kaneohe Bay Drive up to the development and also the other leg which we call Unit 2.

CREIGHTON: Another question which I suppose is going to be difficult to answer. How do you calculate that a given development like this will produce a 1% increase in flow?

NISHIZAWA: I believe the way to do it is to determine the runoff before any development or any present condition, and then introduce or transplant the proposed development on this area, increasing the runoff where paved land and homes are going to be built. It will show a certain increase because of the shortness and the time of concentration, or your runoff factor is increasing because of covered or paved areas. This increase is then compared to what is normally the stream flow designed in the main channel. This is not the only tributary to that main stream. It comes out to about a 1% increase.

WAY: Mr. Nishizawa, how do you relate that 1%? Is that in terms of the flow?

NISHIZAWA: I'm not sure what the exact figures are but its a comparison of before and after flows this development has contributed.

WAY: Is there some way of relating that to the potential hazard?

NISHIZAWA: We could go one step and determine the amount of rise as compared to before and after design flow. It gets to be very minimal if you think about the rise in the depth of flow. It doesn't solve the flooding problem. It just compares the degree of aggravation.

WAY: As this project would proceed, there would be construction drawings and further information provided to your office. Would that provide additional information and more in detail that you would be analyzing as the development proceeds, particularly the engineering having to do with the flooding? What I'm saying is, will your department be reviewing that even more so as time progresses, is that not correct?

NISHIZAWA: You mean the downstream flooding?

WAY: Yes, or the specifics of this project as it might pertain to the runoff. You'll examine where the culverts and outfalls would be, and their further impact on the drainage basin.

NISHIZAWA: No.

WAY: Could you explain then what would be the next step as far as the drainage analysis is concerned.

NISHIZAWA: The drainage analysis for this development would probably go into detailed hydraulics and the sizing of their local or internal system. We may reevaluate with the proposed grading whether there would be an encroachment into the natural waterways. I'm not sure whether that has been already determined, building setback lines and minimum flow elevation. Those things would be set up and established.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Director, when do you feel the final phase of this proposed PD will go in?

ENG: The proposal calls for four development phases, the first phase to be complete by 1974, and the fourth phase to be complete by September 1974.

CHAIRMAN: Considering the drainage problem, Mr. Nishizawa have you taken into consideration that all four phases of this project will go in roughly three years before you are able to take care some of the present flooding problems?

NISHIZAWA: That's the present CIP schedule.

CHAIRMAN: Considering the fact that there is presently flooding in the area, and we have testimony indicating that, and even considering a 1% increase in the runoff and that's considered under normal rain conditions, or is that also taking into account heavy rains?

NISHIZAWA: We design according to standard which is peak discharge.

CHAIRMAN: Peak meaning the heaviest amount that you would have?

NISHIZAWA: I don't want to get to how we determine the peak but its based on recorded peaks of various streams in the area. We have a composite curve to be dammed to determine the runoff for other streams in the same region.

CHAIRMAN: So, you've taken under consideration what's the heaviest amount of rainfall received that would come off this development.

NISHIZAWA: Right.

CHAIRMAN: That would increase the present flooding problem at least by 1%?

NISHIZAWA: I didn't say it would increase the flooding problem. It would aggravate or increase the present flow or the design flow by 1%, the before and after flow, let's say.

CHAIRMAN: Is there a flooding problem? We have testimony that on Ohaha Street and in other areas, homes have been flooded. Apparently the drainage system during certain times is not able to take the flow.

NISHIZAWA: We've had complaints of flooding in the Pikoiloa area, yes. Where we've the opportunity, we've gone in with remedial measures. In fact, we did program and install some local drainage improvements along Mokulele Drive and in the area that drains into Unit 2. We've also had flooding at Na Moku Street, and Kawa Stream in a section, yes. We are aware of these problems.

CHAIRMAN: Will the remedial steps you have taken be able to handle the increased flow?

NISHIZAWA: The remedial steps for the upper Pikoiloa area is not affected by the new development. The flow into the main Kawa Stream will be affected to the extent of a 1% aggravation by this development. It may mean an inch or two of rising in the water surface flowing down the channel.

CHAIRMAN: This is my concern. If some places have not been flooded because it is an inch lower, if you add an inch, you may very well have a flood situation.

NISHIZAWA: Well, the basic problem has been constriction at the Na Moku Street culvert. From all the report and feed back that we've had on flooding, this is where the water overflows the channel or the present waterway, gets on to Na Moku Street and goes one or two blocks down. That has been the source flood as far as the flooding on Kawa Stream.

3. Department of Traffic - Mr. Kenneth Hirata

CREIGHTON: The question raised is whether when the additional work is done on Mokulele Street, whether it will satisfactorily handle the additional traffic impact from the proposed development. Can you expand a bit on your general statement that you believe that it will? How do you calculate that?

HIRATA: The Mokulele extension would be a 60-foot right-of-way. We would have at least 40 feet curb-to-curb pavement. That will give us two lanes of traffic for each direction of travel. The 300 units and the additional traffic that will be attracted can be serviced by these two additional lanes.

CREIGHTON: Is that going to cause any danger for pedestrians in the area? Has there been any study made of the extent to which Mokulele Drive is used as a pedestrian route at the present time?

HIRATA: I imagine today there is no direct connection to Kam Highway. The pedestrian traffic would be going through an indirect route to the shopping center and to the elementary school. This development, I believe, is closer to Kam Highway and the new portion would service this traffic plus whatever is attracted. Naturally there would be an increase incident rate for whatever pedestrians are utilizing the streets there. I think this is a normal thing. I don't see anything unusual about it.

CHAIRMAN: I believe we did have some other questions that arose in the testimony. Could we have those transmitted to the Traffic Department for their reaction.

WAY: Yes.

Testimony in SUPPORT

1. Mr. Frank Brandt, Project Planner for the applicant.

BRANDT: The applicant agrees with and accepts the conditions and recommendations of the Planning Director for approval of the General Plan Amendment and the Planned Development Housing as submitted to the Commission today. If there are questions, our Traffic Consultant, Dave Shoppert from Allan Vorhees and Associates, is here; Walter Lum our Soils Engineer from Walter Lum and Associates is here; and Clarence Tanonaka our Engineering Consultant of Park Engineering is here.

CREIGHTON: I'd like to ask Walter Lum about the soil conditions. Mr. Lum, I imagine you've heard the questions raised by the community about the possibility of slides similar to those that have occurred in adjacent areas. I presume that you prepared the soil report for the developer. What do you find about the nature of the soil which makes you feel sure that there won't be any instability of that kind?

LUM: We're very familiar with the soils in the area, and are also familiar with the soils where the slides have taken place because we were the consulting engineers on both projects.

On the Pikoiloa project, that is a housing project with individual houses. There was mass grading. The cuts and fills were a little more than what we're doing on the PDH. The cuts are greater than 20 and 30 feet in height. They do cut through drainage paths and did have some slides. But, the soils test indicates that you can drain these areas and they can be stabilized. The slides that they spoke about today have been during the construction period. Those things have been corrected. I haven't heard of any complaints after the slides were corrected.

In a PD project, a different approach is taken; that is, you're not building individual houses and you're not trying to get the maximum number of lots. You are leaving open spaces. You're avoiding the drainage area. In addition to that, you're avoiding the cuts and fills. Slides, in my opinion, is not a problem. We're designing a different concept altogether.

CREIGHTON: Has the project reached the point of design yet where you know what the maximum cut might be?

LUM: Well, I don't think the cut in the area that is close to the cemetery is any problem because its more of a cinder cone. That in there is pretty well drained. On the other side of the older subdivision, again, I don't think heights and cuts are real criteria. If you cut the surface down and you remove the driving sources, the problem of slides is removed because its the driving sources that cause the slides. So, depending on how you make the cut is more of a criteria than the height of cut.

CREIGHTON: On another subject, does your study get into the permeability of the soil? Would you have any comment to make about the possibility of runoff and addition to the drainage and flooding problem we've been discussing?

LUM: Listening to the testimony, I think that 1%, my guess is that you're talking about the site development, say 50 acres relative to the drainage area of maybe 200 or 300 acres. Kawa Stream doesn't only serve the 17 acres. Kawa Stream serves probably somewhere greater than 200 acres. This is just off the cuff. This is how you arrive at the 1%. If you were to say site development, improvements alone on the site itself, your runoff may increase. But, on the total picture, it doesn't increase the total picture at all.

WAY: Mr. Lum, in connection with the proposed site layout that we have before us, in your opinion, are there proper appropriate safeguards with respect to the soils condition in terms of the design? Do you feel that this design is such that it will avoid soils problems?

LUM: I think the principle of the design will avoid soils

problems. We will go into a very detailed unit for unit set up in the construction to analyze the whole thing so that you do not have a soils problem.

WAY: What would that be? Could you just briefly describe the form of such an examination?

LUM: Usually, such an examination would be looking at the grading plans, looking at the drainage plans, also looking at the foundations. We do look for the sufficiency of the foundations, are they deep enough, your rates are such that you're not in a seepage area or the seepage area is corrected before the site is graded.

SULLAM: Could you rather broadly outline which areas are going to be graded on the map, and if you know, how many feet of fill there will be in certain areas? Where are you taking it away? Where are you putting it?

LUM: We only make a reconnaissance, and these are reconnaissance plans. The drainage plans are being prepared by the civils. After that, we will make the detailed analysis for each cut and each fill. But right now, I would say that we wouldn't be able to give you specific information.

CHAIRMAN: Any further questions of Mr. Lum? If not, are there further questions of Mr. Brandt?

CREIGHTON: Mr. Brandt, a number of us are curious about the price level at which the units are planned. Was this the result of a market analysis which indicated the need for prices in this level, or was it getting things as low as you could, considering all of the costs? How did you arrive at this particular price range?

BRANDT: One was the cost was pretty high in developing this piece of property. The number of units we had, we did make a market analysis. Accommodation of the market and the development cost did result in the \$48,000 to \$56,000 price range. When we started the project, we were anticipating maybe a little lower, \$45,000 to early \$50,000s. Prices on the units have increased because of some of the costs that we had to undertake in developing the project. We had not expected to provide the low income type of housing as was mentioned today. That area, in our feeling, was suited to a different type of unit. This is the result.

CREIGHTON: I don't quite understand your comment to a different type of unit. We keep hoping that some of the new PDs will be able to provide housing in the low and moderate income levels. I understand your comment about high development costs, maybe. I'm not quite sure what you mean by that.

BRANDT: There are high development costs in the area. We are trying to work it out with planned development, and are incorporating 15% low income housing units. But the size of this project of 300 units, the incorporation of both the low income and moderate and the higher price was not possible in this particular development.

WAY: Mr. Brandt, in connection with your studies which may have been undertaken on this site, do you have any relative costs of what might be the site development cost for an individual or typical subdivision lot and house as against the planned development where you do obtain a considerable benefit in numbers of units? Do you know, in other words, what it would cost for a conventional subdivision lot?

BRANDT: My engineer could better answer that.

CLARENCE TANONAKA: Its difficult to come up with dollars and cents. In a PDH, we put in more amenities such as play areas, a recreation center. Although we have more units, our experience has been--I don't know what the dollar amount is but the difference is not that greater per unit. The other thing is in a PDH, it requires more planning and architectural work which on a conventional subdivision, you will not have that.

CREIGHTON: What you're telling us is interesting because among other advantages which have been presumed when the planned development concept was included in the code, was that there would be appreciable savings in site development over the spread out subdivision with the utility runs, individual foundations, roads and so forth. You're telling us that you don't see that difference as an advantage for the PD.

BRANDT: The front end costs have been very high because we have been working on this particular land development for 15 months now. The carrying charges have amounted to considerable costs.

SULLAM: Is there any possibility, in view of your preliminary cost estimate of holding a certain percentage of these units to a lower price or must they all be sold at this price level you state?

BRANDT: At this time the cost has been worked out. If we did sell at a lower price, it would mean that the difference would have to be made up by higher prices in other instances.

2. Mr. Leonard Moffitt, Resident, 45-215 Koa Kahiko St., Kaneohe

In his testimony, Mr. Moffitt indicated that the request conforms to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map. He would prefer the proposed PDH which is well planned, attractive, provides for open space and recreational facilities, over a conventional subdivision in which these amenities are not required of the developer. He feels that whatever type of development takes place, flooding will be an important part of it.

3. Mr. Manuel J. Souza, Retired Farmer

Mr. Souza pointed out that his property which was sold to the developer under an agreement of sale, is now proposed for park use. He did not know the property would be used for park purposes, and his neighbors have expressed concern on this point.

The public hearing was closed and the matter was taken under advisement, on motion by Mr. Creighton, seconded by Mr. Bright and carried.

ACTION: The Commission concurred with the Director's recommendation on both requests, and recommended approval of the two requests by the applicant, on motion by Mr. Bright, seconded by Mr. Kahawaiolaa.

Discussion followed.

SULLAM: Has any communication been received from the DOE regarding the selected school site? In the report, there is mentioned that a site is being sought.

WAY: We have no further information from DOE. At this time, about all that's been provided was information that they were seeking such a site. They have not yet, at this moment and to my knowledge, determined exactly where it would be. The matter is still under study with them. I think they raised it as a question to us simply to alert us. They indicated in no way that they were interested in this site; that is, there would be no conflict with their plans for providing a new site somewhere in the Kaneohe area, as far as this site was concerned. On that basis, we did move ahead.

SULLAM: Another concern I have is, I would like us to recommend to the Council that they consider very carefully, the idea of allocating a certain percentage of these units to low-cost housing, even if it involves raising the cost of the selling price of some units to achieve this. I would like this to be sort of an addendum to our recommendation for approval.

CREIGHTON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Commissioner Sullam would be willing to change the intent of our amendment somewhat. I think we all agree that from time to time, questions about the Planned Development provision in the CZC have come up. Questions as to whether a PD below a certain size really works in the sense of giving back amenities of open space and so forth, to the community as it is supposed to.

The question which was raised today in the discussion which I raised of whether this does result in less expensive construction, the question of whether the PD provision should also include conditional zoning requiring certain benefits beyond the physical amenities which the PD presumably provides, and so forth. In other words, it does seem time to reexamine the whole concept of the PD in light of the experience we've had. I would suspect that the Planning Department will agree with that point of view, that it is time to reexamine.

If your specific request were incorporated in a larger reexamination, I think it would be more palatable to everybody.

SULLAM: Yes, I agree with you completely. I would very much like to see it placed before them in that fashion. In fact, perhaps even exploring what the actual costs are in producing these units in a PD. Perhaps this might be the precursor of some form of control on costs or a selling price.

WAY: Mr. Chairman, may I, if I understand what the discussion is about, might I suggest that we deal with the question of the particular General Plan and Planned Development application before us, and then as a separate item, explore the larger concept that Mr. Creighton is talking to of reexamining the whole approach to a PD, particularly as it not only applies to the physical, but other aspects that would be of a community interest. I think it might be more forcefully brought to the attention of the Council, more directly at least, if that were possibly a separate item for their consideration, not necessarily tied to a project that we're looking at.

Any other items that you would like to attach to this one, fine, but I think maybe they are really two matters to bring to the Council's attention; one dealing with this application, and the second, planned developments in general.

BRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, my motion is to accept the Director's recommendation on both items one and two.

CREIGHTON: Perhaps we should make a comment on all the testimony we had from the community. My reaction to it, and the reason I'm going to vote for the motion is, a number of important questions were raised. But, it seems to me that the answers we got from the city departments indicated that there are problems in recreational area, in flooding, and perhaps in traffic, but none of these problems are going to be worsened by this particular PD. That's an unsatisfactory answer to the community, but I think it is a good reason to approve a development which appears to stand well on its own two feet.

SULLAM: It wasn't stated in the report that there has been proven that there is a need for this housing. We all conclude that it will be sold, even at the price proposed, but yet there is no need is there?

WAY: I think there is a need. Maybe while not proven as such, I think part of the question is a little moot. Its not really pointed out as well as it might have been, but the area is already zoned for single-family residential. It would be possible to develop a conventional subdivision now on most of the area. The only question that would come up would probably be one of a challenge to the government as to whether or not it would purchase the land designated for park. In that sense, I think there is somewhat of an agreement on the recognition at least of some need for housing. Then, it becomes a matter of degree. Well, its increasing floor area on the order of some 80%. What this means in terms of our total requirement, its fairly insignificant, although

on this particular site it does increase it substantially. It doesn't double the number but a conventional subdivision presumably could get something on the order of 150 more or less units on that site, right now. I think there would be little trouble in that price range, personally, disposing of the property. Its not at all out of line in terms of the overall market for that type of housing. Its right in it.

CHAIRMAN: The probability of cost in the conventional subdivision is higher.

WAY: Yes, but I was somewhat surprised on the testimony, however, from the applicant on this. Part of it is zoned R-3 which is 10,000 sq. ft. lots. Incidentally, it would be possible to build duplexes on those lots under the CZC. Our figures come up a little closer if this would be the form of development that the owner might wish to undertake. Maybe it would more nearly 200 or 250 units under conventional subdivision with duplexes.

There was no further discussion. The motion carried.

AYES - Bright, Creighton, Kahawaiolaa, Sullam  
NAYES - None  
ABSENT - Crane, Yamabe  
ABSTAINED - Connell

STATE LAND USE  
COMMISSION REFERRAL  
AGRICULTURAL TO URBAN  
MOKULEIA  
MOKULEIA PROPERTIES  
(72/LUC-10)

Referred to the Commission for review and comment is a petition from the State Land Use Commission to amend the State Land Use District Boundaries. The petitioner plans to enter in a joint venture agreement with the Hawaii Housing Authority under Act 105 for a Residential Planned Unit Development. However, no agreement exists between the petitioner and the Hawaii Housing Authority. A low density of approximately 700 units to be sold in fee simple is proposed. According to the petitioner, only families that qualify under Act 105 would be eligible to purchase the units.

The Director's evaluation of the petition was made on the following basis:

- A. The requirements of Section 205-4, Chapter 205, Hawaii Revised Statutes.
- B. The Standards for Determining District Boundaries, Part II, State Land Use District Regulations.
- C. The land use policies of the City and County General Plan.

The conclusion is that the information available is inadequate as a basis for amending the State Urban Land Use District. The petitioner does not provide adequate information and analyses to demonstrate that this site is appropriate to meet the identified need. The Director's recommendation is for denial.

Questioned by the Commission as to what assurance there is by the petitioner that this project will be developed in low-cost housing, Mr. Prentiss of the staff indicated that he spoke with Mr. Cooper who is the Administrator of Act 105 programs. Mr. Cooper held a preliminary meeting with the petitioner. At the present time, there is no existing agreement between the Hawaii Housing Authority and the petitioner for low-cost development.

There were no further questions of the staff.

ACTION: The Commission adopted the Director's recommendation, and recommended that the petition be denied, on motion by Mr. Creighton, seconded by Mrs. Sullam and carried.

AYES - Bright, Creighton, Kahawaiolaa, Sullam  
NAYES - None  
ABSENT - Crane, Yamabe  
ABSTAINED - Connell

UNFINISHED BUSINESS	The public hearing on this matter was held January
STATE SPECIAL USE	3, 1973 and kept open to permit the applicant to
PERMIT & CONDITIONAL	address areas of concern discussed in the Direc-
USE PERMIT	tor's report.
(SANITARY LAND FILL	
OPERATION & RELOCATION	Public testimony was continued.
OF EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRY)	
EWA: PUU PALAILAI &	No one testified AGAINST the proposal.
PUU MAKAKILO	
PACIFIC CONCRETE &	Testimony in SUPPORT--
ROCK COMPANY, LTD.	
(FILE #72/SUP-1 &	1. Mr. Robert B. Robinson, President, Pacific
72/CUP-15)	Concrete & Rock Co., Ltd.
	2. Mr. Donald Wolbrink, Consultant for the
	applicant.

Mr. Robinson indicated that the application is vital to the continuation of Pacific Concrete as a corporate entity as well as to the community because it will insure a continued source of concrete on Oahu. It will provide a badly needed location for a sanitary landfill on Leeward Oahu, and will restore their quarry site to usable use.

A slide presentation was made to graphically demonstrate the proposal.

The Commission questioned Mr. Robinson and Mr. Wolbrink.

SULLAM: How successful has landfill been with regard to stability of soil?

ROBINSON: With respect to that, in the interest of brevity, we did not bring our ultimate use plan for the old site, but I can describe this

28 acres. Don worked out a plan which would have housing surrounding the 28 acres with nothing built on it. There would be no construction on the landfill itself. We're leaving it as an open area. Its amazing how that 70-acre total goes around the 28 acres, with housing around an open area. In direct answer to your question, we're solving the problem by presupposing that there will be some settlement and to leave the area open.

CREIGHTON: How long do you think it will take you to quarry this entire area?

ROBINSON: Our contract is for 20 years. We're counting on a 23 million cubic yard operation.

CREIGHTON: Would you start any landfill operations in some parts that you had quarries before that ultimate date?

ROBINSON: We're scratching the last out of the existing quarry. Until we get assurance that we can move to the new site, we can't start the landfill. We can possibly dig out just a little more rock which will last just a few months. We may be able to stretch it a little longer than that.

CREIGHTON: What about the new quarry site?

ROBINSON: We'll start actual production in July of '76.

CREIGHTON: And your total quarrying time would be some 23 years.

ROBINSON: 20, 23.

CREIGHTON: What I was wondering was if during that period, you would begin refilling some of this new site area?

ROBINSON: There's no refilling.

CREIGHTON: No refilling?

ROBINSON: All removing.

CREIGHTON: Your plan is based entirely on the contours that would be left after the quarrying operation, with no landfill.

ROBINSON: Except for top soil.

CREIGHTON: I see. I didn't quite understand that. Then, that leads to another question. Would it be possible to start using that as residential property before the end of the total quarrying operation?

ROBINSON: The 71 acres in the specific site itself, but we have surrounded it with whatever you have here, its says in the application. I think there's 150 acres. We buffered it. The total is 295 acres. That will remain in agricultural use. Its used for very limited grazing. The rest of it, no. With the environmental restrictions, you just can't be too close to your neighbors.

CREIGHTON: So in other words, these imaginative plans--

ROBINSON: Will have to wait.

CREIGHTON: So really, the plans are 25 years in the future.

ROBINSON: That's right.

CREIGHTON: Are there alternative sites?

ROBINSON: No, there are none.

CREIGHTON: I suppose, until we explore completely the problem of alternatives which is always a tough one, I suppose there is no alternative for this kind of rock for the concrete aggregate. Its not a situation like the sand where you can manufacturer something else.

ROBINSON: No. Its like oil or gold. Its where it is.

(There were no further questions of Mr. Robinson.)

Mr. Gilbert Sasaki representing the Makakilo Community Association stated that at their community meeting, the membership voted in favor of the project, mainly because of the relocation of the quarry to another site.

The public hearing was closed, and the matter was deferred for a statutory period of 15 days, in accordance with the State Special Use Permit regulations, on motion by Mrs. Sullam, seconded by Mr. Bright and carried.

Noting the Director's recommendation for denial on the Conditional Use Permit for the quarry operation, Commissioner Bright questioned what conditions and control might be placed upon the Conditional Use Permit should the Commission consider to act favorably on it. The Director stated: "Since action cannot be taken for 15 days, and in light of some new information provided to us by the applicant, and we are seeking some further information, at that time we would have more specific recommendations to make to the Commission. This data is now becoming available only recently. Our position would be better outlined to the Commission at that time."

UNFINISHED BUSINESS  
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT  
HOUSING  
EWA BEACH  
FORT WEAVER ROAD  
HAWAII LABORER'S  
HOUSING CORPORATION  
(FILE #72/PDH-3)

The public hearing held on January 3, 1973 was kept open to permitt additional testimony from Ewa Beach Community Association, and to permit the architect to submit a revised site plan.

Discussion followed.

RAYMOND X. AKI: I represent the employees of Hawaii Laborer's Housing Corporation. At this time I would like to state that although our architect and the Planning Department has agreed on the scope of the plans, we, ourselves, are not satisfied with questions on the convenience, cost factors, the fire safety, et cetera. So, we would like to withdraw and then resubmit perhaps within the next 30 days.

CHAIRMAN: Fine, Mr. Aki. My understanding is once an application has been withdrawn, there is no necessity of continuing with a public hearing. We will look forward to reviewing your next application.

WAY: Mr. Chairman, would you close the public hearing since we had called a public hearing.

CHAIRMAN: To simplify matters, may I have a motion to close the public hearing.

(On motion by Mr. Creighton, seconded by Mrs. Sullam and carried, the public hearing was closed.)

UNFINISHED BUSINESS            The public hearing held January 3, 1973 was kept  
PUBLIC HEARING                open to permit residents the opportunity to engage  
A-2 APT. TO R-6                a consultant.  
RESIDENTIAL DIST.  
PUUNUI                         To the Chairman's call for testimony either for  
PLANNING DIRECTOR             or against the proposal, no one appeared.  
(FILE #72/Z-71)                The public hearing was closed, and the matter  
                                  was taken under advisement, on motion by Mr.  
                                  Bright, seconded by Mr. Kahawaiolaa and carried.

ACTION: The Commission adopted the Director's recommendation and recommended approval of the request, on motion by Mr. Bright, seconded by Mr. Kahawaiolaa and carried.

AYES     - Bright, Creighton, Kahawaiolaa, Sullam  
NAYES    - None  
ABSENT   - Crane, Yamabe  
ABSTAINED - Connell

\* \* \* \* \*

The Commission authorized the Planning Director to schedule public hearings for the following matter, on motion by Mr. Bright, seconded by Mr. Kahawaiolaa and carried:

GENERAL PLAN/DLUM            The request is to amend the General Plan  
AMENDMENT                    (Detailed Land Use Map) for Puuloa by redesignating a 4.7-acre parcel of land designated for  
RESIDENTIAL & ROAD           High School use and a 3.7-acre parcel of land  
USE TO SCHOOL USE           designated for Residential and Road use to School  
PUULOA                        use.  
EWA BEACH  
STATE OF HAWAII  
DEPT. OF ACCOUNTING  
& GENERAL SERVICES,  
DIVISION OF PUBLIC  
WORKS  
(FILE #195/C2/31)

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Henrietta B. Lyman".

Henrietta B. Lyman  
Secretary-Reporter II