START

Roll No. 31

Planning Commission Minutes

MAY 30, 1968 to NOVEMBER 20, 1969

Planning Department
City & County of Honolulu

FLASH NO. 1

PLANNING COMMISSION

INDEX TO MINUTES

MAY 30, 1968 TO NOVEMBER 14, 1968

BOOK NO. 124

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM:

May 30, 1968	Capital Budget Ordinance for Fiscal Year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969	16
June 13, 1968	Amendment to the C.I.P. for Fiscal Year 1967-68 (Supplementary No. 6)	33
Aug. 8, 1968	Amendment to the Capital Budget Ordinance and the C.I.P. for Fiscal Year 1968-69 (Supplementary No. 1)	128
Nov. 14, 1968	Amendment to the C.I.P. for Fiscal Year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969 (Supplementary No. 2)	306
Nov. 14, 1968	Sub-Committee of the Planning Commission	308

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:

May 30, 1968	Maunalua - Hawaii-Kai, Kuapa Isle (Private Community Recreational Center) Lewers and Cooke, Inc.	6
May 30, 1968	Waipio - Mililani Town - Private Recreational Center - Mililani Town, Inc.	15
June 13, 1968	Waipio - Mililani Town Private Recreational Center - Mililani Town, Inc.	24
June 13, 1968	Ewa Beach - 91-564 Pupu St. - Edward W. Enos	33
June 27, 1968	Ewa Beach - 91-564 Pupu Street - Mrs. Edward W. Enos - (Private Swimming Pool)	39
June 27, 1968	Waipio, Ewa - Off Kamehameha Highway - Airport use - State Department of Transportation	48
July 11, 1968	Waipio, Ewa - Kamehameha Highway, Honolulu side of road leading to Mililani Cemetery General Utility Airport - (State Department of Transportation)	52
July 25, 1968	Waipio, Ewa - East side of Kamehameha Highway, Honolulu side of the road leading to Mililani Cemetery - State Department of Transportation	85
Aug. 8, 1968	Waipio, Ewa - East side of Kamehameha Highway, Honolulu side of the road leading to Mililani Cemetery - State Department of Transportation	114
Aug. 22, 1968	Maunalua - Hawaii-Kai Marina, Unit 1-F - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development - By: Hong and Iwai, Attorneys at Law	141
Oct. 3, 1968	Maunalua - Hawaii-Kai Marina, Unit 1-F - Hawaii-Kai Drive (Private Recreational Center) Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	175
Oct. 17, 1968	Maunalua - Hawaii-Kai Marina, Unit 1-F - Hawaii-Kai Drive (Private Recreational Center) Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	221
Oct. 17, 1968	Ewa - Laupapa and Hanakahi Streets - Lewers and Cooke, Inc.	227
Oct. 31, 1968	Ewa - Laupapa and Hanakahi Streets - Lewers and Cooke, Inc.	245
Nov. 14, 1968	Kaonohi, Kalauao - Mauka of Moanalua Road, Ewa of Leeward Hospital (Off-Street Parking use)	306

FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAMS:

July 25, 1968	Makaha Interceptor Sewers, Section 2 - City and County - Dept. of Public Works	98
Aug. 8, 1968	City and County of Honolulu - Punanani Water Development Project	129
Aug. 8, 1968	State Department of Transportation Highways Division - Kahaluu Construction of Connection of Kahekili Highway to Kamehameha Highway	130
Aug. 22, 1968	State Department of Transportation Highways Division - Waiau Interchange Cane Haul Road Construction	142
Sept. 19, 1968	State Department of Transportation - New Wilson Bridge in Wahiawa	171

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN:

Aug. 22, 1968	Central Business District	141
Oct. 17, 1968	Central Business District	193
Oct. 17, 1968	Central Honolulu District (Makiki, Pawaa, Ala Moana) Planning Area No. 13	228
Oct. 31, 1968	(Planning Area No. 13) - Makiki-Pawaa-Ala Moana (Central Honolulu District)	258
Oct. 31, 1968	Central Business District	265
Nov. 14, 1968	Central Honolulu District (Makiki, Pawaa, Ala Moana)	292
Nov. 14, 1968	Central Business District	295

GENERAL PLAN AND/OR DETAILED LAND USE PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN (AMENDMENT):

May 30, 1968	Kailua to Waimanalo - Sewage Pump Station Sites	1
May 30, 1968	Ala Moana-Kewalo - Rycroft Street and Cedar Street	9
May 30, 1968	St. Louis Heights - Palolo - Hokulani School Expansion and Kamakini Street Extension	14
May 30, 1968	Waikiki-Diamond Head - Kalakaua and Kuhio Avenues, Park use	14
May 30, 1968	Laie Point - Naupaka Street - Park use	15
June 13, 1968	Waikiki - Kuhio Avenue, Olohana Street, and Kalakaua Avenue - Park and Recreational use	18
June 13, 1968	Laie Point - Naupaka Street - Park use	24
June 13, 1968	Ala Moana-Kewalo Rycroft Street and Cedar Street	30
June 13, 1968	St. Louis Heights-Palolo - Hokulani School Expansion and Kamakini Street Extension	32
June 27, 1968	Waikiki - Olohana Street between Kuhio and Kalakaua Avenues - Park and Recreational use	35
June 27, 1968	Ala Moana-Kewalo - Cedar Street Turnaround	46
June 27, 1968	Wahiawa - 231 Lehua Street Residential use - (Soon Yee Choi Song)	47
July 11, 1968	Wahiawa - 231 Lehua Street - Residential use - (Soon Yee Choi Song)	63
July 11, 1968	Aiea - Mauka of Moanalua Road, Diamond Head side of Aiea Stream - Commercial use (St. Timothy's Episcopal Church)	78
July 25, 1968	Aiea - Mauka of Moanalua Road, Diamond Head side of Aiea Stream (Adjacent to Aiea Shopping Center) Commercial use - St. Timothy's Episcopal Church	82

GENERAL PLAN AND/OR DLUP AND DP (AMENDMENT): (Cont'd)

July 25, 1968	St. Louis Heights-Palolo	96
July 25, 1968	University Community Plan - Farrington Street Closer at Wilder Ave.	99
July 25, 1968	St. Louis Heights-Palolo - Pooleka Street Extension Deletion; Ahe Place Widening	100
Aug. 8, 1968	University-Manoa Development Plan - Closing of Farrington Street at Wilder Avenue	104
Aug. 8, 1968	St. Louis Heights-Palolo - Hokulani School Expansion and Kamakini Street Extension	124
Aug. 22, 1968	St. Louis Heights-Palolo - Deletion of Pooleka Street Extension and Widening of Ahe Place	133
Aug. 22, 1968	Waianae - Makai of Farrington Highway in Proximity to Mauna Lahilahi Beach Park - Manoa Investment Co., et al - By: James Y. Shigemura, Attorney	142
Sept. 19, 1968	Waimanalo - Kalanianaole Hwy - Sewage Pump Station	172
Sept. 19, 1968	Kaneohe to Kualoa - Right-of-way width of Kamehameha Highway	172
Sept. 19, 1968	Waiawa to Halawa - Off Lipoa Place - Apartment use (Island Construction Co., Ltd.)	172
Oct. 3, 1968	Waimanalo - Kalanianaole Highway, East of Kahawai Stream - Sewage Pump Station Site	181
Oct. 3, 1968	Moanalua - Off Salt Lake Boulevard - Fire Station Site and Medium Density Apartment use	192
Oct. 17, 1968	Kalauao - Makai of Kamehameha Highway, Ewa of Kalauao Stream - Commercial, Medium Density and Low Density Apartment uses	206
Oct. 17, 1968	Waimanalo - Kalanianaole Highway, East of Kahawai Stream - Sewage Pump Station Site	219
Oct. 17, 1968	St. Louis Heights-Palolo - Deletion of Pooleka Street Extension and Widening of Ahe Place	226
Oct. 17, 1968	Kaneohe to Kualoa - Kaneohe-Heeia - Various Changes	228
Oct. 24, 1968	Waianae-Kai - Makai of Farrington Highway in Proximity to Mauna Lahilahi Beach Park (Resort-Hotel Use) - Manoa Investment Co., et al - By: James Shigemura, Attorney	230
Oct. 24, 1968	Moanalua - Off Salt Lake Boulevard (Medium Density Apartment use and Establishment of a Fire Station Site)	237
Oct. 24, 1968	Kaneohe-Heeia - Various Changes	252
Oct. 31, 1968	Kalauao - Makai side of Kamehameha Highway between Kalauao Stream and the Sewage Treatment Plant (Commercial, Medium and Low Density Apartment uses)	271
Nov. 14, 1968	Kaneohe-Heeia - Various Changes	286
Nov. 14, 1968	Kaneohe-Heeia - 45-773 Kamehameha Highway - Commercial use) Dr. M. Kagawa	305
Nov. 14, 1968	Kaonohi, Kalauao - Various Changes	305

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION:

June 27, 1968	Hauula, Koolauloa - 200-400 Feet Mauka of Kamehameha Highway - Urban District (Richard Routson and Haaheo Estate)	48
Sept. 19, 1968	Waipahu between Kunia Road and Waikele Gulch, Inland of H-1 Highway - Robinson Trusts and HSM Ventures (Urban District)	155
Oct. 3, 1968	Waipahu between Kunia Road and Waikele Gulch, Inland of H-1 Highway - Robinson Trusts and HSM Ventures (Urban District)	187
Nov. 14, 1968	Waimalu and Waiau (Bishop Estate and Bishop Trust Co.,--Austin Heirs) Urban District	299

MISCELLANEOUS:

June 13, 1968	Election of Officers	34
July 11, 1968	Time of Public Hearing	52
July 25, 1968	1968 Hawaii Congress of Planning Commissioners and Directors	102
July 25, 1968	Proposed Downtown Plan - Victor Gruen Associates	103
Aug. 8, 1968	Central Business District Presentation - Victor Gruen and Associates	131
Aug. 8, 1968	Passage of Comprehensive Zoning Code	131
Aug. 8, 1968	Temporary Relocation of Meeting Place	131
Aug. 8, 1968	Problems of Private Parks in Subdivisions	131
Oct. 3, 1968	Special Meeting on Thursday, October 24, 1968	192
Oct. 24, 1968	Meeting Date	244

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

May 30, 1968	General Plan DLUM (Amendment) - Kailua to Waimanalo Sewage Pump Station Sites	1
May 30, 1968	Zoning Apartment District C - Makiki - 1722 Makiki Street - Minoru Shigemura	3
May 30, 1968	Zoning Business - Waikiki, Kalakaua & Kaiulani Avenues - Princess Kaiulani Hotel Premises - Kokusai Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha	5
May 30, 1968	Conditional Use Permit - Maunalua - Hawaii-Kai - Kuapa Isle (Private Community Recreational Center) Lewers and Cooke, Inc.	6
May 30, 1968	General Plan Development Plan (Amendment) - Ala Moana - Kewalo, Rycroft Street and Cedar St.	9
June 13, 1968	General Plan DLUM (Amendment) - Waikiki, Kuhio Avenue, Olohana Street & Kalakaua Ave. - Park and Recreational use	18
June 13, 1968	General Plan DLUM for Laie to Kaaawa (Amendment) - Laie Point - Naupaka Street - Park use	24
June 13, 1968	Conditional Use Permit - Waipio - Mililani Town - Private Recreational Center - Mililani Town, Inc.	24
June 13, 1968	Zoning Business - Makiki - Off Kinau and Piikoi Streets - Ted K. Fujiyoshi, et al	28
June 27, 1968	General Plan DLUM (Amendment) - Waikiki - Olohana Street between Kuhio and Kalakaua Aves - Park and Recreational use	35
June 27, 1968	Conditional Use Permit - Ewa Beach - 91-564 Pupu Street - Mrs. Edward W. Enos - (Private Swimming Pool)	39

PUBLIC HEARINGS: (Cont'd)

June 27, 1968	Zoning Business - Kailua - South of Kailua Road, East of Hahani Street - Windward Plaza, Inc.	41
June 27, 1968	Amendment to the Subdivision Rules and Regulations of the City & County of Honolulu Relating to Street Names	42
July 11, 1968	Conditional Use Permit - Waipio, Ewa - Kamehameha Highway, Honolulu side of road leading to Millani Cemetery - General Utility Airport (State Department of Transportation)	52
July 11, 1968	General Plan DLUM (Amendment) - Wahiawa - 231 Lehua Street - Residential use (Soon Yee Choi Song)	63
July 11, 1968	Zoning General Industrial - Kalihi-Kai - Makai-Ewa Corner of Dillingham Blvd and Mokauea Street - Paul M. Brady	64
July 11, 1968	Zoning Apartment District B - Kalihi - 1531 and 1537 Kam IV Road - Estate of Rose H. Smith	65
July 11, 1968	Zoning Business - Waikiki - 2229 Kuhio Ave. - Benjamin Ayson, Sr.	66
July 11, 1968	Zoning Business - Waikiki - Diamond Head side of Seaside Avenue, between Kuhio and Kalakaua Avenues - Consolidated Amusement Co., Ltd.	69
July 11, 1968	Zoning Ordinance - Off Street Loading Requirements	73
July 25, 1968	General Plan DLUM (Amendment) - Aiea - Mauka of Moanalua Road, Diamond Head side of Aiea Stream (Adjacent to Aiea Shopping Center) Commercial use - St. Timothy's Episcopal Church	82
Aug. 8, 1968	General Plan (Amendment) - University-Manoa Development Plan - Closing of Farrington Street at Wilder Avenue	104
Aug. 8, 1968	Zoning Industrial - Kalihi-Kai - 1911 and 1917 Hau Street - Maguire Bearing Co., Ltd.	106
Aug. 8, 1968	Zoning Apartment District C - Kaneohe - Northeast Corner of Kahekili Highway and Keaahala Road - Hawaii Housing Authority	109
Aug. 8, 1968	Zoning Business - Heeia - Makai side of Kamehameha Highway - Star Markets, Ltd.	113
Aug. 22, 1968	General Plan Development Plan (Amendment) - St. Louis Heights - Palolo - Deletion of Pooleka Street Extension and Widening of Ahe Place	133
Aug. 22, 1968	Zoning Business, Apartment District B and Apartment District C - Waiawa - Kam Highway and Road leading to Manana Capehart Housing - Easy Appliance Properties, Ltd. - By: George T. Nakamura, Attorney	136
Aug. 22, 1968	Zoning Class A-1 Residential - Makiki - 2028 Makiki Street - L. D. Haxton, et al	138
Sept. 19, 1968	Zoning Ordinance Amendment to Chapter 21, Article 1	144
Sept. 19, 1968	Zoning Apartment District C - Pacific Heights - 1901-1901-A - Pacific Heights Road - Shigeichi Nakamura	145
Sept. 19, 1968	Zoning Apartment District C - Makiki - 1825 Poki Street - William Y. M. Chinn	146
Sept. 19, 1968	Zoning Apartment District B - Palolo - 1238 Palolo Avenue - Robert Au	147

PUBLIC HEARINGS: (Cont'd)

Sept. 19, 1968	Zoning Business - Pearl City - 921 Kamehameha Highway - Waipahu Garage, Ltd.	147
Sept. 19, 1968	Zoning Class A-1 Residential - Makiki - Makiki Street and Round Top Drive - L. D. Haxton, et al	148
Oct. 3, 1968	Conditional Use Permit - Maunalua - Hawaii-Kai Marina, Unit 1-F - Hawaii-Kai Drive (Private Recreational Center) Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	175
Oct. 3, 1968	General Plan DLUM (Amendment) - Waimanalo - Kalanianaole Highway, East of Kahawai Stream - Sewage Pump Station Site	181
Oct. 3, 1968	Zoning Business - Waianae - Farrington Highway and Lualualei Naval Road - Nakatani Enterprises, Inc.	183
Oct. 3, 1968	Zoning Business - Maili - 87-860 Farrington Highway - Ah Hoon Dang	185
Oct. 17, 1968	General Plan DLUM - Central Business District	193
Oct. 17, 1968	General Plan DLUM (Amendment) - Kalauao - Makai of Kamehameha Highway, Ewa of Kalauao Stream - Commercial, Medium Density and Low Density Apt. uses	206
Oct. 17, 1968	Zoning Business - Waikiki - Royal Hawaiian Ave, Kuhio Ave, Seaside Ave and Waikolu Way - Jaimiee Rich, et al	209
Oct. 17, 1968	Zoning Apartment District B - Palolo - 1216 Palolo Ave. - Howard Chun	213
Oct. 17, 1968	Zoning Resort-Hotel District No. 1 - Makaha - 84-325 Makau Street - Mrs. Mahealani J. Fernandez	214
Oct. 17, 1968	General Plan DLUM (Amendment) - Waimanalo - Kalanianaole Hwy, East of Kahawai Stream Sewage Pump Station Site	219
Oct. 24, 1968	General Plan DLUM of Waianae (Amendment) - Waianae-Kai - Makai of Farrington Highway in Proximity to Mauna Lahilahi Beach Park (Resort-Hotel use) Manoa Investment Co., et al By: James Shigemura, Attorney	230
Oct. 24, 1968	General Plan and DLUM of Aliamanu-Salt Lake (Amendment) Moanalua off Salt Lake Boulevard (Medium Density Apartment use and Establishment of a Fire Station Site)	237
Oct. 24, 1968	Zoning Business - Kapahulu - 2848 Kihei Place - Davenroy Drycleaners - By: Richard H. F. Yee, General Manager	238
Oct. 24, 1968	Zoning Business - Waikiki - Prince Edward Street and Koa Avenue - Kahili Hotel, et al	239
Oct. 24, 1968	Zoning Apartment District C - Palolo - 3324 Sierra Drive - Edward R. Aotani	242
Oct. 31, 1968	Conditional Use Permit - Ewa - Laupapa and Hanakahi Streets - Lewers and Cooke, Inc.	245
Oct. 31, 1968	Zoning Class A, A-1 & AA Res. - Maunalua - Hawaii-Kai Development - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	248
Oct. 31, 1968	Zoning Business - Kalauao - 99-298 Kamehameha Highway - Miyasato Properties	250
Oct. 31, 1968	Zoning Business - Kaneohe-Heeia - Kamehameha Hwy & Lilipuna Road - T. F. McCormack, et al	251

PUBLIC HEARINGS: (Cont'd)

Oct. 31, 1968	General Plan DLUM (Amend) - Kaneohe-Heeia - Various Changes	252
Oct. 31, 1968	General Plan DLUM and DP (Planning Area No. 13) - Makiki-Pawaa-Ala Moana (Central Honolulu District)	258
Oct. 31, 1968	General Plan DLUM - Central Business District	265
Nov. 14, 1968	Zoning Apartment District C - Pauoa between Auwaiolimu Street and Puowaina Drive - R. Hollinger	275
Nov. 14, 1968	Zoning Business - Waikiki - 337 Royal Hawaiian Avenue - Dr. Donald W. Hewitt	276
Nov. 14, 1968	Zoning Resort-Hotel District No. 1 - Laie - 55-289 Kamehameha Highway - Theresa K. Malani and Woodrow W. Miggs	278
Nov. 14, 1968	Zoning Class A-2 Residential - Waipahu between Waipahu Street and H-1 Highway - Oahu Sugar Co., Ltd.	280
Nov. 14, 1968	Amendment to the Subdivision Rules and Regulations, Sections 10-M and 10-N	282
Nov. 14, 1968	General Plan DLUM of Kaneohe to Kualoa (Amend) Kaneohe-Heeia - Various Changes	286
Nov. 14, 1968	General DLUM and DP - Central Honolulu District (Makiki, Pawaa, Ala Moana)	292

STREET NAMES:

May 30, 1968	Street Naming Policy	15
May 30, 1968	Puuloa, Ewa - Ewa Estates, Unit I Subdivision	15
May 30, 1968	Honouliuli, Ewa, Makakilo City, Unit 13 Subdivision	15
June 13, 1968	Hauula - Keneula Subdivision	33
June 27, 1968	Amendment to the Subdivision Rules and Regulations of the City and County of Honolulu relating to Street Naming Policy	42
June 27, 1968	Koolaupoko, Kailua and Kaneohe - Kainalu Park Subdivision	49
June 27, 1968	Kaneohe - Mahinui Estates Subdivision	49
June 27, 1968	Puuloa, Ewa - Ewa Estates, Unit I	50
June 27, 1968	Waianae - Waianae Kai	50
June 27, 1968	Nuuanu - Nuuanu Valley Park Tract Subdivision	51
July 25, 1968	Pearl City - Momilani Suburb, Unit VIII and Manana Unit 2 Subdivision	100
Sept. 19, 1968	Kaneohe Bay View Estates Subdivision	173
Oct. 17, 1968	Haleiwa, Waialua - "Kaika Place"	228
Oct. 17, 1968	Maunalua, Hawaii-Kai - Koko Isle Condominium	228
Oct. 17, 1968	Moanalua - Moanalua Hillside Apartments	228
Oct. 31, 1968	Maunalua - Hawaii-Kai - Kamilonui Agricultural Subdivision	273
Oct. 31, 1968	Pearl City, Ewa - Momilani Suburb, Unit X Subdivision	273
Oct. 31, 1968	Waipio, Ewa - Waipio Heights Subdivision, Unit 2 (Crestview)	273
Oct. 31, 1968	Pearl City, Ewa - Momilani Suburb, Unit VIII Deletion of "Hookani Street"	274
Nov. 14, 1968	Heeia, Kahaluu - Ahuimanu Units 1-B, 2 & 3 Subdivision	306

SUBDIVISION RULES AND REGULATIONS:

June 27, 1968	Amendment to the Subdivision Rules and Regulations of the City and County of Honolulu relating to Street Names	42
Oct. 24, 1968	Amendment to the Subdivision Rules and Regulations relating to lot area and lot width	244
Nov. 14, 1968	Amendment to the Subdivision Rules and Regulations, Sections 10-M and 10-N	282

ZONING - APARTMENT DISTRICT B:

June 27, 1968	Kalihi - 1531 and 1537 Kam IV Road - Estate of Rose H. Smith	47
July 11, 1968	Kalihi - 1531 and 1537 Kam IV Road - Estate of Rose H. Smith	65
July 25, 1968	Waiawa - Kamehameha Highway and Road leading to Manana Capehart Housing - Easy Appliance Properties, Ltd.	100
Aug. 8, 1968	Palolo - 1238 Palolo Avenue - Robert Au	131
Aug. 22, 1968	Waiawa - Kam Highway and Road leading to Manana Capehart Housing - Easy Appliance Properties, Ltd. - By: George T. Nakamura, Attorney	136
Sept. 19, 1968	Palolo - 1238 Palolo Avenue - Robert Au	147
Sept. 19, 1968	Palolo - 1216 Palolo Avenue - Howard Chun	173
Oct. 17, 1968	Palolo - 1216 Palolo Avenue - Howard Chun	213

ZONING - APARTMENT DISTRICT C:

May 30, 1968	Makiki - 1722 Makiki St. - Minoru Shigemura	3
July 25, 1968	Kaneohe - Makai-Kahuku - Corner of Kahekili Highway and Keaahala Road - Hawaii Housing Authority	99
July 25, 1968	Waiawa - Kamehameha Highway and Road leading to Manana Capehart Housing - Easy Appliance Properties, Ltd.	100
Aug. 8, 1968	Kaneohe - Northeast corner of Kahekili Highway and Keaahala Road - Hawaii Housing Authority	109
Aug. 8, 1968	1825 Poki Street - William Y. M. Chinn - By: Kenneth W. Wong, Broker	131
Aug. 8, 1968	Pacific Heights - 1901-1901-A - Pacific Heights Road - Shigeichi Nakamura - By: T. C. Yim	131
Aug. 22, 1968	Waiawa - Kam Highway and Road leading to Manana Capehart Housing - Easy Appliance Properties, Ltd. - By: George T. Nakamura, Attorney	136
Sept. 19, 1968	Pacific Heights - 1901-1901-A Pacific Heights Road - Shigeichi Nakamura	145
Sept. 19, 1968	Makiki - 1825 Poki Street - William Y. M. Chinn	146
Oct. 3, 1968	Palolo - 3324 Sierra Drive - Edward R. Aotani	191
Oct. 24, 1968	Palolo - 3324 Sierra Drive - Edward R. Aotani	242
Oct. 24, 1968	Pauoa - Puowaina Drive and Auwaiolimu Street - Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Hollinger	243
Nov. 14, 1968	Pauoa - Between Auwaiolimu Street and Puowaina Drive - R. Hollinger	275

ZONING BUSINESS:

May 30, 1968	Waikiki - Kalakaua and Kaiulani Avenues - Princess Kaiulani Hotel Premises - Kokusai Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha	5
May 30, 1968	Makiki - Off Piikoi and Kinau Streets - Ted K. Fujiyoshi	15
June 13, 1968	Makiki - Off Kinau and Piikoi Streets - Ted K. Fujiyoshi, et al	28
June 13, 1968	Kailua - South of Kailua Road and East of Hahani Street - Windward Plaza, Inc.	33
June 27, 1968	Kailua - South of Kailua Road, East of Hahani Street - Windward Plaza, Inc.	41
June 27, 1968	Waikiki - 2229 Kuhio Ave. - Benjamin Ayson, Sr.	48
June 27, 1968	Waikiki - Seaside Avenue between Kuhio and Kalakaua Aves. - Consolidated Amusement Co., Ltd.	48
July 11, 1968	Waikiki - 2229 Kuhio Ave. - Benjamin Ayson, Sr.	66
July 11, 1968	Waikiki - Diamond Head side of Seaside Avenue, between Kuhio and Kalakaua Avenues - Consolidated Amusement Co., Ltd.	69
July 25, 1968	Waikiki - 2229 Kuhio Avenue - Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin Ayson, Sr.	89
July 25, 1968	Waikiki - Diamond Head side of Seaside Avenue, between Kuhio and Kalakaua Avenues - Consolidated Amusement Co., Ltd. By: Morio Omori, Attorney	90
July 25, 1968	Heeia - Makai side of Kamehameha Highway, near Honey's Star Market, Ltd.	99
July 25, 1968	Waiawa - Kamehameha Highway and Road leading to Manana Capehart Housing - Easy Appliance Properties, Ltd.	100
Aug. 8, 1968	Heeia - Makai side of Kamehameha Highway - Star Markets, Ltd.	113
Aug. 8, 1968	Waikiki - 2229 Kuhio Avenue - Benjamin Ayson, Sr.	121
Aug. 22, 1968	Waiawa - Kam Highway and Road leading to Manana Capehart Housing - Easy Appliance Properties, Ltd. - By: George T. Nakamura, Attorney	136
Aug. 22, 1968	Pearl City - 921 Kamehameha Highway - Waipahu Garage, Ltd. - By: Wallace T. Mikami, Secretary-Manager	141
Aug. 22, 1968	Waianae - 87-2070 Farrington Highway - Nakatani Enterprises, Inc.	141
Aug. 22, 1968	Maili - 87-860 Farrington Highway - Ah Hoon Dang By: Richard Kageyama	141
Sept. 19, 1968	Pearl City - 921 Kamehameha Highway - Waipahu Garage, Ltd.	147
Sept. 19, 1968	Waikiki - Royal Hawaiian Avenue, Kuhio Avenue, Seaside Avenue and Waikolu Way - Benjamin Ayson, Sr., et al	172
Oct. 3, 1968	Waianae - Farrington Highway and Lualualei Naval Road - Nakatani Enterprises, Inc.	183
Oct. 3, 1968	Maili - 87-860 Farrington Highway - Ah Hoon Dang	185
Oct. 3, 1968	Kapahulu - 2848 Kihei Place - Davenroy Drycleaners	191
Oct. 3, 1968	Waikiki - Koa Avenue and Prince Edward Street - Kahili Hotel, Ltd.	192
Oct. 17, 1968	Waikiki - Royal Hawaiian Avenue, Kuhio Avenue, Seaside Avenue and Waikolu Way - Jaimiee Rich, et al	209

ZONING BUSINESS: (Cont'd)

Oct. 17, 1968	Kaneohe-Heeia - Kamehameha Highway and Lilipuna Road - Bishop Estate, et al and Dev: T. F. McCormack	227
Oct. 17, 1968	Kalauao - 99-298 Kamehameha Highway - Miyasato Properties	227
Oct. 24, 1968	Kapahulu - 2848 Kihei Place - Davenroy Drycleaners - By: Richard H. F. Yee, General Manager	238
Oct. 24, 1968	Waikiki - Prince Edward Street and Koa Avenue - Kahili Hotel, et al	239
Oct. 24, 1968	Waikiki - 337 Royal Hawaiian Avenue - Donald W. Hewitt and Budget Rent-A-Car of Hawaii - By: Morio Omori, Attorney	244
Oct. 31, 1968	Kalauao - 99-298 Kamehameha Highway - Miyasato Properties	250
Oct. 31, 1968	Kaneohe-Heeia - Kamehameha Highway and Lilipuna Road - T. F. McCormack, et al	251
Nov. 14, 1968	Waikiki - 337 Royal Hawaiian Avenue - Dr. Donald W. Hewitt	276
Nov. 14, 1968	Makaha - Hana and Orange Streets - Ann Leung Lau	305
Nov. 14, 1968	Waianae - 87-282 Farrington Highway - David Awong	305

ZONING - CLASS A RESIDENTIAL:

July 11, 1968	Maunalua - Off Lunalilo Home Road - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	79
July 25, 1968	Maunalua - Off Lunalilo Home Road in Hawaii-Kai	95
Oct. 3, 1968	Maunalua - Off Lunalilo Home Road - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	192
Oct. 31, 1968	Maunalua - Hawaii-Kai Development - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	248
Nov. 14, 1968	Maunalua - Off Lunalilo Home Road - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	295

ZONING - CLASS A-1 RESIDENTIAL:

July 25, 1968	Makiki - 2028 Makiki Street - L. D. Haxton, et al	100
Aug. 22, 1968	Makiki - 2028 Makiki Street - L. D. Haxton, et al	138
Sept. 19, 1968	Makiki - Makiki Street and Round Top Drive - L. D. Haxton, etal	148
Oct. 3, 1968	Makiki - 2028 Makiki Street - L. D. Haxton, et al	186
Oct. 3, 1968	Maunalua - Off Lunalilo Home Road - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	192
Oct. 17, 1968	Makiki - 2028 Makiki Street - L. D. Haxton, et al	224
Oct. 31, 1968	Maunalua - Hawaii-Kai Development - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	248
Nov. 14, 1968	Maunalua - Off Lunalilo Home Road - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	295

ZONING - CLASS A-2 RESIDENTIAL:

July 11, 1968	Maunalua - Off Lunalilo Home Road - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	79
July 25, 1968	Maunalua - Off Lunalilo Home Road in Hawaii-Kai	95
Oct. 24, 1968	Waipahu - Makai of the Interstate Highway - Oahu Sugar Company, Ltd.	244
Nov. 14, 1968	Waipahu - Between Waipahu Street and H-1 Highway - Oahu Sugar Company, Limited	280

ZONING - CLASS AA RESIDENTIAL:

Oct. 3, 1968	Maunalua - Off Lunalilo Home Road - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	192
Oct. 31, 1968	Maunalua - Hawaii-Kai Development - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	248
Nov. 14, 1968	Maunalua - Off Lunalilo Home Road - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	295

ZONING- GENERAL INDUSTRIAL:

June 27, 1968	Kalihi-Kai - Makai-Ewa Corner of Dillingham Blvd and Mokauea Street - Paul M. Brady	47
July 11, 1968	Kalihi-Kai - Makai-Ewa Corner of Dillingham Blvd and Mokauea Street - Paul M. Brady	64
July 25, 1968	Kalihi-Kai - 1911 and 1917 Hau Street - Maguire Bearing Company, Ltd.	99
Aug. 8, 1968	Kalihi-Kai - 1911 and 1917 Hau Street - Maguire Bearing Company, Ltd.	106

ZONING ORDINANCE:

June 13, 1968	Proposed Amendment relating to Off-Street Loading and Unloading areas	34
June 27, 1968	Off-Street Loading requirements	48
July 11, 1968	Off-Street Loading requirements	73
July 25, 1968	Off-Street Loading requirements	94
Aug. 22, 1968	(Ordinance No. 3234) Comprehensive Zoning Code	142
Sept. 19, 1968	Amendment to Chapter 21, Article 1	144

ZONING - RESORT-HOTEL DISTRICT NO. 1:

June 13, 1968	Makaha - Makau Street, Approximately 210 feet makai of Farrington Highway - Mrs. Mahealani Jones Fernandez, et al	33
Oct. 17, 1968	Makaha - 84-325 Makau Street - Mrs. Mahealani J. Fernandez	214
Oct. 24, 1968	Laie - 55-289 Kamehameha Highway - Mrs. Theresa K. Malani and Mr. Woodrow W. Miggs - By: Robert K. Fukuda, Attorney	244
Nov. 14, 1968	Laie - 55-289 Kamehameha Highway - Theresa K. Malani and Woodrow W. Miggs	278

ZONING - MISCELLANEOUS - CEMETERY USE:

July 25, 1968	Nuuanu - Mauka side of Judd Street, Midway between Nuuanu Avenue and Apio Lane - Samuro Ichinose	97

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
May 30, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, May 30, 1968, at 2:10 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Thomas N. Yamabe II presiding:

PRESENT:

Thomas N. Yamabe II, Chairman
Philip T. Chun
Robert L. Muller (present from 4:00 p.m.)
Arthur A. Rutledge (excused at 3:30 p.m.)
Richard K. Sharpless
Fred K. Kwock, ex-officio

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director
Denis Leong, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Edward Brennan
Cyril W. Lemmon
Robert F. Ellis, ex-officio

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
KAILUA TO
WAIMANALO
SEWAGE PUMP
STATION SITES

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend portions of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map for Kailua, Lanikai, Maunawili and Waimanalo by designating areas for sewage pump stations in Lanikai and Kailua as follows:

a. Aala Drive Sewage Pump Station, Lanikai, Oahu

A parcel of land containing 11,250 sq. ft., situated at the northwesterly corner of Mokulua and Aala Drives, covered by Tax Map Key 4-3-05: Parcel 1.

b. Alala Point Sewage Pump Station, Lanikai, Oahu

A parcel of land containing 13,560 sq. ft., situated on the mauka side of Mokulua Drive between Aalapapa and Kaelepulu Drives, covered by Tax Map Key 4-3-08: Parcel 27.

c. Coconut Grove Sewage Pump Station, Kailua, Oahu

A parcel of land containing 6,000 sq. ft., situated on the north corner of Kihapai and Hooulu Streets, covered by Tax Map Key 4-3-65: Parcel 36.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of May 19, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to 18 adjoining property owners, and to the various community and civic groups in the Kailua-Lanikai area. No written comments or protests have been received to date.

The Director explained the request of the Department of Public Works to have the three sites designated on the General Plan as sewage pump station sites in

order that construction of the pump stations can proceed. All of the sites have already been acquired. He gave the estimated cost of the stations as follows:

Alala Point (13,560 sq. ft.)

Engineering and Construction, 1969/70--	$251,000
Engineering and Construction, 1970/71--	12,000
Inspection, 1971/72----------	3,000
Total:	$266,000

Aala Drive (11,250 sq. ft.)

Acquisition and Planning, 1970/71------	$ 35,000
Engineering and Construction, 1971/72--	191,000
Inspection, 1972/73----------	8,000
Total:	$234,000

Coconut Grove (6,000 sq. ft.)

Acquisition and Planning, 1970/71------	$ 45,000
Engineering and Construction, 1972/73--	295,000
Inspection, 1973/74----------	4,000
Total:	$344,000

Mr. Chew Lum Lau from the Division of Sewers was present and in reply to questions from the Commission stated that:

1. The Alala Point station site has an old dwelling on the lot but the other two lots are vacant.

2. The Coconut Grove lot was acquired in 1962 at a cost of $10,475; the Aala Drive lot in 1958, at $13,200; and the Alala Point lot in January of this year at $25,755.

3. They do attempt to blend the station with the surrounding neighborhood through landscaping so that the quality of the neighborhood would not be lowered.

4. The two station sites in Lanikai are about 3,000 feet apart. The stations are located in relation to the areas they are to serve. In residential areas, the stations are generally closer together because of the smaller trunk lines and the greater slope of the pipes.

When questioned whether it is a common practice of the Chief Engineer's Office to acquire the land prior to having it designated on the General Plan for sewage pump station purpose, Mr. Lau stated that starting next year, his office will request that the land to be acquired for a pump station be designated for this purpose before acquisition is made. He noted that there are one or two stations which are in the process of being acquired. Generally, they

select an area which is vacant. He indicated that it is not a simple matter to select an area for a pump station, have the land use designation changed, then acquire the site. After engineering studies are made, if the site selected is not suitable, then they must go through the whole process of selecting another site and having the land use designation changed before they can acquire the site. He felt that they would meet more opposition when attempting to have the land use designation changed first instead of proceeding with the present method of acquiring the land first then having the land use designation changed.

The Chairman suggested to the Director that he meet with the Public Works Department to see whether or not some solution can be found to the problem cited by Mr. Lau.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposals.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Sharpless, seconded by Mr. Chun, voted to close the public hearing and to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to portions of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map for Kailua, Lanikai, Maunawili and Waimanalo by designating the three subject parcels for sewage pump station purposes. (Mr. Muller was not present during this public hearing).

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING APARTMENT
DISTRICT C
MAKIKI
1722 MAKIKI ST.
MINORU SHIGEMURA

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District C for the rear portion of a parcel of land at 1722 Makiki Street, situated on the ewa side of Makiki Street between Heulu and Dominis Street in Makiki, identified by Tax Map Key 2-4-24: portion of Parcel 13, in conformity with the adopted General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu. Presently, the front portion of 13,500 sq. ft. is zoned Hotel and Apartment while the back portion of 6,168 sq. ft. is zoned Class A Residential.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of May 19, 1968, was read by the Director who reported that copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, and to the Central Honolulu Community Association.

He read the letter received from Mr. Henry A. Wicke of 1419 Dominis Street, owner of a 20,000 sq. ft. parcel in the immediate area. Mr. Wicke reiterated the same position taken by him many times in the past, that any proposed change in zoning for this area of Makiki mauka of the present Hotel and Apartment zoning boundary should be Hotel and Apartment zoning and not Apartment District C as proposed. He felt it illogical to have one-third of the lot zoned as Apartment District C and the other two-thirds as Hotel and Apartment district.

He noted that the utilities (water and sewer) in the area are more than adequate to take care of the needs generated by the Hotel and Apartment zoning.

The Director pointed out on the map the subject property and the present boundary of the Hotel and Apartment District created many years ago by taking the first 100 feet depth of properties fronting the streets. As a result, the first 100 feet of this property is zoned Hotel and Apartment while the back portion of about 40 to 48 feet is zoned Class A Residential. A previous request for rezoning was denied on the basis that sewer facilities were not adequate. The Chief Engineer has now reported that for rezoning purposes, sewers can be assumed to be adequate on the basis that the Makiki Street Relief Sewer Project will be completed within three months. The Board of Water Supply has reported that its facilities in this area are adequate to serve the proposed use. Makiki Street fronting this property has a right-of-way width of 56 feet with a pavement width of 36 feet in good condition. The Department of Public Works has recommended that sidewalks be constructed along the lot frontage in compliance with Ordinance No. 2412, as amended.

The permissible floor area ratio is 200% under the Hotel and Apartment zoning while it is 100% under the Apartment District C zoning. According to the development plan submitted, a 5-story, 30-unit apartment structure with 30 off-street parking areas is to be constructed on the property. The proposal complies with the floor area ratio allowable under the combined zoning classifications. Presently, there is a single family residential dwelling on the lot.

Mr. Henry Wicke, whose letter was read, stated that he is strongly in favor of having the remainder of this area designated for hotel and apartment uses to erase the present inconsistent zoning boundaries.

When questioned about the parking situation in the area, Mr. Wicke stated that it is quite serious because during school hours, Punahou School students park their cars in the area. There definitely is insufficient parking. He felt that any apartment development should make provisions for sufficient parking areas on the lot.

No one spoke in support of the proposed rezoning.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Sharpless. (Mr. Muller was not present during the public hearing.)

The Commission discussed this matter later and was informed by the Director that Nehoa Street is the dividing line between the single family residential and apartment uses. In working with the community association, the majority felt that this area immediately makai of Nehoa Street should be low density rather than medium density apartment uses

because of its close proximity to the residential area. The density would then be graduated to medium density then high density. Until such time as the Detailed Land Use Maps for the City of Honolulu are completed, he did not believe that Mr. Wicke's suggestion to zone the entire area to Hotel and Apartment should be accepted. The two different zoning on the property should be corrected, but he indicated that the owner of the property expressed no objection and is willing to adjust the floor area ratio accordingly. Later, after adoption of the Comprehensive Zoning Code and in reviewing the zoning district boundaries, proper adjustments will be made. He believed that there are only about two properties in the immediate area having the same condition of dual zoning on the property.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Sharpless, recommended approval of the change in zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District C for the rear portion of a parcel of land at 1722 Makiki Street. (Mr. Rutledge was not present at this time.)

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
WAIKIKI
KALAKAUA AND
KAIULANI AVENUES
PRINCESS KAIULANI
HOTEL PREMISES
KOKUSAI KOGYO
KABUSHIKI KAISHA

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business for the rear portion of a parcel of land situated at the mauka-ewa corner of Kalakaua and Kaiulani Avenues in Waikiki, same being the premises of the Princess Kaiulani Hotel, identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-22: portion of Parcel 1, in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Waikiki-Diamond Head, Section A. Presently, the first 110 feet of the property fronting on Kalakaua Avenue is zoned Business while the remaining portion of about 142,380 sq. ft. is zoned Hotel and Apartment.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of May 19, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies and to the various community and civic organizations in the Waikiki and Diamond Head areas. No written comments or protests have been received to date.

The Director pointed out the existing business and hotel-apartment zoning boundaries of this section of Waikiki and noted that the interior section of the hotel premises is the only area in this block still zoned Hotel and Apartment District. The proposed zoning to business is in conformity with the recently adopted Detailed Land Use Plan for Waikiki which designates the entire hotel premises for resort-commercial uses. The owner proposes to make alterations and additions to the existing hotel. An existing parking garage in the back is presently being enlarged and it will contain a total of 420 parking stalls. This is double the capacity of the present garage. There are business shops and the Wax Museum fronting on Kalakaua Avenue. Water and sewer facilities are adequate to serve the area.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Shiro Kashiwa, attorney, representing the owner, stated that the existing party house is to be demolished and an addition to the hotel made. He indicated that under the present hotel and apartment zoning, the addition cannot be made because of restriction on setback requirements and certain building code requirements. For that reason, a variance had to be obtained from the present setback requirement to construct additional floors to the existing multi-deck parking structure which was constructed right at the property boundary. An adjacent parking structure within a business zone is built right up to the property line so that placement of a 10-foot setback area in compliance with existing regulations above the third floor of the hotel's parking structure seems unreasonable. He pointed out that within this block, this is the only area still in Hotel and Apartment zoning, and he requested approval of the rezoning in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Plan for this Waikiki area.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Sharpless, seconded by Mr. Chun, closed the public hearing and voted to recommend approval of the change in zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business for the rear portion of the Princess Kaiulani Hotel premises situated at the mauka-ewa corner of Kalakaua and Kaiulani Avenues in Waikiki. (Mr. Muller was not present during this public hearing.)

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT
MAUNALUA
HAWAII-KAI
KUAPA ISLE
(PRIVATE COMMUNITY
RECREATIONAL
CENTER)
LEWERS AND COOKE,
INC.

Pursuant to the provisions of Ordinance Nos. 2423 and 2447, a public hearing was held to consider an application by Lewers and Cooke, Inc., for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction and operation of a private community recreational center within the proposed Kuapa Isle condominium development situated on the Koko Head side of Hawaii-Kai Drive, in the Kuapa Pond area, at Hawaii-Kai, Maunalua, and identified by Tax Map Key 3-9-08, within an Unrestricted Residential District.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of May 19, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to Bishop Estate, the Koko Head Farm Bureau Center, and to the various community associations in the Koko Head and Hawaii-Kai areas. No letters of comment or protest have been received. Although the office has not received the letter as yet, the Director reported on the request of the Koko Head Farm Bureau Center to withdraw a letter sent earlier.

The Director explained the request by pointing out the project site situated at the southwesterly portion of Kuapa Isle within the condominium development. As shown on the Detailed Land Use Map displayed, the island extends into Kuapa Pond with a waterway running through the center of the island. The recreational center will be accessible from the

other portion of the island via a foot bridge across the waterway. The center will consist of a two-story pavilion type clubhouse containing a total floor area of approximately 6,700 sq. ft. and extending 90 feet into the waterway, a swimming pool, and boat docking and storage areas. The clubhouse will be open from 8:00 a.m. to about 9:00 or 10:00 p.m. There will be a managing agent to enforce proper conduct at the community center. This center is for the exclusive use of the residents of Kuapa Isle condominium development and their guests and it is to be a part of the common element of the condominium development so that its operation and enforcement will be governed by the condominium owners' association.

The condominium development will consist of 117 two-story duplex family dwellings for a total of 234 units. Since the community center use is compatible with the overall marina type residential development in the area and conforms to the objectives of the General Plan, the Director recommended approval of the request but with the attachment of the following conditions:

1. The development plan submitted with the application shall be made a part of the permit and the development of the recreational center shall conform substantially to said plan except as indicated below.

2. A 6-foot high fence shall be installed with adequate plant materials adjacent to said fence to preserve and protect the adjoining residential uses from adverse effect of the recreational center.

3. The placement of buildings and yard spacing, as well as the schedule and extent of operation shall be in conformance with the best interests of the surrounding residential properties and neighborhood.

4. The entire premises, including the building, fencing, parking area, boat launching ramp, the pool and other improvements and facilities shall be maintained in an attractive condition, harmonious and compatible with the surrounding residential character.

5. The Planning Director or the Planning Commission may impose additional conditions necessary for the protection of persons using the facilities of the center and/or the occupants of adjacent residential properties; and

6. After the issuance of the conditional use permit, the City Council may, at any time, upon finding that any of the conditions imposed are not being complied with by the applicant, authorize the Planning Director or the Planning Commission to revoke the permit or to suspend such operation until compliance with said conditions is obtained.

The Director stated that the required number of parking spaces for the community center was not specified but the developer has indicated that 38 stalls would be set aside. The new set of plans submitted showing the details of the community center project and its parking areas will be made a part of the permit so that development must conform generally to that plan. He believed that the number of stalls set aside should be sufficient because the center is within easy walking distance from the apartment units. Invited guests may be utilizing those spaces.

In reply to questions from the Commission, the Director indicated that the fence around the community center is mainly for protection and to better control the hours of operation. The applicant was apprised of the conditions to be imposed with the permit and has accepted the conditions.

No one spoke in opposition to the application.

Mr. James Funakoshi, attorney for the applicant, stated that prior to the hearing, he was informed of the conditions to be imposed and the applicant is agreeable to those conditions including the requirement for a 6-foot fence.

Mr. Grant Harrington, project manager for Lewers and Cooke, was questioned by the Commission. He stated that the plan shows 36 parking spaces for the community center. This is in addition to guest parking spaces provided for each unit of the condominium development. The farthest walking distance to the clubhouse is about 1,200 feet; therefore, some parking spaces have been provided at the center. The center is to be maintained as a part of the condominium landscaping and building maintenance fee covering the entire project. No commercial or restaurant operation is to be conducted on the premises. He believed that the conditional use ordinance does not permit this type of operation.

The Director confirmed that commercial operations would not be permitted under the zoning ordinance.

<u>ACTION</u>: The Commission voted to close the public hearing and to recommend approval to grant a Conditional Use Permit to the applicant to construct and operate a private community recreational center within the Kuapa Isle condominium development situated on the Koko Head side of Hawaii-Kai Drive at Hawaii-Kai, Maunalua, with the attachment of the six conditions mentioned by the Director, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Rutledge. (Mr. Muller was not present during this public hearing.)

PUBLIC HEARING GENERAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN (AMENDMENT) ALA MOANA-KEWALO RYCROFT STREET AND CEDAR STREET

A public hearing continued from May 16, 1968, was held to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the Development Plan for the Ala Moana-Kewalo section, street pattern, as follows:

1. Rycroft Street between Sheridan and Keeaumoku Streets:

   To delete the street widening setback on the makai side of Rycroft Street and establish a 16-foot setback on the mauka side.

2. Cedar Street makai of Rycroft Street:

   To reduce the radius of the turn-around at the makai end of Cedar Street to 8 feet and reduce the street extension by approximately 20 feet.

The Commission had continued the hearing to obtain additional information regarding the rationale under which the decision was made to show a taking entirely from only the mauka side of Rycroft Street and to visit the site. Through a Committee Report from the City Council's Committee on Public Works, the Planning Department was directed to incorporate the proposed amendments on the Development Plan for the Ala Moana-Kewalo section.

Mr. William Ling from the Department of Public Works again explained to the Commission how the changes were initiated. He stated that at the public hearing held by the City Council to consider the Sheridan Tract Improvement District project, certain comments were made together with the filing of several letters by the affected property owners. These communications were referred to the Public Works Committee of the City Council and the Committee without any recommendation from the Department of Public Works decided to make the changes now under consideration by adopting Committee Report No. 780 dated April 16, 1968, which instructed the Planning Department to incorporate the changes on the Development Plan.

He showed a parcel map of the improvement district project indicating the road widening setback area on Rycroft Street in yellow and the outline of the existing buildings to be affected by the widening in red. He noted that the parcel map shows the taking of about 6 feet on the mauka side to line up the center line of Rycroft Street with that portion ewa of Sheridan Street. He also showed another parcel map indicating how the existing buildings would be affected by a 16-foot taking. In evaluating the Council's changes at the Department's level, they felt that since the existing buildings on the mauka side would be cut anyway under the 6-foot taking, it seemed reasonable to take the road widening entirely from the mauka side.

The Commission asked how the center line in this block would align with the center line of Rycroft Street on the Diamond Head side of Keeaumoku Street.

Mr. Ling indicated that if the widening is taken entirely from the mauka side, the center line of both blocks would not align, but it would if the widening is taken from both sides of the street. He did not know the rationale under which the Public Works Committee made its decision on this proposal.

The Commission recalled the information given previously by Mr. Ling that the land on the mauka side of Rycroft Street was purchased by a developer who is intending a major development of the entire area. The Commission asked how this would affect the lessees who indicated possession of a lease on the land up to 1991.

Mr. Ling filed an up-dated tax map showing the owners of the land as Edith J. K. Plews and Juliet A. Wichman with an Agreement of Sale to Manoa Investment Company and leased to Hirotoshi Yamamoto. He stated that the owner can transfer the existing leases to the new owner.

Mr. James Shigemura, attorney for the lessees affected by the proposed road widening on the mauka side of Rycroft Street, stated that the sale does not affect in anyway the existing leases or sub-leases. He produced a copy of his client's lease agreement and indicated that he could find no cancellation clause in it. He was willing to have the lease examined by the City's legal counsel. (The lease was shown to Mr. Denis Leong for examination.)

When asked what are the rights of the lessees in the event of condemnation, Mr. Shigemura stated that it usually involves payment for damages and so forth.

(The Commission recessed the meeting at 3:30 p.m. due to lack of a quorum since Mr. Rutledge was excused from the meeting. With the presence of Mr. Muller at 4:00 p.m., the Commission reconvened the meeting and explained to him what had transpired in his absence.)

Mr. Shigemura gave his testimony as follows as additional facts in opposing the proposal involving Rycroft Street widening:

1. The taking of 16 feet entirely from the mauka side would cause a misalignment of Rycroft Street with that portion on the Diamond Head side of Keeaumoku Street. This misalignment would be about 10 feet.

2. There has been no testimony to indicate that the proposed taking entirely from the mauka side would in anyway help the traffic pattern or be of public necessity, convenience or safety. It seems that the justification for the change was based upon financial consideration only without any regard to the effect upon his clients' economic welfare or ability to continue in business.

3. They fully realized that the original 8-foot setback on the mauka side would require cutting into existing buildings. They accept this and at no time had objected to this proposal. However, they had no knowledge of a 16-foot taking and do object to this proposal which would require extensive cutting into the existing buildings.

4. The buildings at the corner of Sheridan and Rycroft Streets and at the corner of Keeaumoku and Rycroft Streets were setbacked behind the 8-foot setback line with the knowledge that there would eventually be a street widening proposal.

5. They see no justification in requiring the property owners on one side of the street to accept the full burden of the improvement district.

6. The property owner on the makai side of the street for whom no setback is involved has a property with a depth estimated to be 300 feet. The taking of 8 feet is a very minimal reduction, whereas, the taking of 16 feet from the mauka side, especially for the Modern Contracting Company's property would leave a depth of only about 55 feet which is too narrow for storing of contracting equipment and material and for maneuvering trucks in the area.

7. Although Mr. Ling had reported the recordation in the Land Court of an Agreement of Sale, his clients have a valid lease with the owner which must be honored. They realize that the owner has the right to negotiate a sale, but his clients would like to continue their business for the remainder of their lease term which is 23 more years.

Mr. Morio Omori, attorney for Honolulu Sash and Door located on the makai side of Rycroft Street, declared that his client is not the applicant in this matter which was initiated by the Planning Department after evaluation of all facts by the Chief Engineer and the Public Works Committee of the City Council. His client is involved only from the standpoint of being located on one side of the proposed street widening.

His client endorses the findings of the experts and the departments involved which had made the evaluation. He believed that the decision is based on very sound and reasonable grounds and contrary to what Mr. Shigemura stated, the public interest is being served because the cost of the improvement district to the general public is a very vital matter. He noted that the present taking of 8 feet from the mauka side would still involve the defacing of the buildings and compensation to the lessees and at the same time compensation for the taking and refacing of the building on the makai side. From the financial standpoint, if the taking involved only the mauka side without affecting the building on the makai side, the public interest would be served because the City would be saving about $100,000.

Regarding the alignment or misalignment of Rycroft Street by the widening on one side only, he indicated that this misalignment presently exists. However, regardless of how the widening is done, there would still be a misalignment because Rycroft Street in this block is being widened to a 56-foot right-of-way while that portion beyond Sheridan Street is being retained at 40-foot right-of-way. Therefore, he believed that this factor should not be given too much consideration in the determination of how the taking should be made.

With the consent of Mr. Shigemura, he had read the contents of the lease. He noted that the clause on condemnation is a standard one providing for abatement of rent, prorating the value of the improvements, and the right of the tenants to compensation involving other damages which he can prove. This is not an unusual lease; therefore, he did not believe that the testimony given has produced any compelling reason for overturning the evaluation and decision made by the Chief Engineer and the Public Works Committee of the City Council.

In the discussion that followed, the Commission asked several questions relating to the reason for widening only this one block section of Rycroft Street, the actual cost of the improvement district involving this section, and so forth.

The Director reported that Elm and Liona Streets between Sheridan and Keeaumoku Streets in the mauka section below King Street are being deleted so that a wider connecting road at Rycroft Street is needed.

Mr. Ling stated that severance damages were considered in the total cost of the improvement district. Under the present proposal involving the taking from both sides of the street, the cost would be high because of substantial work needed to cut and reface the Honolulu Sash and Door building and warehouse on the makai side. For the mauka side, the Modern Contracting Company's building would have to be purchased because the cutting would be too substantial and the remaining portion would not be usable. The same applies to the Torii Store at the corner of Sheridan and Rycroft Streets. Because this is a wooden structure, the refacing must conform to the higher standard of construction involving a commercial building. Often it is advisable to purchase the entire building than to reface at a high cost.

He stated that the City usually negotiate with the owner of the land and not the lessee because the lease is a private agreement between the lessor and the lessee. In this instance, Plews and Wichman are the owners and they also own the land on the makai side. The narrow depth of the land mentioned involves only that portion allocated to the lessee but the size of the land actually is quite large. The lessees are generally compensated for the improvements while the owner would be compensated for the value of the land. His office does have the cost figures involving the present taking on both

sides of the street but does not have the figures for the new proposal involving the taking from the mauka side only. However, just by looking at the proposal, one can see a substantial saving because no taking of the Honolulu Sash and Door improvements would be involved while the mauka section would involve the taking of additional land only.

Mr. Ling believed that the widening to a 56-foot right-of-way was proposed because this is a business area and additional traffic lanes are needed for better circulation. In addition, the deletion of Elm and Liona Streets will generate a need for a better connection between Sheridan and Keeaumoku Streets. He stated that a 56-foot right-of-way with a pavement width of 40 feet will give two 12-foot traveling lanes and two 8-foot parking lanes while a 40-foot right-of-way with a pavement width of 28 feet will give two 10-foot traveling lanes and one parking lane.

The Commission asked what is to be accomplished by the wider roadway. It noted that the difference between a 40-foot and a 56-foot right-of-way was the addition of one more parking lane; therefore, by restricting parking to one side only, there would be two traveling lanes which is the same number obtained by a 56-foot right-of-way. The Commission observed that other streets within this same area are being retained at 40-foot right-of-way so that it saw no compelling reason for the wider roadway and felt that, if necessary, Rycroft Street could be made one way with parking permitted on one side only.

Mr. Ling did not wish to comment too much on traffic but he felt that a wider road was needed for this area in commercial and industrial uses. He indicated that the Meadow Gold milk plant is in the area and he understands that this use is to remain for quite some time. The proposed major development in the area would also generate a lot of traffic into the area. During peak hours, he stated that the Council usually recommend no parking on the streets to provide for additional moving lanes, but since Rycroft Street is not considered a through street, such as King Street, there is a need for parking lanes.

The Director stated that within apartments, commercial and industrial areas, a 56-foot right-of-way is generally recommended because of the increase in traffic and the number of commercial vehicles and trucks going through the area. Although it would be desirable to extend the 56-foot right-of-way beyond Sheridan Street, the 40-foot right-of-way was decided upon many years ago because the area is designated for medium density apartment use and there is difficulty in widening the streets due to existing apartment buildings. The next solution would be to convert to a one-way system. Because of the narrow streets, a request for a high density apartment use designation for this entire area was not approved.

Mr. Shigemura informed the Commission that his clients would not object to the taking of 8 feet from the mauka side and the deletion of the 8-foot taking from the makai side.

Mr. Omori stated that his client would be happy if the change proposed by Mr. Shigemura can be done.

In reply to the Commission's question, Mr. Ling stated that a 48-foot right-of-way would provide for a pavement width of 36 feet which would permit four 9-foot lanes. He felt that a 9-foot lane was too narrow for trucks.

The Commission requested the Director to check on the suggestion made for an 8-foot taking on the mauka side only with no taking on the makai side to provide for a 48-foot right-of-way and determine whether or not this width would be desirable and what sort of configuration can be obtained from this width.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Sharpless, seconded by Mr. Muller, voted to close the public hearing and to take the matter under advisement.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND
USE MAP AND
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
(AMENDMENT)
ST. LOUIS HEIGHTS-
PALOLO
HOKULANI SCHOOL
EXPANSION AND
KAMAKINI STREET
EXTENSION

At the request of the staff, the Commission deferred further consideration of the proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan of St. Louis Heights-Palolo by changing the land use designation from Public Facility use to Residential use for the areas proposed for Hokulani School expansion and deleting the proposed Kamakini Street extension from Hokulani School to Koali Road.

A public hearing was held and closed on May 2, 1968, and the Commission had deferred action for receipt of additional information relating to the school expansion area and alternate proposals for extending Kamakini Street.

The Director had reported the receipt of a letter from the Department of Education but the study on an alternate route for extending Kamakini Street has not been completed with the Traffic Department.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Sharpless, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, authorized the calling of public hearings on Thursday, June 13, 1968, to consider the following proposals initiated by the Planning Director:

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND
USE MAP
(AMENDMENT)
WAIKIKI-DIAMOND
HEAD
KALAKAUA AND
KUHIO AVENUES
PARK USE

(1) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waikiki-Diamond Head by changing the land use designation from Commercial use to Park and Recreational use for five parcels of land situated at the "Y" intersection of Kalakaua and Kuhio Avenues in Waikiki. A Gateway Park to Waikiki is proposed for this area.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
WAIPIO
MILILANI TOWN
PRIVATE RECREATIONAL CENTER
MILILANI TOWN, INC.

(2) Conditional Use approval to construct and operate a Private Recreational Center within Unit 1-B of the Mililani Town Subdivision at Waipio on land containing 2.1 acres and zoned Rural Protective.

ZONING BUSINESS
MAKIKI
OFF PIIKOI AND KINAU STREETS
TED K. FUJIYOSHI

(3) Change in zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business, in conformity with the General Plan, for two parcels of land situated off Piikoi and Kinau Streets in Makiki identified by Tax Map Key 2-4-11: Parcels 12 and 113 and the rear portions of four parcels of land in the same area identified by Tax Map Key 2-4-11: Parcels 9, 10, 11, and 100.

Water and sewer facilities are available and adequate to serve the area.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT)
LAIE POINT
NAUPAKA STREET
PARK USE

(4) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Laie to Kaaawa by changing the land use designation from Residential use to Park use for two parcels of land situated on Naupaka Street and adjoining the proposed Laniloa Point Beach Park (Laie Point Park), containing a total area of 20,130 sq. ft. and zoned Class A-1 Residential.

STREET NAMING POLICY

(5) Adoption of a new Policy for Naming of Streets within the City and County of Honolulu.

STREET NAMES
PUULOA, EWA
EWA ESTATES, UNIT I SUBDVN

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Muller, recommended approval of the following street names:

(1) Roadway within the Ewa Estates, Unit I Subdivision at Puuloa, Ewa, Oahu:

APOLE PLACE - Deadend roadway off North Road between Kehue Street and Hanakahi St.
Meaning: Smooth

STREET NAMES
HONOULIULI, EWA
MAKAKILO CITY, UNIT 14 SUBDIVISION

(2) Roadways within Makakilo City, Unit 14 Subdivision at Honouliuli, Ewa, Oahu:

LIHAU STREET - Extension of an existing roadway to Nohohale Street.

PALAILAI STREET - Extension of an existing roadway to its intersection with Nohohale Street.

PALAILAI PLACE - Deadend roadway off Palailai Street between Nohouka Street and Nohohale Street.

NOHOPONO STREET - Roadway extending from Palailai Street to Lihau Street and being between Palailai Street and Nohopaa Street.

Meaning: Sitting properly; behaving well

NOHOUKA STREET - Roadway running off Palailai Street between Nohopono Street and Palailai Place.

Meaning: Upland dweller; to live inland

NOHOHALE STREET - Roadway running off Palailai Street mauka of Nohouka Street.

Meaning: House dweller

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM CAPITAL BUDGET ORDINANCE FOR FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 1968 TO JUNE 30, 1969

The City Council had referred to the Planning Commission for its review and recommendation, Bill No. 51 (Capital Budget Ordinance for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969) an Ordinance relating to capital improvements and the financing thereof, making appropriations for capital improvements related thereto out of current revenues, federal grants, and property owners share of improvements and authorizing expenditures from general obligation bonds for the period ending June 30, 1969, and Budget Study Committee Report No. 21 recommending approval of the list of amendments proposed to the C.I.P. as submitted by the Mayor for the fiscal year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969. (Budget Study Committee Report No. 21 was made a part of the minutes and attached herewith.)

The Commission reviewed the amendments proposed by the City Council. The Director reported that basically, there are no program discrepancies between the Administration's proposal and the Council's amendments. The largest adjustment is for the Fort Street Mall to increase the City's share for construction from $250,000 to $1,398,000 pending settlement of a suit on the improvement district. The second largest adjustment is for the Diamond Head Monument Area ($1,000,000 City and $1,000,000 Federal Funds) which was deferred in its entirety pending a definite determination on the project.

The Director recommended approval of the amendments listed except for two sewer projects which should be increased by at least $50,000 each. These projects are the "Sewer Extensions and Connections--Property Owners' Share" and "Sewer Extensions and Oversizing--City's Share." Each of the projects was programmed for $300,000 but the Council reduced them to $150,000 based on past expenditures. At least an additional $100,000 is needed at the beginning of the fiscal year in order to be able to call for bids on the Ewa Beach Trunk Sewers extension to serve the Leeward Community College. He did not believe that the Council was aware that the second increment of Leeward Community College is scheduled to open in September of 1969 and requires the sewer

connection. The extension to serve this college is expected to take more than a year to construct and cost the City more than $400,000. Supplementary appropriations will be too late to meet the projected deadline. This is a joint project with the State and reimbursement is expected.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Sharpless, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission voted to recommend approval of all the amendments listed in Budget Study Committee Report No. 21 except for the two sewer projects mentioned and to recommend to the City Council that these two sewer projects be increased by at least $50,000 each for the reasons stated by the Director.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima

Carole A. Kamishima
Secretary-Reporter II

REPORT OF THE
COMMITTEE
on
BUDGET STUDY

From the
CITY CLERK
CITY HALL
HONOLULU, HAWAII

To
__ COUNCIL
__ Auditor
__ Clerk
__ Committees:
__ Finance
__ Legislative
__ Public Works
__ Whole
__ MAYOR
__ Board of Water Supply
__ Budget Director
__ Civil Defense, Oahu
__ Civil Service Dept.
__ Corporation Counsel
__ Finance Dept.
__ Liq. Commission
__ Inform. & Complaints
__ Municipal Library
__ Planning Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Commission
__ Royal Hawaiian Band
__ Managing Director
__ Auditoriums Dept.
__ Building Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Fire Dept.
__ Health Dept.
__ Medical Examiner
__ Parks & Recreation
__ Police Dept.
__ Commission
__ Prosecuting Attorney
__ Public Works:
__ Chief Engineer
__ Automotive
__ Engineering
__ Land
__ Refuse
__ Road
__ Sewers
__ Redevelopment
__ Traffic Dept.
__ Urban Renewal

__ Governor
__ Acct. & General Services
__ Dept. of Education
__ Dept. of Health
__ Dept. of Transportation
__ District Courts
__ Land & Natural Resources

Honolulu, Hawaii
May 28, 1968

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Your Budget Study Committee, in reviewing the City and County Capital Improvement Program as submitted by the Mayor for the fiscal year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969, recommends that the following proposals to amend the program be approved:

General Government:
Building Department:

1) 250.4002 Administrative Facilities for City, $316,000,
- expenditure of funds in this project subject to the Council's approval of site plans.

2) 250.4003 City Hall Council Chambers--Restoration of Public Seating in Balconies, $39,000,
- Defer this project pending completion of new administrative building to provide more office space. (39,000)

Public Safety:
Police Protection:

1) 200.2004 Kalihi Police Activities League Clubhouse, $58,000,
- Defer this project pending further study for federal aid and location of a site. (58,000)

2) 250.4010B Pawaa Annex--City Hall Conversion of Storage Room 21 to Police Administration Office, $17,000,
- Defer this project pending the Building Department locating some suitable place to store material now in Room 21. (17,000)

Fire Protection:

1) 220.0005 Aiea Fire Station, $286,000,
- Reduce to $236,000 to eliminate the construction of quarters for a ladder company. (50,000)

REPORT OF THE
COMMITTEE
on
BUDGET STUDY

From the
CITY CLERK
CITY HALL
HONOLULU, HAWAII

To
__ COUNCIL
__ Auditor
__ Clerk
__ Committees:
__ Finance
__ Legislative
__ Public Works
__ Whole
__ MAYOR
__ Board of Water Supply
__ Budget Director
__ Civil Defense, Oahu
__ Civil Service Dept.
__ Corporation Counsel
__ Finance Dept.
__ Liq. Commission
__ Inform. & Complaints
__ Municipal Library
__ Planning Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Commission
__ Royal Hawaiian Band
__ Managing Director
__ Auditoriums Dept.
__ Building Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Fire Dept.
__ Health Dept.
__ Medical Examiner
__ Parks & Recreation
__ Police Dept.
__ Commission
__ Prosecuting Attorney
__ Public Works:
__ Chief Engineer
__ Automotive
__ Engineering
__ Land
__ Refuse
__ Road
__ Sewers
__ Redevelopment
__ Traffic Dept.
__ Urban Renewal

__ Governor
__ Acct. & General Services
__ Dept. of Education
__ Dept. of Health
__ Dept. of Transportation
__ District Courts
__ Land & Natural Resources

2) 220.0004 Hawaii-Kai Fire Station, $208,000,
- Reduce to $198,000 to deduct construction cost included for later expansion for ladder truck service. (10,000)

3) 220.0003 Waipahu Fire Station Relocation, $52,000,
- Reduce to $5,000 for inspection, planning and construction funds provided in 1967-1968. (47,000)

Fire Department (Equipment):
1) 220.0005 Aiea Fire Station, $113,000,
- Delete the entire amount, which include provision for aerial ladder truck; funds for furniture, furnishings and equipment can be provided when station is completed. (113,000)

Flood Control:
1) 300.3001C City's Participation in Stream Wall, $30,000,
- Reduce to $15,000 as prior years' expenses for this project have indicated the lower amount is sufficient. (15,000)

2) 300.3001E Kuliouou Stream Flood Control, $15,000,
- Reduce to $10,000 as only inspection funds are needed. (5,000)

3) Niu Stream Flood Control, Unit II, $310,000,
- Add this amount for project to consist of construction of 2,000 feet of invert slab and 700 feet of concrete channel plus land acquisition for boulder basin, one each for the east and west branches mauka of Niu Shopping Center.

Land.....	50,000	
Construction.....	250,000	
Inspection.....	10,000	310,000

REPORT OF THE
COMMITTEE
on
BUDGET STUDY

From the
CITY CLERK
CITY HALL
HONOLULU, HAWAII

To
__ COUNCIL
__ Auditor
__ Clerk
__ Committees:
__ Finance
__ Legislative
__ Public Works
__ Whole
__ MAYOR
__ Board of Water Supply
__ Budget Director
__ Civil Defense, Oahu
__ Civil Service Dept.
__ Corporation Counsel
__ Finance Dept.
__ Liq. Commission
__ Inform. & Complaints
__ Municipal Library
__ Planning Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Commission
__ Royal Hawaiian Band
__ Managing Director
__ Auditoriums Dept.
__ Building Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Fire Dept.
__ Health Dept.
__ Medical Examiner
__ Parks & Recreation
__ Police Dept.
__ Commission
__ Prosecuting Attorney
__ Public Works:
__ Chief Engineer
__ Automotive
__ Engineering
__ Land
__ Refuse
__ Road
__ Sewers
__ Redevelopment
__ Traffic Dept.
__ Urban Renewal

__ Governor
__ Acct. & General Services
__ Dept. of Education
__ Dept. of Health
__ Dept. of Transportation
__ District Courts
__ Land & Natural Resources

4) Waialae-Iki Stream Boulder Basin, $110,000,
- Reduce to $38,000 for land and plans and engineering, funds for construction to be provided later. (72,000)

5) 300.3001J Wailani Stream Flood Control, $260,000,
- Reduce to $10,000 for inspection cost. (250,000)

6) Wailani Stream Flood Control, Farrington Highway to Paiwa Street - Waipahu, $240,000,
- Add this amount for a project to include 1,600 feet of channel improvements -
Planning and Engineering - 10,000
Construction - - - - - - -220,000
Inspection - - - - - - - - 10,000. 240,000

7) 300.3004 Wailupe Stream Flood Control, Unit I, $80,000,
- Reduce to $10,000 for planning and engineering for this project. (70,000)

Other Protection:
1) 300.3003 Coastal Engineering, Beach and Stream Erosion and Sedimentation Studies, $5,000,
- Reduce to $1,000 as prior years' expenses showed low needs. (4,000)

2) 300.3002 Foundations, Soils and Slide Studies, $5,000,
- Increase to $25,000 as more funds are needed for these studies. 20,000

Highways:
Roadways:
Traffic Department:
1) 230.0006 Intersection Improvements in Joint Participation with State Construction, $20,000,
- Change program to read: "Intersection Improvements in Joint Participation with State--improvements to selected critical areas as agreed to by State and City".

REPORT OF THE
COMMITTEE
on
BUDGET STUDY

From the
CITY CLERK
CITY HALL
HONOLULU, HAWAII

To
__ COUNCIL
__ Auditor
__ Clerk
__ Committees:
__ Finance
__ Legislative
__ Public Works
__ Whole
__ MAYOR
__ Board of Water Supply
__ Budget Director
__ Civil Defense, Oahu
__ Civil Service Dept.
__ Corporation Counsel
__ Finance Dept.
__ Liq. Commission
__ Inform. & Complaints
__ Municipal Library
__ Planning Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Commission
__ Royal Hawaiian Band
__ Managing Director
__ Auditoriums Dept.
__ Building Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Fire Dept.
__ Health Dept.
__ Medical Examiner
__ Parks & Recreation
__ Police Dept.
__ Commission
__ Prosecuting Attorney
__ Public Works:
__ Chief Engineer
__ Automotive
__ Engineering
__ Land
__ Refuse
__ Road
__ Sewers
__ Redevelopment
__ Traffic Dept.
__ Urban Renewal

__ Governor
__ Acct. & General Services
__ Dept. of Education
__ Dept. of Health
__ Dept. of Transportation
__ District Courts
__ Land & Natural Resources

Public Works--Division of Engineering:

1) 300.3001 Fort Street Mall, Beretania to Queen, $1,483,000,
- Changing City's share for construction from $250,000 to $1,398,000 pending settlement of suit on the improvement district. 1,148,000

2) 300.3019 Improvements Initiated by Owners--Advance Property Owners Share, $50,000,
- Reduce to $25,000 as prior years' expenses indicated that the smaller amount is sufficient. (25,000)

3) 300.3003 Keolu Drive--Vicinity of Shopping Center to Realigned Kalanianaole Highway, $1,460,000,
- Reduce to $875,000 to take out the improvement district assessment portion pending the outcome of property owners' suit. (585,000)

4) 300.3016 Moiliili Triangle Area Improvement District, $1,563,000,
- Reduce to $400,000 for land and planning; construction funds to be provided later. (1,163,000)

5) 300.3006 Pensacola Street Improvement District--King to Auahi, $200,000,
- Reduce to $15,000 for preliminary use; balance to be provided by supplementary when needed. (185,000)

6) Waipio Acres Improvement District, $20,000,
- Add the above amount to improve streets in this area to General Plan widths. Improvements--grading, paving, curbs, gutters, street lights, drains and adjustments to sewer and water systems.
Planning and Engineering....20,000. 20,000

REPORT OF THE
COMMITTEE
on
BUDGET STUDY

From the
CITY CLERK
CITY HALL
HONOLULU, HAWAII

To
__ COUNCIL
__ Auditor
__ Clerk
__ Committees:
__ Finance
__ Legislative
__ Public Works
__ Whole
__ MAYOR
__ Board of Water Supply
__ Budget Director
__ Civil Defense, Oahu
__ Civil Service Dept.
__ Corporation Counsel
__ Finance Dept.
__ Liq. Commission
__ Inform. & Complaints
__ Municipal Library
__ Planning Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Commission
__ Royal Hawaiian Band
__ Managing Director
__ Auditoriums Dept.
__ Building Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Fire Dept.
__ Health Dept.
__ Medical Examiner
__ Parks & Recreation
__ Police Dept.
__ Commission
__ Prosecuting Attorney
__ Public Works:
__ Chief Engineer
__ Automotive
__ Engineering
__ Land
__ Refuse
__ Road
__ Sewers
__ Redevelopment
__ Traffic Dept.
__ Urban Renewal

__ Governor
__ Acct. & General Services
__ Dept. of Education
__ Dept. of Health
__ Dept. of Transportation
__ District Courts
__ Land & Natural Resources

Street Lighting:

1) 230.0010 Kaimuki Business District Master Plan, $7,000,
- Change scope of project by deleting the words "fire alarm and".

2) 230.0007 Kapiolani Boulevard--Wiliwili and Kamoku Streets, $137,000,
- Reduce to $131,000 to change scope of project and to exclude "fire alarm and". (6,000)

3) 230.0008 South King Street--Richards to Awa Street, $97,000,
- Change scope of project by deleting the words "fire alarm and".

4) 230.0009 Waikiki Area Phase I--Kuamoo, Kalakaua Avenue and Lewers, $122,000,
- Reduce to $111,000 to change scope of project and exclude cost for "fire alarm and". (11,000)

Bridges:

1) 300.3001 Ala Moana Bridge Over Ala Wai Canal, $10,000,
- Increase to $472,000 to provide funds, part of which was lapsed, to finish the project. 462,000

2) 300.3009 Bridges--Advance Plans, $10,000,
- Reduce to $5,000 as prior years' spending indicated the lower amount is sufficient. (5,000)

3) 300.3002 Moanalua Road Bridge at Puanani Gulch, Waimalu, $8,000,
- Increase to $183,000 to provide funds, part of which was lapsed, to finish the project. 175,000

Storm Drains:

1) 300.3001G Ala Moana Park Drainage Canal--Kalia, $860,000,
- Reduce to $815,000 to lower the cost for planning and engineering from $50,000 to $5,000. (45,000)

From the
CITY CLERK
CITY HALL
HONOLULU, HAWAII

To
__ COUNCIL
__ Auditor
__ Clerk
__ Committees:
__ Finance
__ Legislative
__ Public Works
__ Whole
__ MAYOR
__ Board of Water Supply
__ Budget Director
__ Civil Defense, Oahu
__ Civil Service Dept.
__ Corporation Counsel
__ Finance Dept.
__ Liq. Commission
__ Inform. & Complaints
__ Municipal Library
__ Planning Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Commission
__ Royal Hawaiian Band
__ Managing Director
__ Auditoriums Dept.
__ Building Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Fire Dept.
__ Health Dept.
__ Medical Examiner
__ Parks & Recreation
__ Police Dept.
__ Commission
__ Prosecuting Attorney
__ Public Works:
__ Chief Engineer
__ Automotive
__ Engineering
__ Land
__ Refuse
__ Road
__ Sewers
__ Redevelopment
__ Traffic Dept.
__ Urban Renewal

__ Governor
__ Acct. & General Services
__ Dept. of Education
__ Dept. of Health
__ Dept. of Transportation
__ District Courts
__ Land & Natural Resources

2) 300.3001C Land Acquisition for Drains, Stream Setbacks and Easements, $50,000,
- Reduce to $30,000 as prior years' spending indicated that the lower amount is sufficient. (20,000)

Off-Street Parking:
Traffic Department:

1) 230.0003 Bethel-King Off-Street Parking Facility--Central Business District, $1,100,000,
- Increase to $1,108,000 to include $8,000 for engineering and planning deferred from Supplementary No. 5. 8,000

Sanitation and Waste Removal:
Sewer Systems:

1) 300.7017 East End Interceptor Sewer, McCully to Dole, $2,000,
- Delete the entire amount as the appropriation is not needed. (2,000)

2) 300.7049 Kailua Sewage Treatment Plan, Additional Facilities, $172,000,
- Reduce to $80,000 to limit the construction to one maintenance building. (92,000)

3) 300.7029 Kailua Sewage Treatment Plant, Effluent Pump Station, $25,000,
- Defer project pending study on effect of the outfall. (25,000)

4) 300.7029 Kailua Sewage Treatment Plant, Outfall Sewer, $125,000,
- Defer project pending study and solution for the location of the outfall. (125,000)

5) 300.7026 Kaneohe Bay Oceanographic Study, $150,000,
- Reduce to $50,000 as amount seems to be sufficient for one specific area. (100,000)

6) 300.7050 Miscellaneous Land Acquisition for Sewer Projects--Oahu, $75,000,
- Reduce to $50,000 as prior years' expenses indicated that the lower amount is sufficient. (25,000)

REPORT OF THE
COMMITTEE
on
BUDGET STUDY

From the
CITY CLERK
CITY HALL
HONOLULU, HAWAII

To
__ COUNCIL
__ Auditor
__ Clerk
__ Committees:
__ Finance
__ Legislative
__ Public Works
__ Whole
__ MAYOR
__ Board of Water Supply
__ Budget Director
__ Civil Defense, Oahu
__ Civil Service Dept.
__ Corporation Counsel
__ Finance Dept.
__ Liq. Commission
__ Inform. & Complaints
__ Municipal Library
__ Planning Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Commission
__ Royal Hawaiian Band
__ Managing Director
__ Auditoriums Dept.
__ Building Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Fire Dept.
__ Health Dept.
__ Medical Examiner
__ Parks & Recreation
__ Police Dept.
__ Commission
__ Prosecuting Attorney
__ Public Works:
__ Chief Engineer
__ Automotive
__ Engineering
__ Land
__ Refuse
__ Road
__ Sewers
__ Redevelopment
__ Traffic Dept.
__ Urban Renewal

__ Governor
__ Acct. & General Services
__ Dept. of Education
__ Dept. of Health
__ Dept. of Transportation
__ District Courts
__ Land & Natural Resources

7) 300.7023 Sewer Extensions and Connections--Property Owners Share, $300,000,
- Reduce to $150,000 as prior years' expenses indicated that the lower amount is sufficient. (150,000)

8) 300.7024 Sewer Extensions and Oversizing--City's Share, $300,000,
- Reduce to $150,000 as prior years' expenses indicated that the lower amount is sufficient. (150,000)

9) 300.7053 Sewer System Infiltration Control Program, $50,000,
- Reduce to $5,000 as prior years' expenses indicated that the lower amount is sufficient. (45,000)

10) 300.7051 Sewerage Master Plan, $30,000,
- Reduce to $10,000 as prior years' expenses indicated that the lower amount is sufficient. (20,000)

<u>Recreation</u>:
Organized Recreation:

1) 720.0037 Hans L'Orange Park, $98,000,
- Increase to $156,000 to provide additional funds for the acquisition of this park. Amount was deferred from Supplementary No. 5. 58,000

2) 720.0053 Jonathan Springs Loi Kalo Botanic Garden, $5,000,
- Delete the entire amount as State funds have been received for the planning of this project. (5,000)

3) 720.0023 Kaneohe District Recreation Park, $50,000,
- Expenditure of funds for this project subject to the availability of site and approval by the Council.

From the
CITY CLERK
CITY HALL
HONOLULU, HAWAII

To
__ COUNCIL
__ Auditor
__ Clerk
__ Committees:
__ Finance
__ Legislative
__ Public Works
__ Whole
__ MAYOR
__ Board of Water Supply
__ Budget Director
__ Civil Defense, Oahu
__ Civil Service Dept.
__ Corporation Counsel
__ Finance Dept.
__ Liq. Commission
__ Inform. & Complaints
__ Municipal Library
__ Planning Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Commission
__ Royal Hawaiian Band
__ Managing Director
__ Auditoriums Dept.
__ Building Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Fire Dept.
__ Health Dept.
__ Medical Examiner
__ Parks & Recreation
__ Police Dept.
__ Commission
__ Prosecuting Attorney
__ Public Works:
__ Chief Engineer
__ Automotive
__ Engineering
__ Land
__ Refuse
__ Road
__ Sewers
__ Redevelopment
__ Traffic Dept.
__ Urban Renewal

__ Governor
__ Acct. & General Services
__ Dept. of Education
__ Dept. of Health
__ Dept. of Transportation
__ District Courts
__ Land & Natural Resources

4) 720.0067 Palolo Park, $120,000,
- Reduce to $80,000 as land to be acquired has been reduced from 6 to 4 acres (40,000)

Municipal Parks:
Building Department:
1) 250.4005 Warehouse Facility, $67,000,
- Defer the entire amount pending the location of a suitable site. (67,000)

Department of Parks and Recreation:
1) 720.0046 Ala Moana Park, Master Plan of park, $5,000,
- Delete the entire amount pending receipt of plans from the State as to what is to be done with Magic Island. (5,000)

2) 720.0059 Thomas Square, Reconstruct Fountain, $37,000,
- Delete entire amount as it is recommended that the present fountain be left as is. (37,000)

3) 720.0034 Traffic Circles, Small Park Areas and Medial Strips, $50,000,
- Reduce to $25,000 as prior years' expenses indicated that the lower amount is sufficient. (25,000)

Special Recreation Facilities:
Building Department:
1) 250.4004 Honolulu International Center, $67,000,
- Defer the entire amount pending further study as to the need and proper location of additional restroom facilities for the Theater-Concert Hall. (67,000)

Department of Parks and Recreation:
1) 720.0013A Diamond Head Monument Area, $2,000,000,
- Delete entire amount pending a definite determination on the project. (2,000,000)

REPORT OF THE
COMMITTEE
on
BUDGET STUDY

From the
CITY CLERK
CITY HALL
HONOLULU, HAWAII

To
__ COUNCIL
__ Auditor
__ Clerk
__ Committees:
__ Finance
__ Legislative
__ Public Works
__ Whole
__ MAYOR
__ Board of Water Supply
__ Budget Director
__ Civil Defense, Oahu
__ Civil Service Dept.
__ Corporation Counsel
__ Finance Dept.
__ Liq. Commission
__ Inform. & Complaints
__ Municipal Library
__ Planning Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Commission
__ Royal Hawaiian Band
__ Managing Director
__ Auditoriums Dept.
__ Building Dept.
__ Appeals Board
__ Fire Dept.
__ Health Dept.
__ Medical Examiner
__ Parks & Recreation
__ Police Dept.
__ Commission
__ Prosecuting Attorney
__ Public Works:
__ Chief Engineer
__ Automotive
__ Engineering
__ Land
__ Refuse
__ Road
__ Sewers
__ Redevelopment
__ Traffic Dept.
__ Urban Renewal

__ Governor
__ Acct. & General Services
__ Dept. of Education
__ Dept. of Health
__ Dept. of Transportation
__ District Courts
__ Land & Natural Resources

Your Committee further recommends that the Planning Commission be requested to review the amendments proposed by the Council and to consider revisions to the Capital Improvement Program in line with these recommended proposals.

Your Committee further recommends that the Budget Director be instructed to adjust the funding for the amended or added projects, charging to the maximum amounts available from the pay-as-you-go cash of the General and Highway Funds and reducing the Public Improvement Bond Fund accordingly.

CITY COUNCIL
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU
HONOLULU, HAWAII

I hereby certify that the foregoing COMMITTEE REPORT was, on the date and by the vote indicated to the right hereof, adopted by the CITY COUNCIL of the City and County of Honolulu.

ATTEST:
Eileen K. Lota
EILEEN K. LOTA,
CITY CLERK

Herman G. P. Lemke
HERMAN G. P. LEMKE,
CHAIRMAN & PRESIDING OFFICER

Dated MAY 28 1968

17a

ADOPTED Meeting Held MAY 28 1968		
AYES	N	A
CHIKASUYE		
FASI		
KAAPU		
KAITO		
KENNEDY		
KOGA		
LEMKE		
NAKAMURA		
TAKABUKI		
9	00	

Reference:

Resolution No.

Bill No.

COMMITTEE REPORT NO.
21

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
June 13, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, June 13, 1968, at 1:40 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Vice Chairman Richard K. Sharpless presiding:

PRESENT: Richard K. Sharpless, Vice Chairman Presiding
Edward Brennan
Philip Chun
Cyril W. Lemmon
Robert L. Muller
Arthur A. Rutledge
Victor Givan, ex-officio (Acting Managing Director)

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director
Denis Leong, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT: Thomas N. Yamabe II
Fred K. Kwock, ex-officio

MINUTES: The minutes of May 16, 1968, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Chun.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
D.L.U.M.
(AMENDMENT)
WAIKIKI
KUHIO AVENUE,
OLOHANA STREET,
AND KALAKAUA AVE.
PARK AND
RECREATIONAL USE

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515 (2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waikiki-Diamond Head by changing the land use designation from Commercial use to Park and Recreational use for approximately 24,858 sq. ft. of land within the triangular block bounded by Kuhio Avenue, Olohana Street and Kalakaua Avenue in Waikiki, identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-16: Parcels 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36, and excluding Parcels 30, 65 and 67.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 2, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies and to the various community and civic associations in the Waikiki and Diamond Head areas. He read the letter submitted by the Outdoor Circle which supported the proposal to designate this block for park and recreational uses. The Outdoor Circle, however, expressed concern over the sketch that was displayed featuring a giant aloha torch and lei, but indicated its understanding that this plan was only a suggestion and that the overall development of the Gateway Park would be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Parks and Recreation.

The Director explained the proposal to establish a Gateway Park approach to Waikiki by developing this triangular block up to an existing alleyway as a plaza with appropriate landscaping and statues, such as an aloha torch and lei to symbolize the spirit of Hawaii. He stated that, originally, the development of this concept included the entire block up to Olohana Street but because the owner of Parcels 30 and 65 had reported of plans to develop a high rise hotel building on his property, the parcels and

alleyway parcel 67 were excluded from this park designation proposal.

He stated that the Planning Department had proposed the elimination of the Kalakaua Avenue connection at this point and diverting traffic to Kuhio Avenue with a small park in this area adjacent to Fort DeRussy and a mall on Kalakaua Avenue, but that proposal was not adopted by the City Council which had adopted the plan that is displayed which keeps the present alignment of Kalakaua Avenue. Waikiki is a highly congested area and because of the prohibitive cost to develop large parks, small parks, such as the one proposed, should be seriously considered to improve and enhance Waikiki, a prime visitor destination area. The Mayor's Citizens Advisory Committee for the Waikiki Development Plan had also recommended the development of more small parks in Waikiki. As a result, the Department worked with the Parks Department in developing the plan displayed which was referred to the City Council Finance Committee which expressed enthusiasm and encouragement to proceed with the proposal. He noted that Mr. Douglas Sakamoto, Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation, was present to give further testimony.

In reply to the Commission's inquiries, the Director stated that the entire block comprises about 41,000 sq. ft. The excluded area contains about 16,000 sq. ft. which is about 40% of the entire block. Since the block is presently designated for commercial use, an application for a building permit for construction on any of the parcels cannot be denied; therefore, it is urgent that the General Plan amendment be made as quickly as possible in order that this Gateway Park concept can be made a reality.

The Chairman called upon those persons wishing to speak against the proposal.

Mr. Harry B. Kronick stated that he has a master lease on the corner parcel owned by Dr. Chang and he is presently negotiating a lease on the Shell Oil Company's property which is under the jurisdiction of the Hawaiian Trust Company. A consolidation of these two parcels along with Mr. Saiki's property is being proposed and they intend to develop a 400-car parking garage with a fountain in the front with landscaping and benches where people could sit. His proposal is for a 4-story parking structure with shops on the ground floor and a rooftop garden. A hotel is not being proposed, and the 10-foot street setback on Kalakaua Avenue will be observed. He emphasized that Waikiki has a most serious parking problem rather than a park problem; therefore, he felt that his proposal was more appropriate for the area. At the rate of $40 a square foot for land in Waikiki, he felt that the estimated cost of about one million dollars for the land and another one million dollars for construction including the loss of several thousands of dollars in tax rates yearly could be put to better use in other areas where parks are greatly needed. His proposal will meet the parking need of the area and at the same time,

aesthetically improve the appearance of the area.

Mr. Douglas Sakamoto spoke in support of the proposed amendment to the General Plan. He stated that the original plan for the area included the entire block up to Olohana Street but because of the new development proposal announced for the Wagon Wheel property, his department has no objection to the reduced size for the proposed aloha gateway park. They are willing to settle for small parks which can be developed aesthetically and pleasingly. They realize that this is a very expensive property but they feel that the proposal is justified because of the benefit to Waikiki as well as to the entire community.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Sakamoto stated that the same spirit of aloha can be conveyed on the smaller piece of land. Besides the proposed development on the Wagon Wheel property, he has no knowledge of anyone else proposing to develop a hotel in the area.

The Director also indicated no knowledge of anyone else proposing to rebuild in this general area. He noted that the Ambassador Hotel on the mauka side was recently completed with a fountain at one corner but with very little landscaping. It was his understanding that the hotel building on the Wagon Wheel property will be about 14 or 16 stories high. The makai side is improved with low rise commercial structures.

Mr. Hiroshi Sakai, attorney, represented Mr. R. Ing who is the sub-lessee of Mr. Kronick who has the lease on the corner parcel owned by Dr. Chang. Mr. Sakai did not speak in support of or in opposition to the park proposal but was present to obtain some definite answers as to what the City intended to do with the subject area. He stated that his client pays a monthly rental of $800 and is quite concerned about the present proposal which might blight his property because he can neither move forward nor backward until some definite action is taken to proceed with the park development. In the meantime, his client is trying to obtain a tenant in order that he could pay his rent. He asked whether the City is ready to acquire the affected properties and proceed with the development, and if it is, the source of funds for the development. He asked for some assurance that the City is ready to proceed with the development; otherwise, he stated that the land use designation should not be changed and the people should be given the opportunity to develop the land as they see fit.

In reply to Mr. Sakai's inquiry, the Director stated that within the Capital Improvement Program Budget, there is a land acquisition fund which can be used for this purpose. The fund is maintained at approximately one million dollars a year and as it depletes, it is replenished by subsequent appropriations. The other alternative would be through a supplementary appropriation by amending the C.I.P. Budget.

Mr. Sakamoto stated that about three weeks ago when this proposal was presented to the Finance Committee of the City Council, the Committee agreed with the proposal; therefore, upon adoption of the park designation for the area, he believed that the Council would appropriate funds for acquisition. At that time, the cost of the land was estimated at $762,000.

The Commission requested further information from the Director relating to the issuance of the building permit for the Wagon Wheel property, why was this proposal not made earlier, and so forth.

The Director replied that:

1. This park proposal could not be submitted any earlier because the City Council had not acted on the Planning Department's plan for this area which differed from the one adopted by the Council. The Planning Department had proposed a different configuration of the park and a deletion of a section of Kalakaua Avenue with a new connecting service road but the Council did not adopt that plan.

2. The building permit for the Wagon Wheel property has not been issued as yet, but a land consolidation of the two properties has been approved and it was his understanding that the owner is in the process of completing his development plan and will be ready to file his application for a building permit. He did not believe that the General Plan amendment affecting the Wagon Wheel property could be adopted in time to prevent the issuance of the building permit; therefore, he had omitted this parcel from the proposal presently under consideration. However, if it is the desire of the Commission, it may recommend that the Wagon Wheel property be included in the park proposal.

Upon being questioned by the Commission whether he would prefer a larger park area by the inclusion of the Wagon Wheel property, Mr. Sakamoto replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Kronick questioned the figure given by Mr. Sakamoto that the land acquisition cost for the area would be $762,000. At the rate of $40 a square foot, he indicated that the entire area containing about 40,000 sq. ft. would cost about $1.6 million.

The Director believed that the figure quoted represented the current tax assessed valuation and not the market value.

Mr. Kronick then asked whether the Parks Department or the City Council would reconsider this park proposal if the cost should be $1.6 million to $2 million. He believed that this money could be used elsewhere where the need for a park is greater.

The Director believed that the City Council would consider that point.

Mr. James Shoemaker, Executive Officer of the Waikiki

Improvement Association, stated that at a committee meeting yesterday, the Association voted to favor the proposed park project. He indicated that Waikiki is only a minute portion of the total land area of the State and yet it generates more millions of dollars in the island than sugar and pineapple combined. Waikiki also has the potential of doubling its present income between now and 1975; therefore, anything that can be done to upgrade the image of Waikiki is of basic importance since the image of Hawaii by a typical visitor is first made right in Waikiki. Since Waikiki does generate such an enormous revenue for the State, he felt it quite justified to spend the money for the proposed park development because this will help to generate additional income; otherwise, there would be a leveling off of tourists if no improvements are made. If it could be done, he also preferred the larger park size.

When questioned about the composition of the Waikiki Improvement Association, Mr. Shoemaker stated that the present membership is composed mostly of the leading hotels and hotel chains, property owners, and some of the apartment owners. It is a fairly young organization, less than a year old. It is still in the process of developing many basic plans and policies and to set up the different committees. They consider that parking is one of the most important problems in Waikiki and their program will definitely include this issue.

Since there were no further testimony from the public, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Muller.

In considering this matter later, the Commission asked whether it could recommend that the park designation be made for the entire block up to Olohana Street.

Since the public hearing notice did not include the Wagon Wheel property, the Director advised that the Commission could not make that recommendation although it may recommend to the City Council that the Wagon Wheel property be included in the park proposal then call a subsequent hearing on it.

Mr. Brennan reported that this park proposal covering the entire block was discussed at length by the Citizens Advisory Committee for the Waikiki Development Plan and also by the Planning Commission. He had participated in the discussion before both bodies and it was his recollection that the decision made for an entrance park to Waikiki covered the entire block containing an area of about 40,000 sq. ft. and not for a mini park concept. This proposal has been under discussion for the past three years and he believed that the Commission should reaffirm its position and recommend to the City Council that it follow the original concept adopted for the area by including the Wagon Wheel parcel which has been omitted from the present proposal under consideration. He was not in favor of a small park because he felt

that it could serve no useful purpose. If a compromise had to be made between a small park and a parking structure, he was inclined to favor the parking structure because of a serious parking problem in Waikiki and the developer's intention to have a fountain and landscaping in the area. Since no building permit has been issued for the Wagon Wheel property, he felt that some attempt should be made to include that parcel in the park concept and to acquire it.

Mr. Lemmon was not agreeable to any proposal which might delay the adoption of the General Plan amendment presently under consideration. He was concerned that a delay caused by an attempt to include the Wagon Wheel property in the park concept might result in the loss of the entire block. He preferred having a small park than none at all. He believed that action should be taken immediately to adopt the present proposal then to call a public hearing to consider the remaining three parcels within this block for park use.

Commissioners Chun, Muller and Rutledge agreed with Mr. Lemmon that a small park was better than none at all.

Mr. Rutledge commented that the small park in the area would be most beneficial to the hotel planned on the Wagon Wheel property and he did not believe that the prospective developer should have the benefit of a park for his private use right in his front yard.

Mr. Lemmon noted that under the proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code, the developer can use the park as beneficial open space to increase the density of his hotel development.

The Commission agreed in general that the entire block should be developed as a park to effectively develop the concept of a gateway park to Waikiki.

ACTION: Mr. Lemmon moved to recommend approval of the proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waikiki-Diamond Head by changing the land use designation from Commercial use to Park and Recreational use for approximately 24,858 sq. ft. of land within the triangular block bounded by Kuhio Avenue, Olohana Street and Kalakaua Avenue in Waikiki identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-16: Parcels 32 to 36 inclusive. The motion was seconded by Mr. Muller and carried.

ACTION: Mr. Lemmon moved to recommend to the Director that he initiate an amendment to a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waikiki-Diamond Head by changing the land use designation from Commercial use to Park and Recreational use for the remaining three parcels in the same triangular block identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-16: Parcels 30, 65 and 67, inasmuch as the Commission as

a whole is in favor of having this entire triangular block bounded by Kuhio Avenue, Olohana Street and Kalakaua Avenue developed as a Gateway Park to Waikiki, and to set the date of the public hearing to consider this proposal for June 27, 1968. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
D.L.U.M. FOR
LAIE TO KAAAWA
(AMENDMENT)
LAIE POINT
NAUPAKA STREET
PARK USE

The notice of public hearing was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 2, 1968, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map for Laie to Kaaawa by changing the land use designation from Residential to Park use for two parcels of land situated on Naupaka Street at Laie Point, containing a total area of 20,130 sq. ft., and identified by Tax Map Key 5-5-10: Parcel 25 and 26, within a Class A-1 Residential district.

The Director reported that he is withdrawing this proposal since the City Council had taken action not to acquire the two parcels for park use.

Several persons in the audience inquired whether this proposal would be reconsidered at a later date.

The Director stated that the proposal will not be re-submitted, at least not during this calendar year.

Since the proposal was withdrawn, the Chairman announced that the public hearing will not be held.

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT
WAIPIO
MILILANI TOWN
PRIVATE RECREA-
TIONAL CENTER
MILILANI TOWN,
INC.

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Ordinance Nos. 2423 and 2448, to consider an application by Mililani Town, Inc., for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction and operation of a private recreational center facility at the southeast end of Mililani Town Subdivision, Unit 1-B, at Waipio, situated on the north side of Kipapa Drive and identified by Tax Map Key 9-5-01, within a Rural Protective zone.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 2, 1968, was read by the Director who reported that copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, and to the applicant. No letters of comment or protest have been received to date.

The Director explained the applicant's proposal to develop a private recreational center composed of a swimming pool, children's play area, leisure area, a clubhouse and locker room facilities, terraced bleachers, and a sun deck on 2 acres of land situated at the southeast end of Mililani Town subdivision, Unit 1-B. The parking area will accommodate 34 cars and the driveway access is off a 44-foot local street.

Displayed were the site plan showing the various facilities and a detailed layout plan of the two story clubhouse showing offices and shower and locker room facilities on the lower floor and a community meeting hall on the upper floor. The clubhouse will

be staffed by a recreational director and a secretary. The entire facility will be fenced.

The Director stated that the land uses which will adjoin the recreational center are a townhouse development on the north, a public park on the west, a 56-foot roadway and a school site on the south, and single family residential on the east across the 44-foot roadway; therefore, the proposed recreational use is a compatible use for the area. Throughout this residential development, pedestrian walkways will provide connecting accesses to the park, the school, the recreational center, and to the other sections of the development. The center is to be used by the residents of this community and operated through a homeowners' association.

The Director recommended approval of the request with the attachment of the following conditions:

1. The development of the site shall be substantially as shown in the site plan submitted by the applicant except for minor modifications as needed.

2. The schedule and extent of operation of the recreational center shall be in accordance with the best interest and acceptance of the surrounding residential neighborhood.

3. The entire premises, including the building, fencing, landscaping, pool, parking area and driveway shall be maintained in an attractive condition in harmony with the residential character of the neighboring area.

4. The Planning Director or the Planning Commission may impose additional conditions as may be warranted for the welfare of the people residing in the adjoining residential and townhouse units and for the convenience and safety of the people using the recreational facilities.

5. After the issuance of the conditional use permit, the City Council may authorize the Planning Director or the Planning Commission to revoke the permit or to suspend such operation whenever the conditions imposed are not being complied with. The revocation or suspension of the permit shall be in effect until full compliance of said conditions is obtained.

The Director stated that one questionable area was whether the driveway access to the parking area should be off the 44-foot local road or off the 56-foot roadway. However, he felt that this was a minor issue that can be worked out satisfactorily.

In the discussion that followed, the Commission requested further information and asked whether Condition Nos. 4 and 5 can legally be imposed.

The Director replied that the ordinance pertaining to conditional use permits authorizes the imposition of conditions with the approval of the conditional use

permit. He estimated approximately 132 residential lots plus the townhouse development in this general area which residents would be using the recreational center. It was his understanding that each owner of property in Mililani Town will become a member of the homeowners' association through a covenant in the deed. The association will own and operate the recreational center as well as maintain the landscaping strips through assessment against the property owners. It was also his understanding that there will be other similar recreational centers throughout the entire Mililani Town development. He stated that the surrounding lands are gradually being developed with residential homes, commercial operations, and so forth by increments. He was not certain about the acquisition schedule for the school and the park sites.

No one responded to the Chairman's call for testimony in opposition to this application.

Mr. Clarence Tonaki, attorney, and Mr. John Zeazeas represented the applicant.

Mr. Zeazeas, in reply to the questions from the Commission, stated that:

1. Each owner of property in Mililani Town, by virtue of being an owner, will become a member of the Mililani Town Community Association which will operate and maintain the community recreational center as well as the common walkways and landscaped areas. Their concept is to have one community association for the entire Mililani Town development with several recreational centers interspersed throughout the development. Each member will have access to any of the centers but he assumed that the members would use the facility closest to their home.

2. This particular center is designed to serve this section of the development. He believed that the farthest walking distance would be about one-fourth of a mile.

3. In this section, the street improvements for Units 1-a and 1-b are due for completion this month and the houses have been sold and are now being constructed. The townhouse plans are being prepared and they hope to start construction in October. Grading of the park site is being done this week. He did not know the status of acquisition, but to his knowledge, the park and the school sites have not been acquired yet.

4. The recreational center, with the exception of the roof, will be depressed and surrounded by landscaping to isolate noise. The swimming pool will be recessed several feet down with bleachers around it for a bowl like effect.

5. He felt that the parking area and the driveway were properly placed because an access off the 56-foot roadway will require a long driveway along the edge of the recessed recreational center.

6. He felt that the 34 parking spaces provided would be sufficient based on the theory that each person has access to the area through the pedestrian walkway system. It is assumed that the parking area will be used by guests of the residents and others who do not care to walk.

7. At this time, he did not know how many families will be using this recreational center.

8. Through the Association, the residents will be assessed an annual fee for the operation and maintenance of the community center and the common open and landscaped areas.

9. Initially, the developer will construct and subsidize the operation of the recreational center for about three years, then later upon formation of the Community Association, the center operation will be turned over to the Association.

10. He was familiar with the conditions to be imposed, and stated that some minor changes might be made to the plan. They were considering whether or not to eliminate the wading pool and whether to have one center diving board or two as shown on the plan. They ran into the problem of getting the water out of the pool.

11. Mililani Town lots are under fee simple sale and he noted that the development plan encompasses a period of about 30 years.

12. They realize that the operation of community centers is very expensive. He does not know for certain but as they gain experience, they may have to revise some of their policies by constructing one for every two center planned, or they may continue their present policy.

The Commission asked the Director whether the conditional use permit is to be granted to Mililani Town, Inc., or to the Association. It also asked where the responsibility would fall should the Association be unable to operate and maintain the center in a satisfactory manner after the developer relinquishes responsibility to the Association.

The Director replied that the permit is to be issued to Mililani Town, Inc., the developer. After the developer conveys the property and the center facilities to the Association, should the Association be negligent in operating and maintaining the center facilities properly, the City can impose additional conditions to assure the proper operation of the center or it can revoke the permit and cease the operation. By conveying the operation of the center to the homeowners' association, he believed that the developer's objective is to establish a sense of responsibility among the home owners in the area. The oldest known community center in operation is situated in Foster Village and to his knowledge, this is being operated quite satisfactorily. The two

centers in the Pacific Palisades development are too new to say how well they are being operated.

The Commission expressed concern that there would be no responsible party to assure the continuance of the center operation in a satisfactory manner should the Association fail in its responsibility. The Commission asked whether a condition could be imposed upon the developer to assume this responsibility. If this cannot be done, the developer might be willing to dedicate the center to the City for operation.

The Director reported that under the cluster development ordinance, should the homeowners' association become negligent in operating the community center properly, the City can place a lien against the property owners and operate the center, but under the conditional use permit ordinance, no such provision is made. He stated that the developer is attempting to establish a stable community by placing responsibility upon the property owners. He did not believe that the Commission could legally impose upon the developer the responsibility of the center operation after title to the land and the facilities is conveyed to the homeowners' association. The City might accept dedication of the center since it adjoins a park. He stated that the Commission could recommend the attachment of additional conditions with the conditional use permit.

Mr. Lemmon felt that the conditions mentioned by the Director were sufficient to adequately control the operation and was reluctant to add another condition to make the developer responsible in perpetuity for the center operation.

ACTION: Mr. Lemmon made a motion to close the public hearing and to recommend the granting of a conditional use permit to Mililani Town, Inc., for the construction and operation of a private recreational center facility at the southeast end of Mililani Town Subdivision, Unit 1-B, at Waipio, with the attachment of the five conditions mentioned by the Director. His motion was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried.

The Chairman suggested to the Director that he check with the legal department to see what can be done to assure continuity of maintenance and operation of uses permitted under the conditional use permit ordinance and to advise of the various options available to obtain this assurance.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
MAKIKI
OFF KINAU AND
PIIKOI STREETS
TED K. FUJIYOSHI,
ET AL

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515 (2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business for two parcels of land situated on the makai-waikiki corner of Piikoi and Kinau Streets totaling 18,650 sq. ft. and identified by Tax Map Key 2-4-11: parcels 12 and 113, and including the rear portions of four parcels situated on the mauka side of Beretania Street, waikiki of Piikoi Street, and identified by Tax Map

Key 2-4-11: Parcels 9, 10, 11, and 100, in Makiki, in conformity with the adopted General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 2, 1968, was read by the Director who reported that copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the Central Honolulu Community Association and to the property owners affected by the change. He acknowledged receipt of one letter of opposition from Mr. Sing Fat Pang, owner of the parcel at the corner of Beretania and Piikoi Streets. No reason for the opposition was given.

The Director referred to the General Plan map of the area and noted that the corner parcel at Piikoi and Kinau Streets is presently zoned business. Upon the rezoning of the abutting Parcels 12 and 113, the parcels are to be consolidated and developed with a service station as shown on the layout plan submitted. This will then leave a small sliver of Hotel and Apartment zoning between the existing business zone fronting on Beretania Street and the proposed service station property; therefore he had included in this rezoning proposal, this sliver which represents the back portion of four parcels fronting on Beretania Street. A 100-foot depth of these four parcels are zoned business while the back portion of approximately 40 feet is zoned Hotel and Apartment. Public facilities are available and adequate to serve the area. Since the proposed rezoning conforms to the adopted General Plan and the proposed Detailed Land Use Plan for the area, the Director recommended approval of the change.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. Sing Fat Pang, whose letter was just read, stated that he is the owner of the parcel at the corner of Piikoi and Beretania Streets. He received his letter of notification about the rezoning proposal on June 4th and because of this short notice he has not had time to think about the proposal or to consult with his legal counsel. He requested more time to make a decision because this is a very important piece of property to him and he wanted to be sure that no proposal would deprive him of the full use of his property.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Pang stated that his sister-in-law operates a store at the corner and lives in the back dwelling. He requested for a delay of 60 days in order that he could discuss this matter with his family and his legal counsel. He expressed surprise that the other owners were not present to object to the rezoning proposal.

The Commission stated that a delay of 60 days was unreasonable and noted that it meets every two weeks. The other owners were also notified of this rezoning proposal so that their absence can be presumed to mean that they do not object.

Mr. Takeo Tokumaru, real estate agent, stated that he is putting together for an oil company, this package involving the two parcels owned by Mr. Fujiyoshi and the corner parcel owned by Mr. Alfred Ing for a total area of 18,650 sq. ft. Mr. Pang's parcel and the other three parcels in this rezoning proposal are not included in this package. Mr. Ing's property is already zoned business so that the total package to the oil company is dependent upon obtaining the business zoning for Mr. Fujiyoshi's property.

When asked by the Commission whether a delay of two weeks would cause any problems, Mr. Tokumaru stated that time is quite important because one of the conditions of sale made through Mr. Fujiyoshi was that rezoning was to be completed within 90 days from early March. This time period has expired but the purchaser, the oil company, is willing to wait because it is aware of this hearing today. He has until the early part of September to complete this whole package, and he stressed that time is of the essence because it takes time to consummate all necessary arrangements.

The Commission asked Mr. Pang whether his objection is to the proposed rezoning involving Mr. Fujiyoshi's property or to his own.

Mr. Pang stated that he merely wanted more time to think about the rezoning involving his property. He did not wish to detain anyone, but now that he knows of the service station development, he might object.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Muller.

In later discussion, the Commission stated that the reason given by Mr. Pang for a delay hardly seemed justified.

ACTION: Mr. Brennan moved to recommend approval of the change in zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business for two parcels of land situated on the makai-waikiki corner of Piikoi and Kinau Streets, identified by Tax Map Key 2-4-11: Parcels 12 and 113, and including the rear portions of four parcels of land situated on the mauka side of Beretania Street, waikiki of Piikoi Street, identified by Tax Map Key 2-4-11: Parcels 9, 10, 11, and 100, in Makiki, in conformity with the adopted General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu. The motion was seconded by Mr. Muller and carried.

GENERAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN (AMENDMENT) ALA MOANA-KEWALO RYCROFT STREET AND CEDAR STREET

The Commission again reviewed a proposal to amend a portion of the Development Plan for the Ala Moana-Kewalo section by establishing a 16-foot street widening setback on the mauka side of Rycroft Street between Sheridan and Keeaumoku Streets and deleting the setback on the makai side, and also reducing the radius of the turnaround at the makai end of Cedar Street to 8 feet and reducing the street extension by approximately 20 feet.

The public hearing held on May 16th was continued to May 30th and closed, and the Commission had requested information about the effect on traffic movement if Rycroft Street is reduced to a 48-foot right-of-way instead of 56-foot right-of-way, and the configuration obtainable on a 48-foot right-of-way. The Commission recalled the objections made by the affected property owners to the proposed 16-foot setback on the mauka side but their acceptance of an 8-foot setback on the mauka side with no setback on the makai side for a 48-foot right-of-way.

The Director reported that on a 48-foot right-of-way, two 12-foot traveling lanes and one 8-foot parking lane can be accommodated. The same number of lanes can be accommodated on a 40-foot right-of-way which can provide for two 10-foot traveling lanes and one 8-foot parking lane. The Traffic Department was asked to comment on the new proposal and its reply is as follows:

1. Traffic-wise, a 48-foot right-of-way would be inadequate for the proposed street system, whereas, a 56-foot right-of-way for Rycroft Street west of Keeaumoku Street will provide, from the standpoint of traffic and geometrics, the necessary transition to Rycroft Street east of Keeaumoku Street.

2. The closure of Elm Street and Liona Street, adjacent to Rycroft Street will increase the need for a replacement of lanes for these two streets.

3. Rycroft Street is the only street serving as a through street from Kaheka Street to Pensacola Street.

4. All of these arguments which support the need for a 56-foot road system should be given favorable consideration by the Planning Department staff.

The Commission further recalled that the 16-foot taking all from the mauka side was proposed by the Public Works Committee of the City Council because of a report from the Public Works Department that an 8-foot taking from each side of the street would increase the cost of the improvement district for the Sheridan Tract area. Since an 8-foot taking on the mauka side would result in the cutting of existing structures, the Council felt that an additional 8-foot taking would merely involve the condemnation of more land thus avoiding an expensive cutting and refacing that must be done on the makai side which is improved with an extensive office and warehouse structure. This taking all on one side of the street would result in an offset of the center line of Rycroft Street with that section across Keeaumoku Street.

The Commission felt it unfair to the property owners on the mauka side of the street to bear the entire taking for road widening purpose. Apparently, the Council's reason for the change is based on cost factor only and the Commission did not believe that the cost difference would be that great if the warehouse building is affected. Furthermore, it stated

that there is no true alignment of Rycroft Street because an offset presently exists with that portion beyond Sheridan Street. The proposed widening involves only one short block and not that section beyond Sheridan Street to Pensacola Street which is to be retained at 40-foot right-of-way.

ACTION: Mr. Lemmon made a motion to recommend to the City Council that the street widening setback on the mauka side of Rycroft Street between Sheridan and Keeaumoku Streets be confined to 8 feet only and that there be no setback on the makai side of Rycroft Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brennan and carried.

The Commission then discussed the proposal to reduce the radius of the turnaround at the makai end of Cedar Street to 8 feet and reducing the street extension by approximately 20 feet.

When asked whether an 8-foot radius was adequate, the Director replied that normally it is not and the preference is for a 20-foot radius. However, in this instance, the proposal was made to avoid the cutting of existing buildings and the taking of some of the off-street parking areas.

ACTION: The Commission deferred action on this proposal and requested a larger scaled map showing a wider radius and the effect upon the properties upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Brennan.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND
USE MAP AND
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
(AMENDMENT)
ST. LOUIS HEIGHTS-
PALOLO
HOKULANI SCHOOL
EXPANSION AND
KAMAKINI STREET
EXTENSION

At the request of the staff, the Commission deferred further consideration of the proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan of St. Louis Heights-Palolo by changing the land use designation from Public Facility use to Residential use for the areas proposed for Hokulani School expansion and deleting the proposed Kamakini Street extension from Hokulani School to Koali Road.

A public hearing was held and closed on May 2, 1968, and the Commission had deferred action for receipt of additional information relating to the school expansion area and alternate proposals for extending Kamakini Street. The Department of Education has submitted its comments but the Department of Traffic's report has not been received as yet. The Director had reported that due to unforeseen circumstances, the Planning Department staff members assigned to this project were unable to meet with the Traffic Department staff to study alternate proposals for extending Kamakini Street.

The Chairman stated that this subject matter is to be kept off the agenda until the requested reports are ready.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Chun, authorized the calling of public hearings on June 27, 1968, to consider the following proposals initiated by the Planning Director:

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT EWA BEACH 91-564 PUPU ST. EDWARD W. ENOS	(1) Request for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a private swimming pool commercially on a 5,355 sq. ft. parcel of land at 91-564 Pupu Street in Ewa Beach within a Class A Residential zone.
ZONING BUSINESS KAILUA SOUTH OF KAILUA ROAD AND EAST OF HAHANI STREET WINDWARD PLAZA, INC.	(2) Change in zoning from Apartment District C to Business for a 21,500 sq. ft. parcel of land situated south of Kailua Road and east of Hahani Street in Kailua, in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Plan of Kailua. The Board of Water Supply and the Department of Public Works have reported that their facilities are adequate to serve the area.
ZONING RESORT-HOTEL DISTRICT 1 MAKAHA MAKAU STREET, APPROX. 210 FEET MAKAI OF FARRINGTON HIGHWAY MRS. MAHEALANI JONES FERNANDEZ, ET AL	(3) Change in zoning from Class AA Residential to Resort-Hotel District No. 1 for three parcels of land containing a total area of 39,057 sq. ft. situated on Makau Street approximately 210 feet makai of Farrington Highway in Makaha, in conformity with the General Plan of Makaha. Water is adequate and available. Sewage disposal will be by a Cavitette sewage system.
STREET NAMES HAUULA KENEULA SUBDIVISION	The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Chun, recommended approval of the following street names for roadways within the Keneula Subdivision at Hauula, Oahu: HONOMU STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a makai direction to its terminus past Honomu Place. HONOMU PLACE - Deadend roadway off Honomu Street.
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT TO THE C.I.P. FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967-68 (SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 6)	The Commission reviewed Bill No. 92 entitled: "Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 6. An Ordinance amending Ordinance No. 3003, as amended, relating to Capital Improvements of the City and County of Honolulu for the fiscal year July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968," which was referred by the City Council to the Commission for its review and recommendation. The Director explained that the amendment is merely to correct the scope of the Queen Emma Street lighting project to read "Kukui to Lunalilo Freeway" instead of "Kukui to Vineyard". The project scope was incorrectly written in Ordinance 3003. The project cost is the same. ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, the Commission recommended approval of Bill No. 92, Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 6.

ZONING ORDINANCE PROPOSED AMENDMENT RELATING TO OFF-STREET LOADING AND UNLOADING AREAS

Commissioner Brennan expressed his concern, particularly in Waikiki where some of the hotel operators are using the public streets for parking of tourist buses and other vehicles thus creating a very dangerous traffic situation on the heavily congested streets. He felt it urgent that a proper ordinance be adopted immediately to require the developers of tourist oriented buildings to provide for a setback loading area within their own property. Although he was informed that this provision is incorporated in the new Comprehensive Zoning Code, he felt that some action should be taken now because the adoption of the C.Z.C. is not anticipated in the near future.

The other members agreed that such a control was required and noted that some of the new hotel constructions have provided for such a loading area while others have not. They also felt that the police should do everything possible to enforce every applicable ordinance, especially in the Waikiki area.

ACTION: Mr. Brennan moved to suggest to the Director that he introduce an ordinance that would require an off-street loading and unloading area for tourist oriented buildings prior to enactment of the C.Z.C. His motion was seconded by Mr. Muller and carried.

The Commission suggested to the Director that he take immediate steps to advise developers of these tourist oriented buildings presently under construction of the new proposal and to seek their cooperation in providing for the setback loading areas although an enabling ordinance has not yet been adopted.

MISC.
ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The Commission held an election to select its Chairman and Vice Chairman for the next ensuing fiscal year.

Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Muller, Mr. Sharpless was elected as the Chairman of the Planning Commission.

Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Brennan, Mr. Muller was elected as the Vice Chairman.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima
Carole A. Kamishima
Secretary-Reporter II

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
June 27, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, June 27, 1968, at 1:50 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Thomas N. Yamabe II presiding:

PRESENT:

Thomas N. Yamabe II, Chairman
Edward Brennan
Arthur A. Rutledge
Richard K. Sharpless
Victor Givan, ex-officio (Acting Managing Director)--present at 2:30 p.m.

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director
Denis Leong, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Philip Chun
Cyril Lemmon
Robert Muller
Fred K. Kwock

MINUTES:

The minutes of May 2, and 30, 1968, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Sharpless, seconded by Mr. Brennan.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
D.L.U.M.
(AMENDMENT)
WAIKIKI
OLOHANA STREET
BETWEEN KUHIO
AND KALAKAUA AVES.
PARK AND
RECREATIONAL USE

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waikiki-Diamond Head by changing the land use designation from Commercial use to Park and Recreational use for three parcels of land totaling 16,425 sq. ft., situated on the ewa side of Olohana Street between Kuhio and Kalakaua Avenues in Waikiki and identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-16: Parcels 30, 65 and 67.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 16, 1968, was read by the Director who reported that copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, and to the various community and civic groups in the Waikiki and Diamond Head areas.

The Director read the letter received from the Outdoor Circle congratulating the Commission for taking action at its last meeting to designate the area at the intersection of Kalakaua and Kuhio Avenues for park use and supporting the present proposal to designate the remaining parcels in this triangular block for park use to make an adequate gateway park to Waikiki.

The Director pointed out on the map the three parcels under consideration for park designation on the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the remaining parcels in this triangular block recently recommended by the Commission for designation as a park. He reported that an application for a building permit to construct a 17-story hotel building on these parcels was filed with the Building Department on February 6, 1968. The Planning Department reviewed the plans on May 24, 1968.

The Building Department is presently reviewing the plans with respect to Code requirements compliance and it is presumed that the building permit would be issued as soon as this review is completed.

Should the building permit be issued, Mr. Rutledge inquired about the effect upon the proposal to acquire the land for inclusion in the gateway park plan for this triangular block.

The Director replied that if the Commission acts favorably upon the park proposal, the recommendation will be sent immediately to the City Council for action; otherwise, the building permit must be issued. In any event, should the City decide to acquire the parcels for park purpose, he believed that the City must pay for the cost of land and improvements.

In order to assure the development of the area as a park, Mr. Rutledge felt it urgent for the Commission to take immediate action to designate the area for park purpose and send the recommendation to the City Council for action before the building permit is issued.

Mr. Brennan inquired whether the land owner was ever notified, either orally or in writing, of the proposal to acquire his land for park purpose. He also asked for the assessed valuation of the parcels under consideration.

The Director replied that the owner was notified of the park proposal orally and very recently because the previous discussion on the gateway park plan had excluded his parcels. He stated that the assessed valuation of the two parcels, which includes alleyway Parcel 67, is $256,601 for land and improvements while the assessed valuation for the entire triangular block is $645,877. These figures are presumed to be 70% of the market value. The estimated total market value of this block including land and improvements is $922,681.

Mr. Robert Brown, representing Kingsway Motors Hotel of Alberta, Canada, prospective lessee for development of the subject parcels under discussion, spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment to the General Plan. He reported that an application for a building permit was submitted to the City about three or four months ago for the construction of a 17-story high-rise structure containing 200 guest rooms and 62 parking stalls. The ground floor will contain several shops and the lobby of the hotel. The total estimated construction cost of the project is $2.5 million exclusive of furniture and equipment and the land value is about $600,000; therefore, if this project is frustrated, over $3 million in real property tax base would be lost to the City.

Mr. Brown stated that the developers are not opposed to parks per se or the development of this particular area for a park as an aesthetic enhancement to the approach to Waikiki, but their position is that the

additional land is not needed to accomplish the purpose of a gateway park to Waikiki. To indicate their position, he displayed an artist's rendering showing the proposed hotel structure with the park fronting it. He believed that this type of development can adequately meet the aesthetic enhancement planning for the area.

When questioned about the lease, Mr. Brown stated that negotiation is still in progress but they have already considered entering into a contract for a lease.

Mr. Alan Nevels, Jr., attorney representing the Tenn Enterprises, owner of the parcels under consideration, opposed the present proposal for the same reasons given by Mr. Brown. He stated that at the present time, there is no full lease agreement between the owner and the prospective lessee, but a building permit application for the construction of a hotel has definitely been submitted and approval is anticipated very shortly.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Nevels stated that to the best of his knowledge, his client was never informed about the City's proposal to acquire the land for park purpose until very recently and many months after the application for a building permit was submitted. He stated that architectural and engineering drawings and specifications have been completed and his client is ready to let the project out to bid. The prospective contractor is purchasing the material now.

Mr. James Shoemaker, Executive Vice President of the Waikiki Improvement Association, reported on the action taken by its Board of Directors to go on record to approve and support the idea of a full-size park for this area under consideration. He reiterated the same information given by him at the previous public hearing on the gateway park proposal by mentioning again the size of Waikiki in comparison with the total land area of the State and despite this fact, Waikiki generates more dollar volume than pineapple and sugar combined. Waikiki has the potential of doubling its present income by 1972 and he stressed the importance of improving and protecting the values that made Waikiki what it is today by continuing to keep visitor satisfaction at its highest level so that visitors would continue to come to Waikiki rather than go elsewhere. Therefore, their feeling is that the gateway park proposal for this entire triangular block area is the step in the right direction for serving and improving the quality that made Waikiki outstanding.

Mr. Shoemaker then mentioned an idea discussed at the Director's meeting regarding the possibility of a slightly elevated park with public parking below to help generate some revenue to recover public funds spent to build and maintain the park.

In reply to Commissioner Sharpless' inquiries whether the Waikiki Improvement Association had set their goals and objectives for continued visitor satisfaction in Waikiki in the next 10 to 20 years, Mr. Shoemaker replied that six areas of function have

been selected and committees formed. These are:

1. Traffic
2. Zoning
3. Redevelopment
4. Beach development
5. Beautification
6. Police protection and law enforcement

The Association will be holding a press conference soon to announce its general objectives and will come out periodically with brief pamphlets and press releases covering each of the areas mentioned.

When asked what would be the objection, if any, of a reduced park with a high-rise structure next to it, Mr. Shoemaker remarked that Waikiki needs breathing space. A larger park is far more attractive and would be more of an asset than a smaller park.

(Mr. Givan was present from about this portion of the discussion).

Pursuing the proposal mentioned about a parking area below the park, Mr. Shoemaker stated that it would be something similar to Union Square in San Francisco, but because of the high water table in Waikiki, he believed that parking could not go down more than one level. The Association has not gone into this proposal in depth and cannot report on any size for the parking area or the cost involved. They merely felt that the financial state of Waikiki is so great that everything possible should be done to get it on the highest level.

Since there was no further testimony from the public, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

In later consideration, the Commission asked about the actual cost to government if the subject parcels were designated and acquired for park purpose in view of the fact that the owner of the land had incurred some expense by having architectural and engineering drawings prepared, applied for a building permit, and began negotiation with a prospective lessee to develop the area.

The Director believed that the cost to the City would involve the land, improvements, whatever plans already prepared and filed with the City, and the City's share of the legal expense involved in the condemnation proceedings to acquire the properties. He did not believe that damages would have to be paid because of the failure of the prospective lessee to obtain a lease on the land.

Mr. Rutledge noted that the Commission had taken action at its previous meeting to designate the remaining parcels in this triangular block for park purpose and had stated its favor of a larger park involving this entire triangular piece.

ACTION: Mr. Rutledge moved to recommend approval of the proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waikiki-Diamond Head by changing the land use designation from commercial use to park and recreational use for three parcels of land totaling 16,425 sq. ft., situated on the ewa side of Olohana Street between Kuhio and Kalakaua Avenues in Waikiki, identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-16: Parcels 30, 65 and 67, and to suggest to the City Council that it proceed with the acquisition of the subject parcels involved for development of a gateway park to Waikiki for this triangular block bounded by Kuhio and Kalakaua Avenues and Olohana Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brennan and carried.

Citing the present incident as an example, Mr. Brennan asked the Director whether there is some method by which property owners could be notified in advance of any type of proposal by the City to condemn their properties for a public purpose. He felt it a disservice to the public not to notify them in advance of proposals as well as an additional burden to government because of increased cost resulting from completed plans for development of an area. In the future, when there is serious thought to acquire a property for public purposes, he felt that negotiations should be immediately started with the property owner to avoid extensive cost involvements later.

The Commission suggested to the Director that he give serious consideration to the thought expressed by Mr. Brennan and report back to the Commission if there is any progress.

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
EWA BEACH
91-564 PUPU STREET
MRS. EDWARD W. ENOS
(PRIVATE SWIMMING POOL)

Pursuant to the provisions of Ordinance Nos. 2423 and 2447, a public hearing was held to consider an application for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a private swimming pool for the purpose of giving swimming lessons for a fee on a parcel of land at 91-564 Pupu Street, situated on the mauka side of Pupu Street between Amio and Akua Streets, in Ewa Beach, identified by Tax Map Key 9-1-27: Parcel 90, within a Class A Residential District.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 16, 1968, was read by the Director who reported that copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies and to eleven adjoining property owners. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

He explained the applicant's proposal to give swimming lessons for a fee in her backyard swimming pool. Under the residential district regulations, a family swimming pool is permitted but private aquatic facilities for instruction may be permitted in a residential district only by the granting of a Conditional Use Permit. The Ewa Beach Community Association was informed of this proposal and it sent a letter

indicating its approval of the request. Because of the great stress on water safety, the applicant felt it highly desirable if proper instructions can be given in a swimming pool rather than in the ocean, especially for the young children.

The Director stated that the staff has no objection to the proposed operation, and in consultation with the applicant, the following conditions will be incorporated with the Conditional Use Permit:

1. Swimming instruction shall be given to no more than five persons at any given time.

2. Arrival to and departure from said premises by the persons taking swimming lessons shall be primarily by other than vehicular means.

3. Schedule for swimming lessons shall be from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon and from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekdays only and lessons will be given to children between the ages of 5 and 7.

4. Adequate buffer with plant materials or other means shall be installed along the property line adjacent to the swimming pool.

5. The Planning Director or the Planning Commission may impose additional conditions as may be warranted for the convenience and safety of the people using the swimming pool, and for the welfare of the people residing in the adjoining residential area.

6. After the issuance of the Conditional Use Permit, the City Council may authorize the Planning Director or the Planning Commission to revoke the permit or to suspend such operation whenever the conditions set forth herein are not complied with. Said revocation or suspension shall be in full force and effect until there is total compliance with said conditions.

7. Permit shall be limited to one year provided that an extension shall be allowed upon findings of satisfactory operation.

In reply to the Commission's inquiries, the Director stated that the preceding conditions were discussed with the applicant and she had no objection. Eleven adjoining property owners were properly notified of this proposal.

There was no one to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Rutledge.

The Commission considered this matter later.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Sharpless, seconded by Mr. Brennan, the Commission voted to recommend the granting of a Conditional Use Permit to the applicant to operate a private swimming pool for the purpose of giving swimming lessons for a fee on a parcel of land at 91-564 Pupu Street in Ewa Beach with the incorporation of the seven conditions mentioned by the Director.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
KAILUA
SOUTH OF KAILUA ROAD, EAST OF HAHANI STREET
WINDWARD PLAZA, INC.

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing Apartment District C to Business District for a strip of land measuring 50 feet by 430 feet, comprising 21,500 sq. ft. situated 210 feet southerly of Kailua Road and easterly of Hahani Street, identified by Tax Map Key 4-2-01: portion of Parcel 41, in conformity with the adopted General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Kailua area.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 16, 1968, was read by the Director who reported that copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to Kaneohe Ranch, Hui-o-Kailua, and to the various community and civic organizations in the Kailua-Lanikai area. No letters of comment or protest have been received to date.

The Director pointed out on the map, the 50-foot strip of land situated to the rear of Kailua Arms Apartment and adjacent to a business zoned parcel. This strip of land is to be consolidated with the business zoned parcel and will be used as part of the parking area of a proposed shopping center development. He stated that a question raised previously about provisions for parking for tenants of an adjoining apartment was resolved because the owner of the apartment is the same person who owns the business zoned lot. Since the proposed rezoning conforms to the Detailed Land Use Map of the area, the Director recommended approval.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning. Mr. Benny Centeio, representing the owner, had nothing to add to the presentation made by the Director and he was ready to answer any questions from the Commission.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Rutledge.

The Commission considered this matter later.

ACTION: Mr. Rutledge moved to recommend approval of the change in zoning from Apartment District C to Business for a strip of land measuring 50 feet by 430 feet, comprising 21,500 sq. ft., situated 210 feet southerly of Kailua Road and easterly of Hahani Street in Kailua, in conformity with the adopted General Plan Detailed

Land Use Map of the Kailua area. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brennan and carried.

PUBLIC HEARING AMENDMENT TO THE SUBDIVISION RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU RELATING TO STREET NAMES

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3, Act 103, S. L. H., 1961, a public hearing was held to consider an amendment to Section 10-H of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations of the City and County of Honolulu relating to Street Names by adding certain requirements and standards in the naming of roadways within the City and County of Honolulu, as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO SECTION 10-H OF THE SUBDIVISION RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU RELATING TO REQUIREMENTS ON STREET NAMES.

SECTION I. Section 10-H of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations is hereby amended to read as follows:

"H. STREET NAMES. Street naming within the City and County of Honolulu shall comply with the following requirements:

1. Each street that is a continuation of an existing street shall be given the same name of the existing street.

2. Streets that are continuous shall bear the same name throughout.

3. In order to avoid duplication of names, all street names proposed for streets shall be subject to the approval of the Planning Commission and adoption of same by the City Council.

4. Street names shall be Hawaiian, however, others may be considered based on justifications as shall be presented by the subdivider.

5. The street names selected shall:

   a. Have appropriate meanings.
   b. Not be duplications.
   c. Bear no similarity to any existing names.
   d. Be words not exceeding ten letters (space limitation on street signs).

6. Requests for street names on <u>approved subdivisions</u> only are considered, i.e.:

   a. Within subdivisions which have received the approval of the Planning Director on the basis of completion of all street improvements and utilities.

   b. Within subdivisions which have received the approval of the Planning Director on the basis of filing of the required bonds and sureties as required by the Subdivision Rules and Regulations of the City and County of Honolulu.

7. Requests for street names on subdivisions granted tentative approval are also considered; provided that, the subdivider files with the Planning Director a written notification indicating that all street improvements and utilities shall be completed within six months.

8. Notices shall be circulated to all property owners, and where applicable, to tenants affected by proposals to change the name of an existing street.

9. The following nomenclature shall be used in the naming of streets:

Major Highways

FREEWAY	A divided arterial roadway for through traffic with full control of access with grade separations at intersections. (Whenever practicable freeways are named after Hawaiian royalty).
HIGHWAY	A roadway generally serving through traffic on a continuous route providing the primary access between communities. (Whenever practicable highways are named after Hawaiian royalty).

Arterials and Major Collectors

PARKWAY	A major collector roadway usually containing a medial strip with landscaped setback park-like areas on each side of the right-of-way, generally heavily planted with trees for its entire length.
BOULEVARD	A major collector with or without a medial strip, generally shorter than a highway, usually serving through traffic on a continuous route.

Minor Collectors and Distributors

DRIVE	A long winding collector roadway; usually through a valley or mountainous area, having scenic qualities. Following are examples-- Valley area - Hind Drive. Mountainous area - Tantalus Drive, Sierra Drive.

ROAD	A collector roadway in the rural districts generally without full improvements such as curbs and sidewalks.
STREET	A fully improved through roadway serving local or minor collector traffic.
AVENUE	A fully improved through roadway serving local or minor collector traffic, landscaped and planted with trees.

Local Roadways

STREET	A fully improved through roadway serving a local or minor collector traffic.
AVENUE	A fully improved through roadway serving local or minor collector traffic, landscaped and planted with trees.
CIRCLE	A roadway having a circular form with only one access point to the adjoining street.
LOOP	A looped roadway having two access points off the same roadway.
PLACE	A cul de sac serving more than three lots and exceeding 125 feet in length.
WAY	A cul de sac serving more than three lots exceeding 125 feet in length and off another cul de sac.
LANE	A narrow roadway without curbs or sidewalks generally applied to old developments. Presently not used.
COURT	A short roadway partially or wholly enclosed by buildings giving the impression of a small open square. Presently not used.

10. Naming of a private roadways shall be considered only upon compliance with all of the following minimum requirements:

    a. Roadways shall have a legally defined right-of-way.

    b. A minimum right-of-way width of 24 feet.

c. A minimum pavement width of 18 feet.

d. A macadam pavement approved by the Chief Engineer.

e. Adequate drainage facilities.

f. Purchase and installation of signs to be borne by the applicant.

g. Right-of-entry consent to the City and County of Honolulu from owner or owners of right-of-way."

SECTION II. This amendment shall take effect ten days after filing thereof with the City Clerk following adoption by the Planning Commission but the provisions of this amendment shall not be applicable to any subdivider who has obtained tentative approval of a preliminary map prior to the effective date of this amendment and who is granted final approval of the subdivision within one year and forty-five days after the tentative approval of the preliminary map.

The Director explained that the proposed amendment is being made under the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act of the State of Hawaii and is not by ordinance for adoption by the City Council. Upon adoption by the Planning Commission, the proposed amendment is to be forwarded to the City Clerk for recordation and thereafter to the Lieutenant Governor's office for further recordation and enactment as part of the Rules and Regulations of the Planning Commission. He indicated that the proposed street naming procedures were previously discussed by the Commission.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. Norman Chung, representing Mililani Town, Inc., commented on Street Naming Requirement No. 7 and the definition of the word "Drive". He noted that No. 7 provides for the naming of streets within subdivisions granted tentative approval; provided, that, the subdivider files with the Planning Director a written notification indicating that all street improvements and utilities shall be completed within six months. He felt that this requirement should be changed to "...; provided, that, final approval of the subdivision is received within six months after such tentative approval." He explained that there are two methods by which final approval can be received. One is through the completion of street improvements and utilities, and the second is through the filing of required bonds and sureties. In many instances, within a subdivision of the size of Mililani Town, which is planned to cover 3,000 acres, the developer might want to have a certain street named but would not be able to complete the subdivision within six months. Therefore, if he should file a bond or surety to assure the completion of all street improvements and utilities, the street naming request should be given favorable consideration.

With reference to the definition of the word "Drive", which is described as, "A long winding collector roadway, usually through a valley or mountainous area, having scenic qualities.", he indicated the developer's desire to use the word Drive somewhere within the Mililani Town development. Since Mililani Town is situated on a plateau, he suggested that the word "plateau" be inserted after the word "valley" so that as long as there are scenic qualities and the road is winding, that the word Drive be permitted to be used within Mililani Town.

Since there was no other testimony from the public, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Sharpless, seconded by Mr. Brennan.

In later discussion, the Commission asked the Director whether he had any objection to the suggestions made by Mr. Chung.

The Director had no objection and suggested that he resubmit the proposal with the inclusion of the two amendments for approval by the Commission at its next meeting.

The Commission felt that this was not necessary.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Sharpless, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, the Commission approved the proposed amendment to Section 10-H of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations of the City and County of Honolulu relating to Street Names with the following changes:

a. Item No. 7 to read as follows: "Requests for street names shall be considered for subdivisions granted tentative approval only upon the subdivider filing with the Planning Director a written notification indicating that all requirements for final approval shall be met within a period of six months after tentative approval has been granted."

b. The definition of DRIVE to read as follows: "A long winding collector roadway; usually through a valley, mountainous area or plateau, having scenic qualities..."

GENERAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN (AMENDMENT) ALA MOANA-KEWALO CEDAR STREET TURNAROUND

The Commission again reviewed a proposal to amend a portion of the Development Plan for the Ala Moana-Kewalo section, street pattern, by reducing the radius of the turnaround at the makai end of Cedar Street to 8 feet and reducing the street extension by approximately 20 feet. A public hearing was held on May 16, 1968, and continued on May 30, 1968. After closing the public hearing, the Commission on June 13, 1968, took action on the first portion of a proposed amendment affecting Rycroft Street widening between Sheridan and Keeaumoku Streets by recommending the deletion of an 8-foot street widening on the makai side and the retention of an

8-foot street widening on the mauka side of Rycroft Street. Action was deferred on the second portion involving Cedar Street turnaround pending submission of a more detailed drawing showing the areas affected by the turnaround.

Displayed were two maps showing the turnaround area as it presently exists on the Development Plan and as newly proposed. The Director explained that the Public Works Department by letter gave the reasons for the new proposal. The Department noted that under the present plan, the turnaround would require the cutting of a large hollow-tile structure and refacing of the remainder of said building at great expense to the City. Therefore, after discussing the matter with the property owners in the area, the new proposal showing the 8-foot radius was recommended.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Sharpless, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, recommended approval to amend a portion of the Development Plan for the Ala Moana-Kewalo section by reducing the radius of the turnaround at the makai end of Cedar Street to 8 feet and reducing the street extension by approximately 20 feet.

The Planning Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Sharpless, seconded by Mr. Brennan, authorized the calling of public hearings on Thursday, July 11, 1968, to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director:

ZONING APARTMENT DISTRICT B KALIHI 1531 and 1537 KAM IV ROAD ESTATE OF ROSE H. SMITH	(1)	Change in zoning from Class B Residential to Apartment District B, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 26,817 sq. ft. parcel of land situated at 1531 and 1537 Kam IV Road in Kalihi. Water and sewer facilities are available and adequate to serve the area.
ZONING GENERAL INDUSTRIAL KALIHI-KAI MAKAI-EWA CORNER OF DILLINGHAM BLVD. AND MOKAUEA STREET PAUL M. BRADY	(2)	Change in zoning from Class A Residential and Business to General Industrial, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 13,864 sq. ft. parcel of land situated at the makai-ewa corner of Dillingham Boulevard and Mokauea Street in Kalihi-Kai. Approximately 2,080 sq. ft. of this property is zoned Class A Residential while the remainder is zoned Business. Water is available. The Department of Public Works has reported that sewers are available and adequate provided the proposed development does not involve high water usage.
GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE PLAN (AMEND.) WAHIAWA 231 LEHUA STREET RESIDENTIAL USE (SOON YEE CHOI SONG)	(3)	Amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Wahiawa by changing the land use designation from Commercial use to Residential use for a portion of a 17,710 sq. ft. parcel of land situated at 231 Lehua Street in Wahiawa. Presently 8,050 sq. ft. or 45% of the property is zoned Class A Residential while 9,660 sq. ft. or 55% is zoned Business. Water and sewer facilities are available and adequate to serve the area.

ZONING BUSINESS
WAIKIKI
2229 KUHIO AVE.
BENJAMIN AYSON, SR.

(4) Change in zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 3,595 sq. ft. parcel of land situated at 2229 Kuhio Avenue in Waikiki.

Water is available. Sewers will be adequate upon connection to the Kuhio Avenue Sewer. The area required for the rounding of the corner at the intersection of Kuhio and Royal Hawaiian Avenues is not included in this rezoning proposal.

ZONING BUSINESS
WAIKIKI
SEASIDE AVENUE
BET. KUHIO AND KALAKAUA AVES.
CONSOLIDATED AMUSEMENT CO., LTD.

(5) Change in zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business, in conformity with the General Plan, for six parcels of land containing a total area of 60,000 sq. ft. situated on the diamond head side of Seaside Avenue between Kuhio and Kalakaua Avenues in Waikiki. Water and sewer facilities are available and adequate to serve the proposed development of the area.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
WAIPIO, EWA
OFF KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY
AIRPORT USE
STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

(6) A request for Conditional Use Permit to establish a general utility airport to accommodate small airplanes (12,500 pounds or less gross takeoff weight), on 79.531 acres of land situated off Kamehameha Highway in Waipio, Ewa, identified as Tax Map Key 9-4-06: portion of Parcel 1. The airport is identified as Central Oahu Airport, Project No. 0-65-3.

ZONING ORDINANCE
OFF-STREET LOADING REQUIREMENTS

(7) A proposed ordinance to amend Chapter 21, Article 1, R. O. of Honolulu 1961, as amended, by amending the title of Section 21-1.2 and adding thereto a new section to be numbered 21-1.2 (e) relating to off-street loading requirements.

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION
HAUULA, KOOLAULOA
200-400 FT. MAUKA OF KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY
URBAN DISTRICT
(RICHARD ROUTSON AND HAAHEO ESTATE)

The Commission reviewed a petition filed with the State Land Use Commission for a change in the district boundary map from Agricultural to Urban District for two parcels of land situated approximately 200 to 400 feet mauka of Kamehameha Highway in Hauula and identified by Tax Map Key 5-3-13: Parcel 2, containing an area of 58,938 sq. ft. and Parcel 6, containing an area of 57,127 sq. ft.

The Director reported that the two parcels are presently developed with residential uses and adjoin existing residential uses which are in the Urban District. The zoning on the land is Highway and Rural Protective and the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map designation of the area is residential use. He did not know why the Land Use Commission had designated the two parcels in the Agricultural District because the residential uses existed at the time the district boundary map was prepared.

Since the requested change is consistent with the existing land use and the residential use designation on the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the area, the Director recommended approval of the request with the further recommendation that the private roadway serving as access for the properties to Kamehameha Highway be included in the Urban District.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Brennan, voted to recommend to the Land Use Commission that the petitioners' request for a change in the district classification from Agricultural to Urban District be granted for the two parcels of land situated on the mauka side of Kamehameha Highway in Hauula, identified by Tax Map Key 5-3-13: Parcels 2 and 6, with the further recommendation that the private roadway serving these two parcels be included in the Urban District.

STREET NAMES KOOLAUPOKO, KAILUA AND KANEOHE KAINALU PARK SUBDIVISION

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Brennan, recommended approval of the following street names:

(1) Roadways within the Kainalu Park Subdivision at Kailua and Kaneohe, Koolaupoko, Oahu:

KAILUANA PLACE - Deadend roadway off North Kalaheo Avenue extending in a makai direction parallel to the Kawainui Canal and being between the Kawainui Canal and L'Orange Place.
Meaning: A sea that instills a feeling of relaxation and enjoyment.

KAILUANA LOOP - Loop roadway off Kailuana Place.

KAIOLINO WAY - Deadend roadway off Kailuana Place across Kaihone Way.
Meaning: Sparkling sea

KAIHONE WAY - Deadend roadway off Kailuana Place across Kaiolino Way.
Meaning: Melody of the sea

KAILULU WAY - Deadend roadway off Kailuana Place between Kaihone Way and Kailuana Loop.
Meaning: Restful sea

KAIMOANI WAY - Deadend roadway off Kailuana Place makai of Kailuana Loop.
Meaning: Fragrance of the sea borne on the breeze

STREET NAMES KANEOHE MAHINUI ESTATES SUBDIVISION

(2) Roadways within the Mahinui Estates Subdivision at Kaneohe, Koolaupoko, Oahu:

APUAKEA STREET - Extension of an existing roadway from Halekou Road to Kanaka Street.

KAMALANI PLACE - Deadend roadway off Apuakea Street between Halekou Road and Kanaka Street.
Meaning: Child of a Chief

STREET NAMES
PUULOA, EWA
EWA ESTATES,
UNIT I

(3) Roadways within Ewa Estates, Unit 1, at Puuloa, Ewa, Oahu:

AAHA PLACE - Deadend roadway off North Road between Haiamu Street and Aama Place.
Meaning: Netted carrier for a calabash

AAMA PLACE - Deadend roadway off North Road between Aaha Place and Hanakahi Street.
Meaning: Large, black, edible crab that runs over shore rocks

AIAMI PLACE - Deadend roadway off North Road between Hanakahi Street and Apai Place.
Meaning: Type of hula with little foot movement

APAI PLACE - Deadend roadway off North Road between Aiami Place and Kauwili Street.
Meaning: A fish trap

APOKE PLACE - Deadend roadway off North Road between Kauwili Street and Apole Place.
Meaning: A shore piece, cut or broken off

HAIAMU STREET - Roadway off North Road running to Laupapa Street and being on the north side of Aaha Place.
Meaning: To gather, crowd, flock

HAIAMU PLACE - Deadend roadway off Haiamu Street between North Road and Laupapa Street.

KAUWILI STREET - Roadway off North Road running to Laupapa Street and being between Apai Place and Apoke Place.
Meaning: To mingle; mix

KEHUE PLACE - Deadend roadway off existing Kehue Street between North Road and Laupapa Street.

STREET NAMES
WAIANAE
WAIANAE KAI

(4) Roadway within a subdivision at Waianae Kai, Waianae, Oahu:

ALAWA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Farrington Highway between Maiuu Road and Kaulawana Road.
Meaning: To look at both sides

STREET NAMES
NUUANU
NUUANU VALLEY
PARK TRACT
SUBDIVISION

(5) Roadway within a subdivision in the Nuuanu Valley Park Tract Subdivision at Nuuanu, Oahu:

PARK PLACE - Deadend roadway off existing Park Street between Laimi Street and Puiwa Road.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima

Carole A. Kamishima
Secretary-Reporter II

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
July 11, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, July 11, 1968, at 1:55 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Richard K. Sharpless presiding:

PRESENT:

Richard K. Sharpless, Chairman
Edward Brennan
Philip Chun
Robert L. Muller
Arthur A. Rutledge (excused at 4:45 p.m.)
Thomas N. Yamabe II

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director
Denis Leong, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Cyril W. Lemmon (on trip)
Robert F. Ellis, ex-officio
Fred K. Kwock, ex-officio

MINUTES:

The minutes of June 13, 1968, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Muller and seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

MISC.
TIME OF PUBLIC HEARING

The Commission decided hereafter to hold its public hearings starting at 1:30 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
WAIPIO, EWA
KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY, HONOLULU SIDE OF ROAD LEADING TO MILILANI CEMETERY
GENERAL UTILITY AIRPORT
(STATE DEPARTMENT OF TANSPORTATION)

A public hearing was held, pursuant to the provisions of Ordinance Nos. 2423 and 2447, to consider an application by the Airports Division of the State Department of Transportation for a Conditional Use Permit to construct, operate and establish a general utility airport to accommodate small airplanes on a 79.5 acre parcel of land situated on the east side of Kamehameha Highway and on the Honolulu side of the road leading to Mililani Cemetery in Waipio, Ewa, and identified by Tax Map Key 9-4-06: portion of Parcel 1.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 30, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, Mr. Arthur Akinaka, Castle and Cooke, Dole Pineapple Company, Mililani Memorial Park, Federal Aviation Administration, Crestview Community Association, and the Waipahu Community Association.

The Director read the letter received from the Crestview Community Association which objected to the construction of an airport for any purpose within the area described for the following reasons:

1. The distance from the community to the proposed airport site is only 3/4 mile and the turn pattern for aircrafts leaving the ground would place the airplanes within 1/4 mile of the community thus creating a hazard and disturbing the peace and quiet of the community.

2. The Association questions the statement made by Mr. William Klopp of the Airports Division of the State Department of Transportation that the construction of the airport at Mililani would be of economic benefit to the community when better than 99% of the population of Crestview, Waipahu and Pearl City will not participate in this "sport" (privately owned aircraft).

3. The construction of the airport will devalue the homes and properties in Crestview and further isolate the community.

The Association recommended that the State consider a site either at Bellows Air Force Base, Wheeler Air Force Base, or enlarge the present facilities at Honolulu International Airport. The Association further recommended that the Commission disapprove this request for a conditional use permit to establish a general utility airport at Mililani.

The Director presented the proposal by reporting as follows:

1. The proposed airport site is located between Kamehameha Highway and the proposed alignment of the H-2 Interstate Highway. It is situated on the Honolulu side of the road leading to Mililani Cemetery.

2. The search for a site for general aviation use has been conducted since 1961 by the State in conjunction with certain agencies of the City.

3. About 18 potential sites have been examined but for one reason or another, many of the sites were eliminated because they were found to be either remote from the center of population, located within the existing air traffic pattern, or for some other reasons. The sites which remain for further consideration lie on the Schofield plateau and in the Windward area.

4. The reason for seeking an airport site for small aircrafts is due to the increase in traffic at Honolulu International Airport and the need to relieve the crowded facilities at the Airport. It is estimated that in 1967, there were between 51,000 and 52,000 takeoffs and landings at Honolulu International Airport or about 1/6 of the total for purposes of training or practice.

5. The proposed airport is intended to be used by propeller aircrafts, both single and twin engines.

6. The approaches to the runway are at approximately 5% slope and must clear the highway by at least 17 feet for takeoffs and landings. The runway is to be short, between 2,600 and 3,100 feet long. There will be no more than 200 feet for expansion beyond a 3,100-foot runway.

7. The subject site is about 3,952 feet long and 900 feet wide, containing approximately 79.53 acres. The airfield itself will utilize about 40 acres.

Approximately 6 acres are to be in support facilities and the remaining 30 acres may be leased to flying schools and additional support facilities such as hangers.

8. The proposed site offers an ideal situation for the airport because it is remote from the urban areas and separated from the urban areas by an agricultural buffer.

9. Under the Conditional Use Permit ordinance, airport is one of the enumerated uses permitted under certain conditions in areas where they are normally not permitted. After holding of a public hearing, the recommendation of the Planning Commission is submitted to the City Council which takes final action on whether or not to approve the Conditional Use Permit.

10. It is anticipated that sometime in the future, the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Waipio will be amended to show public facilities use for the subject area.

With reference to the recommendation made by the Crestview Community Association that consideration be given to the use of Wheeler Field or Bellows Field, the Director believed that neither of these sites would be made available to the State for the purpose intended. The suggestion made for expediting the seaward runway at Honolulu International Airport will depend on legislative action regarding the expansion plan of the Airport and the necessary appropriation to carry out the project. At the present time, the plan for the Airport is for the extension of Runway 4 to accommodate the Boeing 747 jumbo jets arriving in approximately one year so that the seaward runway is still a remote possibility. He indicated that air traffic at Honolulu International Airport is growing constantly and it is imperative that a general aviation airport be established as soon as possible to relieve the present congestion at the Airport.

Displayed on the board were the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Waipio, a location map showing the proposed site, and the airport layout plan.

In reply to questions from the Commission, the Director indicated that Bellows Field, besides not being made available to the State, is too remote from the major center of population. It was his understanding that this type of facility should be within reasonable commuting distance from the center of activity. In the area proposed for the runway, the distance is about 4,000 feet between the two highways.

Mr. Jack Palk, representing Castle and Cooke, Inc., the landowner, filed a letter of objection which was read by the Director. Their reasons for objection were given as follows:

1. They question the public necessity and

justification for a substantial expenditure of funds to acquire and develop a general aviation airport for a limited number of student pilots because they were advised that the State does not intent to relocate all small aircraft, commercial or private, from the Honolulu Airport. This means that the proposed airfield will simply serve as a touchdown and takeoff training strip for student pilots.

2. The nuisance of flying aircraft over and about the Mililani New Town development and cemetery development would have an adverse impact on prospective purchasers and those who have already purchased in the development.

3. They feel that Kunia Airfield, Bellows Airfield, Dillingham Airfield and Wheeler Airfield are existing airstrips which could well serve the small group of student pilots.

4. Approximately 80 acres will be lost from pineapple cultivation if the airport site is approved. Additionally, there will be certain inefficiencies in working field operations around the airfield which would increase their field costs.

5. Alternate sites just above the Crestview development and across Kamehameha Highway toward Waipahu were suggested because these sites, although still on their own land, would avoid splitting their agricultural operations.

Castle & Cooke noted that these reasons of objection were discussed with the Airports Division staff who feel that there is no other suitable site than that presently proposed. Castle & Cooke questioned whether all of the facts and cost considerations have been fully ascertained prior to making a final decision and urged the Planning Commission to explore fully whether there is a need for a general aviation airport in Central Oahu and, if so, whether existing airstrips, such as at Kunia might well serve this need and thus avoid the taking of 79.5 acres at Mililani out of pineapple cultivation.

When questioned by the Commission, Mr. Palk replied that the State did study about 12 sites in the Central Oahu area, some of which are better than the Mililani site, but for political or other reasons unknown to him, they were not selected. He has not seen any report on economic consideration of each site to indicate the cost consideration of one site versus the other. He confirmed that the subject area is fully cultivated in pineapple. To the best of his knowledge, Castle & Cooke will continue its pineapple cultivation in the foreseeable future and may be expanding, depending on the economics of pineapple on the market. He indicated that there is some major powerline running under the area proposed for the runway strip which would add to their cost of operation.

Mr. Peyton Carroll, President of the Island Flight Center, stated that his company is deeply involved

in the pilot training program. He reported that in Hawaii there are 240 general aviation aircraft. It is anticipated that by 1970 there will be 300 general aviation aircraft; 1975, 500; and by 1985, 1,100. Wheeler Air Force Base is an obsolete military base and he noted that on the mainland, many of the military airfields and control towers are shared with the civilians and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). This objective has not been accomplished at Wheeler nor at Bellows. Dillingham Air Force Base, which is presently the only training field for student pilots living in Honolulu, will go back to private ownership in two years. The flying time of 20 minutes to Dillingham and 20 minutes back to Honolulu is money out of the pocket of the students, whereas, the flying time to Mililani would be only 5 minutes.

He stated that another problem that they are faced with is the need to provide adequate training facilities for students who will be taking flight training under the G.I. Bill. They expect to graduate from 350 to 500 military applicants, but their present facilities are inadequate so that the need is present today and will continue to grow. Although the presently proposed size of the general aviation airport seems to be beyond the scope of operation today, the anticipated increase cited will justify that size.

In the interrogation that followed, Mr. Carroll stated his belief that even if Dillingham Field were available, it would not serve their purpose because it is too far away. General aviation has to stay at Honolulu International Airport because that is where all the field facilities are located and people fly from there to practice. Dillingham is being used successfully but this cannot continue because the long flight back and forth is expensive. It might be ideal for recreation but not for training purposes. The Navy dump site at Pearl City peninsula is the best practice field but it is not available. Practically all of the air space in the middle of Oahu is used for training flights and a student can practice his approach and landing at the Honolulu Airport or go down to Dillingham. For advance work, the South Gate Weather Station is used for weather landings. All instructions must take place where the equipment is located. There are approximately 35 training flights at Honolulu Airport and the present load is about 20 aircraft out per day.

Mr. Carroll stated that there is a General Aviation Council which is aided by Mr. Klopp of the Department of Transportation and Mr. McAuliffe. For a number of years they have been attempting to establish a joint use of obsolete military fields but for some unknown reason, they have not been able to obtain any kind of permission to use any of the military fields except Dillingham. He believed that Mr. Klopp had worked on such a possibility for a long time.

Beside cost and distance, he stated that quite often the island is weathered in so that the students are not allowed to go beyond Wheeler to train at Dillingham. The students are not allowed to fly in the clouds and must turn back and abort their training. They seldom take training flights over water around Kaena Point because the turbulent weather is worse there. As far as weather is concerned, Mililani is a good location.

Mr. Carroll stated that they do carry heavy insurance. This is required by the State whenever they operate out of State proper. He stated that they do need a general aviation airport because much of the students' time at Honolulu Airport is spent waiting to leave because the control tower lets the other flights leave first. The airplanes, however, will still be based at Honolulu Airport because the servicing facilities and hangars are there.

Mr. Carroll stated that Island Flight Center is a corporation. There are two other organizations conducting the same type of training. They are the Associated Aviation Activities and the Pacific Flight Service. There are many other types of general aviation companies at the airport at the present time. He believed that all of the organizations would use the proposed airport at Mililani. The future potential uses of the airport are the addition of hangars, maintenance and service facilities, charter flight services, and so forth.

For training purposes, he stated that a 2,100-foot runway is the absolute minimum. He believed that the proposed strip is planned for 2,600 feet which should accommodate most of the small single-engine planes. He estimated that in a very short time there could be 200,000 or more takeoffs and landings at this airport. General aviation may account for 35 percent of the operation at Honolulu Airport today. As soon as a nearby touch-and-go strip is established, most of the training operations at Honolulu Airport will be eliminated.

Mr. Jack McAuliffe, Jr., stated that in addition to his position as Deputy Director of the State Department of Transportation, 90% of his time is devoted to airport development. He is also a private pilot and had owned a business aircraft a few years ago. Through the news media, he believed that the Commission is aware of the current conflict between general aviation and commercial aviation at major airports. This is true at the Honolulu International Airport where it has become necessary that a significant portion of the training flights be transferred to another airport. This has been the recommendation of both the FAA and the State legislature which have been seeking suitable alternate sites for the past five years. He did not believe that one site would be adequate to take care of the growing general aviation pattern on Oahu. He had personally flown over most of the projected flights and had gone through the complete analysis of all potential sites

on Oahu and as a result of very extensive surveys and economic analyses, the Mililani site was considered the best available selection. Another compatible site is in the Kipapa area.

He stated that the economic factor involved indicates that even with the participation of the FAA, the initial implementation of the airport would not permit the installation of sufficient facilities, such as hangars, service shops, carpenter shops, laundry, etc., which would permit a major transplant of some of the general aviation flight schools. However, he felt that the general population increase in the area would eventually justify a submission to the Legislature for additional funds to complete the facilities and permit this major transfer.

With respect to Bellows Field, he hoped that the State would be able to use it in the near future, but he indicated that obtaining its use would not completely solve the entire problem or diminish the necessity for the Mililani site. Some of the general aviation schools must continue to base at Honolulu Airport so that to send the students to Bellows will create some problems. Only in clear weather, flights go over the Pali or the Kalihi Tunnel area and come back and enter the restricted air space of Honolulu Airport. The FAA has gone on record as eventually endorsing and placing all aircraft at Honolulu Airport under control of the air tower which means that all of the training flights would have to come back from Bellows. They would then become involved in the transcontinental transportation flight pattern where there is problem of staggering arrival and departure, indicating that they would have to be regulated from the Mililani area.

Mr. McAuliffe then entered into the record a chart showing the amount of air space that is restricted on the Island of Oahu. He pointed out the areas of Mililani and Kipapa as being the only areas available for airport control from Central Oahu.

He explained that general aviation involves the average small planes, such as the Cessna, Beech, and so forth, which cannot be called sport aviation. A tremendous number of students will be taking advantage of the G.I. training program and a good portion will become involved in general aviation which concerns air taxis, helicopter service, and so forth. It is expected that Mililani will be developed eventually as a full-fledged general aviation airport. As business becomes more and more feasible and the population in the area increases, people living in the surrounding areas might be keeping a plane at Mililani and fly to Honolulu rather than be involved in the tremendous traffic congestion all the way in to Honolulu.

Mr. McAuliffe stated that safety is not a problem. The biggest problem is the use of the airport by the relatively slow general aviation aircraft which have the tendency to reduce the available runways

at Honolulu International Airport. The only safety factor normally involved in any airport is immediately after takeoff. He noted that the traffic pattern at Mililani does not affect Crestview or the Mililani Town Development. The air space is presently being used for the practice of special maneuvers, therefore, from the noise standpoint there is little or no variation. In fact, noise might be less because practice maneuvers of this sort are not permitted near the vicinity of an airport.

With reference to joint use with the military, Mr. McAuliffe noted that Honolulu International Airport is a joint-use airport. For almost three years they have been trying to obtain sufficient land to extend the runway at Honolulu Airport but they have not been successful. From the liability standpoint of the military, he believed that the joint-use concept has not proved feasible.

To have some concept of how difficult it is to get through to the control tower, Mr. McAuliffe offered to take the Commission members up in an airplane and fly over Honolulu. He indicated that sometimes there is a wait of 15 minutes before he can contact the tower. He believed that no matter where the airport is situated, there will be a conflict with developers because the basic physical requirements of an airport are of such a nature that they automatically become a part of the land and no one will welcome it with open arms. He suspected that in the future the airfield at Kahuku and at Haleiwa may be reactivated. However, he stressed that the Mililani site is still needed. Eventually this area will become the heart of the populated areas and become important to the economy of the whole State. Regardless of a strip, the air over this area will be used increasingly so that it would be desirable to have not one, but two such sites.

In the interrogation that followed, Mr. McAuliffe replied that:

1) The proposed airport project is to be financed through revenue bonds and participation by the FAA. Since the major airlines underwrite such major capital improvements, no project can be undertaken without their concurrence. In this instance, the airlines are 100 percent in favor of the move, for the obvious reason that approximately one-third of the flights will be eliminated from Honolulu Airport.

2) At this time they are requesting a conditional use permit to establish the general aviation airport. Since substantial capital improvements will be involved they will eventually request for the establishment of a permanent zoning for airport use.

3) If land were available at Honolulu Airport, they could construct another parallel runway provided that the air flight pattern does not conflict with the overall flight pattern of the area, but they have not been able to determine how this can be done

under the present long-range Master Plan for Honolulu Airport.

4) The airstrip at Kunia does not meet acceptable standards for general aviation at the present time. It is a private operation and whether or not the present operator, Mr. Uldrick, would continue the use, he does not know. The Robinson Estate has not renewed the lease on the land and the operation is presently closed.

5) There is a gully at the far end of the landing strip with the alignment of the H-2 Freeway running through there. Because of the limited space, the runway cannot be extended any more than the maximum of 3,100 feet if built to that extent.

6) The necessity for a lighted field for night flying will be created by demand. Presently, considerable night flying practice and training are done at Honolulu Airport. Therefore, he would prefer that restriction on the hours of operation would not be imposed at this time until they know exactly what problems would be encountered.

7) Should the general aviation airport be established at this location, he anticipated that training flight movements would be transferred from Honolulu Airport to this field. Following the pattern of growth all over the mainland, he saw the possibility of an expanded airport with an operation tower. If his information is correct, FAA would not be able to fund and construct a tower unless they have 30 years.

8) The initial cost of this project is $1.1 million to $1.2 million. Assuming that they obtain title to the land, they can have the project out for bid within 60 days.

9) Even though the use of Bellows Field is obtained, the Mililani site is needed. For certain flying purposes, Mililani is all right but it is too far for training flights.

10) He believed it feasible to have this type of general aviation airport on the neighbor islands. In fact, a Master Plan for a new airport at Keahole, Kona, Hawaii, is being prepared. This type of facility is needed on Oahu because the people who would be using the airport facilities are on Oahu. There is need for restrooms, coffee shop and the different service facilities found in a general aviation airport. There must also be a certain element of profit.

11) The immediate urgency for the Mililani site is for touch-and-go training flights. Bellows might be preferred by some owners of small, private aircraft because Mililani is not for that type of activities. Both sites are needed.

12) Through their congressional delegation, Washington officials and others, every attempt has been made to obtain the use of Bellows but there

are still oppositions from other branches of the military.

13) He does not have any current information with respect to general aviation activities at Honolulu Airport and the dollar amount of revenue. He believed that this information can be obtained.

14) He did not believe that an economic feasibility study was made on the Mililani site. However, analyses of all possible sites were made and a report prepared indicating the various considerations that were given in selecting the presently proposed site.

15) He believed that the need for another runway at this site is remote.

Mr. Palk supplemented his prior statement by informing the Commission about the airfield at Kunia. He stated that in 1958 Castle and Cooke was asked to release approximately 32 acres for construction of the Kunia airstrip because of the need for student pilots. A dirt runway existed for 6 years and the field was used by pilots. The FAA has certified this airstrip. Now they are told that this field is not usable and must be upgraded to FAA standards. He does not know the economics involved in upgrading the field, but it is his understanding that because the State had taken a position on the Mililani site, the Kunia airfield had to be closed.

To avoid splitting their agricultural operations, Mr. Palk asked again whether this airport could be relocated farther in the makai direction on the other side of Kamehameha Highway. Another site closer to Waipahu was also suggested but it was eliminated because of objection from the Waipahu Community Association. He does not know whether an economic cost study was done, but he believed that these alternate sites were suitable and should be given further consideration.

The Commission asked Mr. Palk whether Castle and Cooke had done its own cost study to support its claim on the suitability of the alternate sites mentioned.

Mr. Palk commented that from experience, he has learned that government, once it makes up its mind about a particular project and with its power of condemnation, will go ahead and proceed with that project despite objections. He suggested that the State determine the feasibility of 4 or 5 sites in terms of cost. He believed that some sort of study was done but he has not seen any data on cost study to support the selection of the Mililani site. He then mentioned that Castle and Cooke is working cooperatively with the Airport Division because there is a proposal to bury the existing power lines under the strip at a cost of about $180,000.

Mr. William T. Klopp, General Aviation Officer with the Airports Division of the Department of Transportation, reported that he had worked on this project for the last two years with Mr. McAuliffe and representatives of the FAA by evaluating the various airport sites. They have checked the ground conditions, the topography of the land, investigated the land ownership, and flown over the sites, and he concurs that the Mililani site is the most feasible site from all standpoints of their evaluation. He admitted that relocation of utilities is a problem and very expensive. The two power lines that presently go through the center of the site must be buried and rerouted to the end of the property. Because of the peculiarity in burying high voltage lines, the lines must be carried over the H-2 highway twice and this proposal has received the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads.

With reference to the alternate site mentioned by Mr. Palk, Mr. Klopp stated that the site was investigated and they had flown over it. It is a favorable site because of its closeness to Honolulu Airport, but the conditions strongly against it are: (1) Not enough length to meet requirement; (2) The takeoff pattern would be directly over the Crestview residential development; (3) A multitude of major power transmission lines crisscrossing the property; (4) A reservoir, water tanks and various items used by the plantation would have to be relocated at considerable expense; and (5) The terrain is such that grading cost would be extremely expensive.

The better points of the Mililani site are the fact that the land is level, the highways at either end of the strip prohibit the expansion of the airport which is not their purpose, the position of the gulches protects the clear zone and at the same time prevent the encroachment of urban uses near the airport, and the agricultural lands act as a buffer from the urban areas.

Regarding the Kunia site, Mr. Klopp stated that a study was done in 1954 or 1955 by L. Frederick Pack Associates. It is true that the land was taken out of pineapple by Dole Company for airport purpose. But, he indicated that this airport was developed by a private individual to standards which are different from those of public airports. The regulations are such that the private owner may declare it to be an airport, but in order for the State to develop a public airport, it must assure the public a reasonable degree of safety. Kunia suffered 12 or 13 crashes since its existence and one of them was fatal. The causes were primarily because of its physical limitations, such as deep gulches, near Kunia Road, and heavy power lines directly in the flight pattern. The maximum length of the runway is 2,200 or 2,300 feet. FAA did not participate in its construction but merely published the fact that an airport existed in the area. It is up to the operators to decide whether or not to use it. For a long time students were stopped from using the airport.

Since there was no further testimony from the public, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Brennan.

In later discussion, the Commission requested additional information from the State with respect to the present nature and extent of general aviation activity at the Honolulu International Airport including volume and the revenue generated, the comparative site study report made of all the sites considered, and the implication of a full-scale airport in the area.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Muller, the Commission deferred action on this application for receipt of additional information.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
WAHIAWA
231 LEHUA STREET
RESIDENTIAL USE
(SOON YEE CHOI
SONG)

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Wahiawa by changing the land use designation from commercial use to residential use for a portion of a parcel of land at 231 Lehua Street, situated 100 feet northerly of Kilani Avenue, in Wahiawa, and identified by Tax Map Key 7-4-05: portion of Parcel 30.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 30, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the owner of the property, and to the Wahiawa Community and Businessmen's Association, Inc. No written comments or protests have been received to date.

The Director reported that the total land area of this property is 17,710 sq. ft., and presently, 8,050 sq. ft. or 45% of the property is zoned Class A Residential while 9,660 sq. ft. or 55% is zoned Business. The owner of the parcel made the request for a change and as a result, adjoining property owners having the same situation of dual zoning on their properties were contacted to see whether or not they would be agreeable to the removal of the commercial zoning from a portion of their properties. In all cases a negative reply was received because the business zoned portion of their lots is improved with apartments. Since Lehua Street does not provide for a good business frontage, the Director indicated that the change from commercial to residential use for the subject property would be appropriate.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Torao Ichikawa represented the owners of the property Mr. and Mrs. Soon Yee Choi Song. He had nothing to add to the presentation made by the Director and he requested the Commission to act favorably upon the proposal.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Muller, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Wahiawa by changing the land use designation from commercial to residential use for a portion of a parcel of land at 231 Lehua Street in Wahiawa.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING GENERAL INDUSTRIAL
KALIHI-KAI
MAKAI-EWA CORNER OF DILLINGHAM BLVD AND MOKAUEA STREET
PAUL M. BRADY

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing Class A Residential and Business to General Industrial, in conformity with the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu, for a 13,864 sq. ft. parcel of land situated at the makai-ewa corner of Dillingham Boulevard and Mokauea Street in Kalihi-Kai and identified by Tax Map Key 1-2-09: Parcel 1.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 30, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the Model Cities field office in the Kalihi-Palama area, and to the various community and businessmen's associations in the Kalihi area. No comments or protests in writing have been received to date.

The Director reported that the subject parcel is presently improved with a service station and the intent of the lessee is to completely rebuild the area with a new service station. A small portion of the property is presently zoned for residential use and rather than zone the area to business, the proposal is to zone the entire parcel to industrial in conformity with the General Plan. The Detailed Land Use Plan for the area is presently being prepared in conjunction with the Model Cities Program. Since the necessary public utilities are available and the property fronts two improved streets, the Director recommended approval of the proposed change in zoning.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposal. Attorney George Ariyoshi was present on behalf of the owner of the land and he had nothing to add to the presentation made by the Director.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Muller, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Class A Residential and Business to General Industrial for the parcel of land situated at the makai-ewa corner of Dillingham Boulevard and Mokauea Street in Kalihi-Kai.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING APARTMENT
DISTRICT B
KALIHI
1531 and 1537
KAM IV ROAD
ESTATE OF ROSE H.
SMITH

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Class B Residential to Apartment District B for a 26,817 sq. ft. parcel of land at 1531 and 1537 Kam IV Road, situated on the waikiki side of Kam IV Road and directly across Pio Place in Kalihi, and identified by Tax Map Key 1-3-14: Parcel 31, in conformity with the adopted General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 30, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, Mr. Lloyd Wong, the Model Cities office, and to the various community and businessmen's associations in the Kalihi area. No comments or protests in writing have been received to date.

The Director explained that through Committee Report No. 1080 dated May 28, 1968 from the City Council, the Planning Department, through the Mayor, was directed to take immediate steps to rezone the subject property from residential to apartment classificiation and to delete the master plan roadway affecting the property. He reported that the Detailed Land Use Plan for this section of Kalihi has not been adopted and a plan is presently under study in conjunction with the Model Cities Program. Under the old master plan adopted for the area, Hulali Place is shown as being extended through this property to Kam IV Road. Under the preliminary plan proposed for the area, Hulali Place is to be curved down in the makai direction to connect with Owene Street. The adopted General Plan designates this general area for apartment use without an indication of whether it is for low, medium, or high density apartment use. The staff is recommending low density apartment use for this area.

When asked by the Commission whether there is a possibility that the plan might be changed again to extend Hulali Place through the subject property, the Director replied in the negative. He noted that the extension of Hulali Place in the makai direction would provide for enough depth and frontage for development of the properties on both sides of the street.

No one spoke in opposition to this proposed zoning.

Mr. Walter Clark was present on behalf of the owner of the property and Mr. O. Vincent Esposito, attorney for the owner. There were no questions from the Commission.

<u>ACTION</u>: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Class B Residential to Apartment District B for a 26,817 sq. ft. parcel of land at 1531 and 1537 Kam IV Road in Kalihi.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
WAIKIKI
2229 KUHIO AVE.
BENJAMIN AYSON, SR.

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business for a 3,595 sq. ft. parcel of land at 2229 Kuhio Avenue, situated on the makai-diamond head corner of Royal Hawaiian Avenue and Kuhio Avenue, in Waikiki, and identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-19: Parcel 8, in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for the Waikiki area.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 30, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies and to the various community and civic organizations in the Waikiki and Diamond Head areas. No written comments have been received to date.

The Director noted that the Commission had observed the property during the field trip through the Waikiki area this morning. The property is improved with a single family residential dwelling and it is situated within an area designated for commercial use on the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for Waikiki. Under the new zoning ordinance, the commercial use designation will become the new resort-commercial district where a certain percentage of residential uses will be permitted in addition to permitted commercial uses. Kuhio Avenue which fronts this property has a right-of-way width of 70 feet with a pavement width of 36 feet in good condition. There are standard curbs, gutters and sidewalks. Sewer and water facilities are available and adequate for the proposed development of the property. He indicated that abutting property owners were contacted to see whether or not they would be interested in joining in the application for rezoning but they were not interested, and as a result, only the subject property is being recommended for rezoning at this time.

In reply to the Commission's inquiries, the Director reported on the abutting uses. The abutting property on the Kuhio Avenue side is improved with a three or four story apartment building and beyond that property is the new Marine Surf Hotel. The abutting property on the Royal Hawaiian Avenue side has a single family residential structure on it and beyond that are several three story apartment buildings.

Since the subject property is small, the Director stated that an attempt was made to have the abutting owners join in this rezoning proposal to provide for an opportunity for a consolidation and joint development, but the answers received from the abutting owners were in the negative. Although the property is small, he believed that its use exclusively for business purpose should pose no problem.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. Howard Corey spoke on behalf of Mr. Henry Grant, owner of property at 349 Royal Hawaiian Avenue which is at the corner of Waikolu Way and Royal Hawaiian Avenue, two lots away from the property under consideration for rezoning. He asked the Director whether the commercial designation of this block prohibits further development of hotels and apartments although the present zoning permits these uses.

The Director replied that the newly proposed resort-commercial district will allow hotel and apartment developments.

Mr. Corey noted that the surrounding area is gradually being developed with fine large hotel and apartment buildings, and he commented that the present proposal to zone one small lot for business appears to be spot zoning and does not lend itself to any consolidation. It seemed obvious to him that sooner or later, development will have to consider more than two-lot consolidation. He indicated that the Director had mentioned the possibility of a consolidation of several lots but noted that no such proposal was made for Mr. Grant's lot. He asked whether the property owner had submitted any plans for development of the property. Not knowing what use is planned for the property, he was at a loss to present any sort of defense.

The Director stated that a development plan has not been received from the owner. Although it is not a requirement, it is preferred that the owner submit a development plan. He stated that the owner can use his property for any type of commercial uses permitted in a business district.

The Commission asked Mr. Corey whether his client had any plans for development of the area through consolidation with adjoining property owners.

Mr. Corey stated that he presently lives in a private home and he fully realizes that eventually the area must undergo a change. If it is possible, he would like to see the consolidation of several lots for a good development, but he indicated that his client is not ready to develop his property. His objection was to the fact that zoning is being proposed on a piecemeal basis. He noted that there is a business enterprise at the other end of Waikolu Way. Although the map does not show this property to be in a business zone, he felt that the business use was preferred than the "Gypsies" and "beach bums" who previously occupied the area.

Mrs. Jaimiee Rich of 353 Royal Hawaiian Avenue took exception to the statement made by the Director that the adjoining property on Royal Hawaiian Avenue is improved by a single family residential home. She stated that there are three apartment units in that building and Hawaiian Trust administers that property. The abutting property on Kuhio Avenue side, she understands, was willed to the Jewish Synagogue by the lady who owned the property. She stated that no one had consulted her about the possibility of a consolidation.

The Director stated that only the immediate abutting property owners were consulted.

Mrs. Rich then indicated that the corner parcel which is presently under consideration for rezoning has four separate apartment units in the existing building. It is not a single family occupancy by the owner. Her property abuts Mr. Grant's property and as stated by Admiral Corey she also did not wish to see anything developed which would jeopardize the proper development of the area. She was approached by three promoters who were interested in developing this one-half block area. She stated that she is agreeable to a consolidated development but not a spot development. However, should the present request be granted, she felt that she should be granted the same privilege. She stated that she maintains a first-class operation with high class clientele on her property. She was afraid that spot business uses might bring in unsavory characters and mentioned that she acts as a watchdog to see that her area is kept decent by picking up empty beer bottles and cans left on the streets and sidewalks. She is very selective of her tenants.

The Commission advised her that she may also apply for business zoning of her property since it is situated within the area designated for commercial use.

Mr. Yamabe believed that serious consideration should be given to the zoning of the entire block or half a block in order to present a total picture of the development potential of the area. Even though the owners may not wish the zoning change at this time, if the property is small, he felt that the zoning change should be made anyway.

The Director stated that zoning is usually done upon a request from the property owner. The other parcels were not included because of past experiences and the reaction of the Commission to exclude those properties which were included in a rezoning proposal because of objection from the owners.

Mr. Allen Marutani, attorney, represented the owner of the property. In reply to questions from the Commission, he stated that the owner plans to operate a curio shop, primarily goods imported from the Philippines. No substantial change is to be made to the existing structure except for necessary alterations for a curio shop operation. He stated that there are four units in the building, three of which are rented and the fourth occupied by the owner. Mr. Ayson, the owner, operates a real estate business and if it is feasible, he would like to operate his business from within the building. Eventually, the apartment operation is to be ceased and replaced by the two business operations. The owner will live on the premises until such time as the business operations are ready.

Mrs. Rich commented that the business operations mentioned might not be open at night so that she

could have some peaceful night's sleep, but she expressed concern should a liquor store or a packaged bottle club operate in the area.

Mr. Marutani stated that his client does not intend to operate a liquor store. Furthermore, a liquor store would require an application to the Liquor Commission so that Mrs. Rich will have every opportunity to protest.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

In later consideration, the Commission suggested to the Director that he consider the possibility of including the rest of the properties in this block for rezoning to business.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission deferred action on this rezoning proposal.

PUBLIC HEARING ZONING BUSINESS WAIKIKI DIAMOND HEAD SIDE OF SEASIDE AVENUE, BET. KUHIO AND KALAKAUA AVENUES CONSOLIDATED AMUSEMENT CO., LTD.

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing Hotel and Apartment District to Business District for six parcels of land totaling approximately 60,000 sq. ft., situated on the Diamond Head side of Seaside Avenue between Kuhio and Kalakaua Avenues in Waikiki, identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-22: Parcels 17, 18, and portions of Parcels 9, 14, 24 and 25, in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Waikiki area.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 30, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies and to the Waikiki Development Company. No protests or comments in writing have been received to date.

The Director presented the request by pointing out the area under consideration situated within the middle of the block adjacent to the Waikiki Theater and the Waikiki Business Plaza building on the makai side and the corner area of Seaside and Kuhio Avenues designated for public use (off-street parking garage) on the mauka side. The area under consideration is to be developed as a three theater complex with a parking garage. Through the Department of Traffic, a discussion was held on the possibility of a combined effort to develop the two parking structures; however, the two structures will be developed separately because such a proposal might not be economically feasible. The proposed public parking garage was established in this area because of a critical need for more off-street parking facilities and presently the area is not extensively developed. Public utilities, water and sewer, are available to serve the proposed development and since the proposed zoning is in conformity with the General Plan, the Director recommended approval.

A sketch plan showing the proposed three theater complex on three different levels and the multi-deck parking structure was displayed.

In reply to questions from the Commission, the Director did not believe that the proposed development would interfere with the City's multi-deck parking structure plan in the adjacent area. He noted that the City originally had planned for a much larger area for the parking structure but the City Council had reduced it to the present size shown of about 60,000 sq. ft., because of the high value of land in Waikiki.

The Director stated that Seaside Avenue has a right-of-way width of 60 feet with a pavement width of 28 feet. Presently, there is no intention to widen the pavement width of Seaside Avenue although the present pavement will be repaved because it is in poor condition as a result of the sewer construction project. He believed that the public parking garage will accommodate about 400 to 500 cars. The parking requirement for a theater is one space for every ten seats. The applicant's proposed development will contain approximately 423 parking stalls.

Testimony was heard from those speaking in opposition to the proposed rezoning.

(Mr. Rutledge was excused from the meeting at about this portion of the discussion.)

Admiral Howard Corey was opposed to the development of the proposed theater complex until such time as the public multi-deck parking structure is constructed. He indicated that the area is quite congested with inadequate parking facilities, especially during the evening and as a result, cars are being parked on the two private streets in the area blocking the private driveways and garages so that the people could not get in or out of their garages. The police are called but they are powerless to do anything because the streets are private. The only recourse the owners have is to swear out a warrant for trespassing and to have the cars removed at their own expense. He noted that the large parking area behind Waikiki Theater will be eliminated by the proposed development. Therefore, he felt that the problem of parking should be resolved before any kind of development is permitted in the area.

The Commission asked Admiral Corey whether during the evening, he had ever observed the length of time necessary for the theater patrons to drive out of the area at the end of a full performance.

Admiral Corey stated that he had never made that observation. The shows, although regularly scheduled, are continuous performances so that it is difficult to produce that type of statistics. He indicated that the congestion is most noticeable when people are going to the 8:00 p.m. show and park most anywhere they can. There is congestion again when the show is over at about 10:30 p.m. or 11:00 p.m.

He emphasized that parking is presently inadequate so that the proposed development will merely intensify that situation.

Mrs. Jaimiee Rich agreed with the statement made by Admiral Corey. She also mentioned the difficulty of getting in or out of her garage as a result of cars parked in front of her garage. During the evening, the theater patrons are usually the offenders and sometimes during the day, the swimmers park their cars in front of her garage.

Mr. Morio Omori, attorney for Consolidated Amusement Co., Ltd., submitted a new set of plans for the theater complex development. He stated that the plan has been changed to two theaters on the ground floor instead of three with a parking ramp of five decks which will accommodate 350 cars. Each theater will contain 992 seats. The parking structure will accommodate the two theaters and the Waikiki Theater which has 1,000 seats because the existing parking area adjacent to Waikiki Theater will be developed as part of this complex. Egress and ingress will be from both ends of the parking structure.

Mr. Omori indicated that under the existing zoning requirement, 299 stalls will be required for the total seating capacity of 2,984 seats but 350 stalls are being provided. The total investment of land and building is estimated at $3.5 million; therefore, the landowner would not be investing in a project which would not be good for Waikiki or to the landowner.

He noted that an area of about 60,000 sq. ft. at the corner of Seaside and Kuhio Avenues will be developed as a public parking garage facility by the City and County. The possibility of a joint use of the two parking facilities was discussed with the Traffic Department and the Corporation Counsel but because of the uncertain building schedule of the City and County, the developer cannot wait and is expected to have all plans completed by October. The City anticipates having commercial spaces on the ground floor of the parking structure and the question as to whether or not the City can use or condemn property for commercial purposes must possibly be ruled by the courts.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Omori did not know the exact number of parking spaces available on the present Waikiki Theater parking area, but he noted that it is in excess of the present one space for ten seats requirement. During theater hours, he stated that the proposed parking structure will be for the exclusive use of the theater goers but as requested by the City, there might be a joint use later where the public will have use of the parking facility during off theater hours. In effect, this parking structure will supplement the public parking facility.

The Commission asked Mr. Omori whether or not his client had made a study on the number of motor vehicles actually generated by the theater, how that traffic is handled, and the estimated number of cars going in and out during what hours of the day and night.

Mr. Omori did not believe that such a study was made. He indicated that the present parking area is operated by a concessionaire who does stack parking. On that basis, he did not believe that the public roadways are being congested any more than what presently exists. He admitted that the proposed use of the premises will generate more traffic, but he noted that there are egress and ingress from both sides of the structure. Besides the exit to Seaside Avenue, there is an easement running between the Waikiki Theater and the Waikiki Business Plaza building which provides an exit to Kalakaua Avenue. This easement extends all the way from Kuhio Avenue so that the City and County parking structure will also be utilizing this easement for access to Kuhio Avenue. He noted that this is not the roadway easement that goes to the Liberty House parking lot from Kuhio Avenue but is an easement that is located slightly in the ewa direction. This easement must be kept open at all times.

Mr. Omori was then asked whether his client had made any study to determine the relationship between the number of seats in a theater and the number of parking stalls which would be required. In other words, for the 2,984 seats, instead of the 350 stalls provided, there might be a need to provide 700 stalls.

Mr. Omori did not know whether such a study was made, but he indicated that based on a study made by his client that the majority of the Waikiki Theater patrons walked rather than used cars, his client decided to develop two more theaters next to an existing theater. On that basis, he believed that 350 car stalls should be more than adequate.

The Commission then asked whether in the discussion with the City, the possibility was ever mentioned about Consolidated developing the public parking structure as well.

Mr. Omori replied that such a discussion was held with the Traffic Department and the Corporation Counsel, but because of the legal problem mentioned earlier, his client did not wish to be involved in any type of development which would lead to some sort of litigation. Because of the high cost of land, the City felt that in order to make the parking project economically feasible, it had to have some commercial areas to generate income. The City must obtain a ruling on whether or not the public purpose section of the condemnation law would be met if a portion of the land is used for commercial purposes.

Mrs. Rich stated her belief that Waikiki Theater contains 1,500 seats and wondered whether Mr. Omori had made a mistake by saying there are 1,000 seats. Mr. Omori did not believe that he had made a mistake.

Since there was no further testimony from the public, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Chun.

In considering this matter later, the Commission requested a report from the Traffic Department with respect to the anticipated number of vehicular traffic generated from the proposed theater complex development, what is being proposed to expedite the movement of traffic out of the parking garage and the streets, and such other pertinent information. The Commission requested that a representative from the Traffic Department meet with the Commission at its next meeting.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Brennan, the Commission deferred action for receipt of further information on traffic.

PUBLIC HEARING ZONING ORDINANCE OFF STREET LOADING REQUIREMENTS

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposed ordinance to amend Chapter 21, Article 1, Revised Ordinances of Honolulu 1961, as amended, by amending the title of Section 21-1.2 and adding thereto a new section to be numbered 21-1.2(e), relating to Off-Street Loading Requirements, to read as follows:

"(e) Off-Street Loading Requirements.

The off-street loading requirements herein specified shall apply to all lots exceeding 5,000 square feet in area for the class or kind of uses indicated.

Moreover, if any building existing or having a valid building permit on the effective date of these provisions is subsequently altered to increase floor area by 50% or more, or converted from any other use to the uses listed in column 1 of the chart below, off-street loading spaces shall be provided as indicated. Where a building is used for more than one use, and floor area for each use is below the minimum required loading space but the aggregate floor area is greater than such minimum, off-street loading space shall be provided as though the total area requiring off-street loading space were used for the purpose requiring the most spaces.

Column 1 Use or Use Category	Column 2 Floor Area in Square Feet	Column 3 Loading Space Requirements
Retail stores, eating and drinking establishments, wholesale houses, warehouse, repair, general service, manufacturing or industrial establishments.	2,000-10,000	one
	10,001-20,000	two
	20,001-40,000	three
	40,001-60,000	four
	Each 50,000 over 60,000	one additional
Hotels, hospitals or similar institutions, or places of public assembly.	5,000-10,000	one
	10,001-50,000	two
	50,001-100,000	three
	Each 100,000 over 100,000	one additional
Funeral home or Mortuary	2,500-4,000	one
	4,001-6,000	two
	Each 10,000 over 6,000	one additional
Multiple-family dwellings, offices or office buildings	20,000-50,000	one
	50,001-100,000	two
	Each 100,000 over 100,000	one additional

No loading space required under the provisions of this Chapter shall be in any public street or alley, but shall be provided within the building or on the lot, and shall have minimum horizontal dimensions of 12 x 35 feet and a vertical clearance of at least 14 feet."

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 30, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, the Chamber of Commerce, Oahu Development Conference, Downtown Improvement Association, Waikiki Jaycees, Waikiki Improvement Association, and to the Black Point, the Diamond Head Terrace, and the Diamond Head Circle Community Associations.

The Director explained the provisions of the ordinance and the purpose for establishing the off-street loading requirements. He indicated that the City Council had discussed the provisions of the ordinance quite extensively and the same provisions are contained in the final draft of the Comprehensive Zoning Code. The size of the off-street loading space is indicated as having a minimum horizontal dimension of 12 x 35 feet and a vertical clearance of at least 14 feet. This size was adopted based on studies made by the Urban Land Institute and also the Planning Advisory Service.

The Director then acknowledged receipt of two letters which were placed on file. He read the letter submitted by Mr. Harold C. Schnack who felt that the proposed requirement as it relates to multiple family dwellings and office buildings is unreasonable. He recommended that the following changes be made:

1. Double the minimum lot size at which an off-street loading space be required for dwellings or offices.

2. An owner be permitted to substitute a passenger loading area for the first required freight area in any dwelling or office building of 20,000 sq. ft.

3. The vertical clearance of any required off-street loading space be reduced to 12 feet from 14 feet.

Victoria Ward, Ltd., in its letter, believed that the vertical clearance of 14 feet is excessive, especially for apartment buildings. It also believed that the number of off-street loading spaces required for apartment buildings should be examined further and cited as an example, the Queen Emma Gardens apartment project of 587 units. Despite its high turnover, moving vans on the premises rarely exceed three, yet, based on its floor area of approximately 570,000 sq. ft., six loading spaces would be required.

Mr. Yamabe asked for the rationale for using the size of the property and not the specific use in determining the need for an off-street loading area. He noted that the minimum lot size for multiple family dwellings and office buildings is 20,000 sq. ft.

The Director explained that an attempt was made to relate the amount of traffic that might be generated for a specific size of lot and for the amount of available floor area. For instance, on a lot size of 5,000 sq. ft., because of the requirement for spacing, yard setback and the limitation on the floor area ratio, it was felt that such limited use would not generate that much loading and unloading requirement, but rather would impose a hardship on the owner if a requirement was made for an off-street loading area. This situation would apply to many of the lots in the McCully and the Moiliili areas where the size of the lots is 5,000 sq. ft. or less and even in the new commercial districts in the downtown area. However, should there be a consolidation and a large building constructed, it would be appropriate to require an off-street loading area.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. Richard Lowe, planner with the Victoria Ward, Limited, did not oppose the proposed amendment in its entirety but questioned certain portions of it. He agreed with the concept of the off-street loading requirements but felt that the number of spaces required for apartment buildings should be examined further. He had spoken to the manager of the Queen Emma Gardens apartment project and the result is as reported in the letter submitted. He indicated that the number of moving vans on the property seems to be determined by the capacity of the elevator indicating that there can't possibly be more than three vans on the property at the same time, yet the requirement for Queen Emma Gardens under the proposal would be six spaces. In one of their proposed apartment project for which a feasibility study has been completed, he indicated that as much as ten loading spaces would be involved.

Regarding the vertical height of 14 feet, Mr. Lowe felt that this was excessive. Although there are some trucks and vans reaching a height of 13 feet, he indicated that the normal height of vans servicing apartments is 11 feet or 11-1/2 feet. Therefore, a reduction seems to be justified from actual experience of some of the apartment building managers.

Mr. Muller noted that under a bridge, the Federal standard is 16-foot clearance, so he believed that someone might build a van to that height indicating that 14 feet is not too high. He felt it wiser to have the higher requirement than a lower requirement of 12 feet.

Mr. Lowe stated that in consulting the moving service companies, he was informed that the size of the moving vans depended on each situation; that is, the apartment property involved and the streets the vans would move over so the possibility is there that a 14-foot van might be used. His concern was that even a foot would make a difference for a project that is to be undertaken by the company he represents.

The Commission noted that the height of a "container" is about 12 feet so that when placed on a flat bed truck, the added height would prevent the truck from entering a space with a 12-foot height.

Mr. Brennan commented that through experience he noticed that trucks and vans vary in size; therefore, the 14-foot height does not seem excessive.

Mr. Don Dumlao, practicing architect, was concerned with certain provisions of the ordinance. Regarding a low rise development consisting of about 20 units on a 20,000 sq. ft. lot, he noted that the ordinance requires a minimum of one loading space. He asked where this space is to be located on the property. If it is placed on one end of the property, he questioned how it would service the units on the other end.

For a high-rise structure, he indicated that the 14-foot height becomes a problem if there are parking decks. The ground floor parking deck would have to go partially below terrain or one level of parking must be eliminated.

He questioned whether the purpose of this ordinance would really be accomplished. Quite often, an ordinance is drafted for a very good reason and he can see the validy of this need for certain hotels in the Waikiki area where there is traffic congestion because loading and unloading operations are conducted on the streets; however, his concern was the effect of the requirement upon different types of situation. His particular reference was to a proposed development by Mr. Schnack of a 17 story apartment building with parking in excess of requirement. In order to comply with the provisions of the off-street loading ordinance, he indicated that approximately three levels of parking would have to be eliminated in order to obtain the required height, provide access, and to make the loading area usable. In some instances, the number of required space and height limitation can be quite excessive, and if there is more than one space, the frequency of use also becomes questionable.

The Director stated that the ordinance does not specify the location of such spaces on the lot. For a low rise development of about two stories, it is assumed that such a loading space can be accommodated on the driveway depending on the layout of the parking area, the driveway width, and so forth. For a low rise development with parking underneath the building, the requirement for a 14-foot clearance might pose a problem unless there is a driveway or setback area that can be used. For high-rise buildings, it is anticipated that the design of the driveways and parking levels would be changed to accommodate this.

The Director stated that the provisions of the ordinance will definitely be enforced. In fact, there is now under consideration, a proposal to enforce this for existing buildings where loading and unloading operations are being conducted on the streets and thus blocking one lane of traffic in areas where no parking is permitted. The City Council and the Traffic Department agree that enforcement would have to be much more strict. Therefore, by requiring such loading areas, it is expected that they would be used. This is fulfilling a real need and he felt that it should have been done a number of years ago.

Mr. Dumlao was not against the concept of the ordinance but his question related to the ratio used and the limitation on height. He also felt that the frequency of use should be taken into consideration. His question on location was answered by the Director.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Chun, closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

The Commission discussed this matter later.

The Director who lives in the Queen Emma Gardens apartment observed that at times, there are eight or ten moving vans or delivery or service trucks on the premises so that he did not agree with the statement made that the requirement of six spaces for this project would be excessive.

The Commission asked whether it is permissible to use driveway space for meeting the loading space requirement.

The Director indicated that the ordinance does not specify that point. The proposal is to examine each situation. Depending on the design of a project, a driveway could be blocked, but taking the Queen Emma Gardens development as an example, the driveway is wide enough and designed in such a way that it is accessible by cars although one lane is blocked.

The Commission was in agreement that if a loading area is to be permitted on a driveway, the driveway should be wide enough to permit two lanes of travel; otherwise, traffic would be blocked and people would be inconvenienced. The Commission felt that it should discuss this matter more in detail at its next meeting.

Mr. Yamabe requested the Director to consider the possibility of common loading areas for groups of small lots.

The Director felt that such a requirement would be too restrictive and it would be difficult to determine who should group together for such common areas. However, if they voluntarily provided a space, there would be no objection.

<u>ACTION</u>: Upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission deferred action on this matter.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) AIEA MAUKA OF MOANALUA ROAD, DIAMOND HEAD SIDE OF AIEA STREAM COMMERCIAL USE (ST. TIMOTHY'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH)

Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Brennan, the Commission authorized the calling of a public hearing on Thursday, July 25, 1968, starting at 1:30 p.m., to consider a proposal initiated by the Planning Director to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Halawa-Aiea area by changing the land use designation from residential use to commercial use for a 42,741 sq. ft. parcel of land situated on the mauka side of Moanalua Road, diamond head side of Aiea Stream and adjacent to the Aiea Shopping Center in Aiea.

ZONING CLASS A
AND A-2 RESIDENTIAL
MAUNALUA
OFF LUNALILO
HOME ROAD
KAISER HAWAII-KAI
DEVELOPMENT CO.

The Commission again considered a proposed change in zoning from Farm District to Class A and A-2 Residential for land situated off Lunalilo Home Road in Maunalua wihtin the Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development area. Approximately 6.073 acres are to be zoned Class A Residential and 109.158 acres, Class A-2 Residential. A public hearing was held and closed on April 4, 1968, and the Commission had deferred action to permit the tenant farmers to meet with Hawaii-Kai Development Company to see whether they could resolve their differences with respect to the relocation of the farmers from the area to the Kamilonui agricultural subdivision.

The Director reported that the staff met with the representatives on both sides and as a result additional correspondence has been received. He understands that Hawaii-Kai has made an offer to the farmers regarding their relocation problem but whether or not that offer has been accepted, he could not say. He noted in the audience Mr. Donald Iwai, attorney for Hawaii-Kai, Mrs. Lillie Wong, President of the Kamilonui Farmers Cooperative, Mr. Jack Toyama, President of the Koko Head Farm Bureau Center, and other farmers.

The Director did not know how far the Commission's authority should extend in trying to help resolve the farmers' problem on relocation because that appears to be a private matter to be settled between the developer and the farmers and does not seem to involve the concept of zoning in any way. Furthermore, even without the proposed zoning classification, under the existing zoning of Farm District, the developer can proceed to subdivide the area into 5,000 sq. ft. lots, but the developer is seeking a Class A-2 classification which is a minimum of 6,000 sq. ft. lots.

The Commission asked Mr. Iwai for a status report.

Mr. Iwai stated that the issue mentioned has not been resolved yet, and he proceeded to explain the negotiations held with the farmers and the most recent offer made in writing to the farmers to assist them in their relocation. He did not believe it necessary to explain the details of the offer and he also did not expect a reply within the next few days since the offer was made recently.

He indicated that within the area under consideration for rezoning, three farmers are involved. Two are piggery operators who have known for sometime that they must relocate and no problem is anticipated in their relocation. The third is a truck farmer and a definite offer of assistance in relocation and financial aid has been made. There are four other farmers in this general area but outside of the area presently pending for rezoning. They are hopeful of obtaining clearance from the Bishop Estate Trustees to grant the farmers tenancy leases for lands in the agricultural subdivision at Kamilonui. It is very important to Hawaii-Kai

that the farmers be relocated as soon as possible because clearance work is being done around the farmers right now and this is not a very healthy situation. The offer is made subject to Bishop Estate's approval of tenancy leases to the farmers.

He stated that the zoning that Hawaii-Kai is now seeking is merely to have the area zoned in conformity with the actual use of the land. As stated by the Director, the underlying zoning of Farm District permits a subdivision into 5,000 sq. ft. lots; therefore, Hawaii-Kai can proceed with its development, except that Hawaii-Kai does not want to go in and tear down the houses. Whether the zoning is deferred or approved, he indicated that this would not help the farmers because this is an issue separate from zoning. They are not trying to create a situation or give the impression that they are forcing the farmers to move from the area. Without getting involved in such private matters, he requested of the Commission to consider the rezoning proposal in accordance with the use designation shown on the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the area.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Iwai elaborated on the offer made to the truck farmer. Hawaii-Kai is quite aware that relocation cannot be done painlessly, and therefore, is extending all the assistance it can in helping the farmers relocate. Should the offer be rejected, the only alternative action Hawaii-Kai can take is to file a suit in court for summary possession of the property, but he stressed that this is a procedure Hawaii-Kai is trying to avoid. He emphasized that the Commission's action on the rezoning proposal would not in any way affect the private agreement between the two parties.

Mrs. Wong confirmed that the Farmers Cooperative did receive the offer mentioned by Mr. Iwai, but she indicated that the offer was received just this morning at 11:00 o'clock. The members are unable to understand the language contained in the offer; therefore, they had suggested a meeting with Hawaii-Kai in the presence of their attorney but they have received no response from Hawaii-Kai.

Mrs. Wong then reported on the hardship encountered by the farmers as a result of being relocated from one farm area to another because the agricultural subdivision at Kamilonui is not ready and the farmers desire some assistance from Hawaii-Kai in clearing and grading the agricultural land. They realize that under the present zoning, Hawaii-Kai can proceed with the residential subdivision and can evict them. They also realize that Hawaii-Kai is attempting to assist them but they are afraid that once zoning is granted, Hawaii-Kai would not be legally bound to assist them and might not even attempt to offer them any kind of assistance. Until the farmers can sit down with their attorney and read the offer made by Hawaii-Kai, she requested the Commission not to take any action on the rezoning proposal.

Upon questioning both parties, the Commission learned that Mr. Iwai did converse by telephone with Mr. Wallace Fujiyama, the farmers' attorney, about the offer but because Mr. Fujiyama is tied up in trial court, a meeting could not be held. The Commission was cognizant of the fact that the offer made is a private agreement between the two parties and should not in any way involve the consideration of whether or not the area should be rezoned. The Commission was sympathetic to the plight of the farmers and of the developer, but since the offer was made just this morning, the Commission felt that a two weeks' delay should not seriously affect the developer's plan for the area and was hopeful that they would resolve their problems within two weeks.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission deferred action on this rezoning proposal for two weeks.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima

Carole A. Kamishima
Secretary-Reporter II

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
July 25, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, July 25, 1968 at 1:32 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Richard K. Sharpless presiding:

PRESENT:
Richard K. Sharpless, Chairman
Philip Chun
Cyril W. Lemmon (present at 2:00 p.m.)
Arthur A. Rutledge
Thomas N. Yamabe II (excused at 3:00 p.m.)
Fred K. Kwock, ex-officio (present at 1:45 p.m.)

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director

ABSENT:
Edward Brennan (on trip)
Robert L. Muller (on trip)
Robert F. Ellis, ex-officio

MINUTES:
The minutes of June 27, 1968, as circulated, were approved on motion of Mr. Yamabe and second of Mr. Rutledge.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
D.L.U.M.
(AMENDMENT)
AIEA
MAUKA OF MOANALUA ROAD, DIAMOND HEAD SIDE OF AIEA STREAM (ADJACENT TO AIEA SHOPPING CENTER)
COMMERCIAL USE
ST. TIMOTHY'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa to Halawa by changing the land use designation from Residential to Commercial use for a parcel of land comprising 42,741 square feet at 99-236 Moanalua Road, adjacent to the Aiea Shopping Center in Aiea and identified as Tax Map Key 9-9-42: 51.

The notice of the public hearing published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 14, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant and to the applicable governmental agencies. No letters of protest have been received.

The Director pointed out on the Detailed Land Use Map displayed on the wall, the subject property which is located adjacent to the Aiea Shopping Center and bordered on the Diamond Head side of Aiea Stream. The applicant is desirous of selling this property to the Aiea Shopping Center for use as employee parking and in the interim, to utilize the existing building for storage of the shopping center supplies, such as Christmas decorations, Thanksgiving decorations, and other accessory storage needs of the shopping center. Presently, the employees are utilizing the prime parking spaces in the shopping center as they arrive before the stores open. A check made of the parking area in the shopping center revealed that there is a total area of 102,000 square feet and 309 parking spaces, which is 30 spaces short of the parking requirements of the shopping center. Under the

proposed Comprehensive Zoning Code requirement for parking, the shopping center should have 340 parking spaces.

Regarding the drainage, the Department of Public Works has indicated that if the existing building is to be utilized for storage purposes, this would not affect the drainage flow. However, if a building is to be constructed in the future, consideration must be given to the right-of-way width of the stream to be certain that there is sufficient land area for drainage.

Although the drawing of the proposed plans submitted by the Aiea Shopping Center shows a 10-foot street setback at this location, the Director indicated that this setback is not shown on the Department's land use map. A letter was sent to the State Highway Department inquiring about the possibility of actually establishing this street setback on the map. The amendment on the street widening proposal will be presented to the Commission at a later date.

He indicated that the area across the street is designated for Commercial uses. He felt that the parking spaces required by the shopping center could be provided and recommended approval of the proposal.

Mr. Yamabe inquired whether the zoning of the parcel is for Commercial uses or is it intended to be zoned as a parking area.

The Director stated that this is a change in land use designation from residential to commercial uses and noted that there is no separate parking district in the new Comprehensive Zoning Code. He anticipated that sometime in the future, there would be other types of commercial development which would have to meet the parking requirement. This could be handled similarly to those shopping centers with several parking levels. He noted that the Aiea Shopping Center has three levels.

He stated that the Church is planning a church-school complex and the property they now occupy cannot meet the parking requirement. The Church has found an area in the near vicinity which can accommodate both the school and church and at the same time provide sufficient parking facilities.

In reply to an inquiry as to whether the church or the developers plan to construct a bridge over the stream, the Director stated that no bridge is planned at this time because the church parcel will be used for employee parking by the Aiea Shopping Center.

However, sometime in the future, it would be desirable to have a connection over the stream somewhere in the back portion of the shopping

center. Presently, it was felt that there was no need because the employees arrive at the shopping center before the stores open.

Reverend Fritz Minuth, Director of St. Timothy's Episcopal Church, stated that the owner of the parcel is the Episcopal Church of Hawaii and not St. Timothy's Episcopal Church. He stated that the present site is inadequate for both church and school purposes, and the Church has found a larger piece of property in the Waimalu area on the Ewa side of the Kam Hi-Way Drive-In Theater to accommodate both the school and the church uses.

In response to questions from the Commission, Reverend Minuth stated that in March an offer to sell the Church property was made to the Aiea Shopping Center which indicated an interest provided that the property was properly rezoned to Commercial use. He does not know whether the offer is still in effect. There is an agreement of sale but this was done several months ago. The Church had made a number of inquiries as to how the land can be used to its highest and best use but they were informed that the land cannot be subdivided because of drainage and sewer problems. No word has been received from the Department of Public Works whether or not they would favor a subdivision. He was informed that the only logical use of the land would be for commercial purposes.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposal.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement on motion of Mr. Chun and second of Mr. Yamabe.

In the discussion that followed, the Commission inquired as to when adequate sewer facilities will be available for utilization of the area for commercial purposes.

The Director stated that an improvement district was proposed in 1961 but it was defeated by the property owners. This is primarily for the area below Moanalua Highway. Since that time, the improvement district ordinance has been amended but the proposed project was not resubmitted to the City Council for action. The staff is now studying the possibility of establishing a set-back for street widening purpose, and after the matter is settled with the State Highways Department, it is possible that an improvement district may be initiated. The main trunk line on Kamehameha Highway has been recently completed.

ACTION: The Commission, on motion of Mr. Lemmon and second of Mr. Rutledge, recommended approval of the proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa to Halawa by changing the land use desig-

nation from Residential to Commercial use for a parcel of land comprising 42,741 square feet at 99-236 Moanalua Road, adjacent to the Aiea Shopping Center in Aiea.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT WAIPIO, EWA EAST SIDE OF KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY, HONOLULU SIDE OF THE ROAD LEADING TO MILILANI CEMETERY STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

The Commission again considered an application for a Conditional Use Permit by the Airports Division of the State Department of Transportation to construct, operate and establish a general utility airport to accommodate small airplanes on a parcel of land comprising 79.5 acres, situated on the east side of Kamehameha Highway and on the Honolulu side of the road leading to Mililani Cemetery in Waipio, Ewa, more particularly identified as Tax Map Key 9-4-06: portion of Parcel 1.

A public hearing was held and closed on July 11, 1968, and the Commission deferred action for further information from the State Airports Division.

The Director reported that the information requested by the Commission was received just prior to the meeting. These relate to the various site studies made by the State. There is a map showing the 15 sites which were reviewed by the State Department of Transportation but most of these were rejected because of various problems; such as topography, nearness to other flight patterns, cost of developing the site because of problems with overhead transmission lines, and so forth.

A copy of the Operational Movements at Honolulu International Airport for the years 1960, 1965, 1966, 1967 and the first six months of 1968 was distributed to the Commission members. The operations for 1960 totaled 254,750 which are for landing and take-off of air carriers, military and general aviation. Out of this total, general aviation activities accounted for 44,326 operations or a rate of 17.4%. In 1967, there was a total of 305,577 operations of which general aviation operation accounted for 119,227 or 39%. For the first six months of 1968, general aviation operation has increased to 40% and the State estimates that by 1970, it may represent 50% of the traffic at Honolulu International Airport. Out of the estimated total operations of 380,000 for 1970, approximately 190,000 will be for general aviation activities. The State has also submitted the number of private aircrafts licensed at Honolulu International Airport.

In reply to questions from the Commission the Director explained that general aviation operations include single engine and two-engine planes, private planes which go to the neighbor islands or elsewhere, and the training operations, and exclude the commercial chartered

airlines, such as the air carrier operations of Pan American, United Airlines, Aloha Airlines, etc. and the military. The proposal is to separate the training flights from the charter flights. The student pilots will undergo training of touch-and-go landings and this type of operation could be relocated to the training field in Waipio.

Mr. Lemmon felt that this Commission should be concerned only with the land use and not with the number of aircrafts or their destination. He felt that he was not qualified to give an opinion on the number of types of aircrafts to be considered.

The Director agreed that the primary responsibility of the Commission is to consider land use and its compatibility with other land uses in the area, but he felt that at times the Commission must look a little further and consider land use as it relates to transportation.

Since the information requested was received just prior to the meeting, the Chairman suggested that the discussion today should be confined to questions and information. The members should orient themselves with the material and be prepared to discuss it at the next meeting. He then requested the Director to briefly explain the provisions of the Conditional Use Permit Ordinance.

The Director explained the provisions of the Conditional Use Permit Ordinance which lists about 12 to 14 uses permitted in all districts, but only upon application as a conditional use. Airport is one of the enumerated uses. After the Commission makes its recommendation, it is submitted to the City Council which also reviews the application and may hold a public hearing if it wished. The Council may also impose whatever conditions it sees fit and then authorizes the Planning Director to issue the Conditional Use Permit. The next procedure would be to amend the General Plan to designate the subject area as institutional use--airport--or blue coloring on the map. The zoning on the land could remain in agriculture to discourage the encroachment of urban uses in the surrounding area, such as that existing at Honolulu International Airport. He explained that the airport designation must be shown on the General Plan because when the State is ready to make an application for Federal Aid, the airport use must be certified as being in conformity with the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu.

Mr. Chun inquired whether the authority of this Commission could be superseded by the State with respect to the use of the land.

The Director stated that there is a difference of opinion on this. He cited an example in connection with Hokulani School where the State contended that it could acquire land for school use without compliance with local plans. The City's attorneys, in a written opinion, felt that the State must comply because the Charter requires this compliance. As far as he knows, the State Attorney General does not have this in writing. There may be provisions in different State statutes but not one overall statute which would cover situations such as this.

Mr. Yamabe wondered whether the Conditional Use Permit procedure is the proper method by which the airport use should be established in the area requested. Because conditions can be imposed with the Conditional Use Permit, he indicated the possibility that the permit can be withdrawn upon sufficient objection from the people. This may then jeopardize the State's plan to apply for Federal Aid to construct the airport.

The Director felt that if a situation should develop where consideration is given to cancelling the permit, then at that time, the State might react through possibly a legal opinion from the Attorney General or someone from the State indicating whether the airport use may or may not be continued. He assumed that legislative action could be taken since the State is the higher authority. Normally, if there are problems under the Conditional Use Permit, one of the conditions written in the permit is that action be taken to correct it and if the differences cannot be resolved, then a recommendation is made to the Planning Commission or the City Council to have the permit withdrawn. However, in a case such as this, even if the permit is withdrawn, it may be that the State may still continue its operation. He felt that this is a question which should be resolved by the Attorney General.

In response to further questioning, the Director stated that the application for Conditional Use Permit was made by the State Airports Division because under Section 204 of the U. S. Metropolitan Development Act, there is a requirement for conformity with local plans. The application for Federal Aid is submitted to the review body which may or may not certify to the Federal Government that the application agrees with the planning for the region. Even if the review body does not certify it, the recommendation is still submitted. The Federal Government will then weigh the merits and demerits of the application. The Airports Division wants to comply with the City's ordinance and also to work with the Commission on the land use planning by establishing the airport use legitimately on the General Plan.

Mr. Owen Miyamoto of the State Airports Division was present and in reply to questions from the

Commission, stated that the information submitted does not contain any financial statistics on revenue produced by general aviation because of insufficient time to extract and separate the financial statistics within the short period of time since receipt of the Commission's letter. They tried to gather as much information as possible. Their problem is trying to define general aviation which is the type of activity that relates to the field which they want to fill and what type of facility should remain at Honolulu International Airport.

He stated that the question about the implication of a full scale airport is not covered in the material submitted. The proposed airport facility is to be strictly for general aviation purposes; that is, primarily for training activities and not for air taxis and charter flights as mentioned by the Director. These types of activities will continue to emanate from Honolulu International Airport. They do not expect a great deal of revenue from this general aviation airport. Their primary concern is safety and they want to get as much of the light plane activities away from Honolulu International Airport.

In the statistics presented to the Commission, Mr. Miyamoto stated that one-half of that represents training activity consisting of teaching student pilots how to fly. In addition to that, quite a few people rent or charter air craft for occasional flights to the neighbor islands. There are those who own their planes and hangar at Honolulu International Airport. They hope to develop facilities at Mililani to provide these hangar facilities so that the private plane owners could move their aircraft from Honolulu International Airport.

He stated that the training activities conducted at Honolulu International Airport consist of beginner pilot students, those requiring some practice of their skills, and those going on into commercial flying. These are some of the activities which they hope to move away from Honolulu International Airport. They realize that all of these activities cannot be moved to the proposed airport. He guessed that approximately 95% of the stated activities could be moved to the new airport. Honolulu International Airport has an instrument landing facility that is needed for that type of training, but the proportion for that type of training activity is very small compared to those just discussed for private licensees.

Mr. Yamabe made a request to the Chairman to have Mr. Miyamoto submit in writing the information just given, and also to consult with the commercial flight schools for their comments on the proposed airport.

In reply to Mr. Chun's question, Mr. Miyamoto stated that each touch-and-go operation is considered as two operations. The training pilot, on a normal training flight, usually stays up for one hour in which time he accomplishes approximately 12 touch-and-go operations for a total of 24 operations.

The Commission deferred action on this matter to enable the members to study the material received from the State Airports Division and to present their opinion at the next regular meeting, and to have in writing from the State Airports Division the information requested by Mr. Yamabe.

ZONING BUSINESS
WAIKIKI
2229 KUHIO AVENUE
MR. AND MRS.
BENJAMIN AYSON, SR.

The Commission again considered a proposal to change the zoning from existing Hotel-Apartment to Business for a parcel of land containing 3,595 square feet at 2229 Kuhio Avenue, situated on the makai-Diamond Head corner of Royal Hawaiian Avenue and Kuhio Avenue in Waikiki and identified as Tax Map Key 2-6-19: 8, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for the Waikiki area.

A public hearing was held and closed on July 11, 1968. The Commission deferred action pending further study to establish an appropriate zoning pattern which will encourage proper development in this area.

The Director indicated that letters were sent to 13 property owners in the entire block inquiring whether or not they would be interested in a change in zoning of their parcels from Hotel-Apartment District to Business District. To date, no replies have been received. Prior to the public hearing, only the adjoining property owners were contacted by telephone.

Although a letter was to be delivered by the adjoining property owner, the Marine Surf Hotel, no letter has been received. The hotel covers approximately half of the block, and it is quite possible that it would favor the change in zoning. If it does and the Commission is willing, the Director stated that the public hearing notice would have to be readvertised to include that property or the entire block. However, he suggested that this matter be deferred until replies are received from the other property owners.

Based on the recommendation of the Director, the Commission deferred action on this matter.

ZONING BUSINESS
WAIKIKI
DIAMOND HEAD SIDE
OF SEASIDE AVENUE,
BETWEEN KUHIO AND
KALAKAUA AVENUES
CONSOLIDATED
AMUSEMENT CO., LTD.
BY: MORIO OMORI
ITS ATTORNEY

The Commission again considered a proposal to change the zoning from existing Hotel-Apartment District to Business District for six parcels of land totalling approximately 60,000 square feet, situated on the Diamond Head side of Seaside Avenue, between Kuhio and Kalakaua Avenues in Waikiki, and identified as Tax Map Key 2-6-22: 17, 18, and portions of Parcel 9, 14, 24 and 25, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map of the Waikiki area. A two-theater complex with a parking garage structure are proposed on the site.

A public hearing was held and closed on July 11, 1968, and action was deferred for receipt of additional information from the applicant and the Department of Traffic.

The Director read the letter received from the Department of Traffic stating as follows:

1) At the present time 5.3 vehicles per minute can move from Seaside Avenue into Kalakaua Avenue as compared to an actual ground count of 2.5 vehicles per minute.

2) At the present time 7.5 vehicles per minute can move from Seaside Avenue into Kuhio Avenue as compared to an actual ground count of 3.3 vehicles per minute.

3) Seaside Avenue has a sixty-foot right-of-way. The pavement width is 32 feet and parking is permitted on both sides continuously. There are no plans to widen this street in the City's six-year CIP. The priorities of street widening are set by your office in consultation with the Department of Public Works.

4) Based upon the completion of the theater project and the public parking facility, the projected peak volume will exceed the capacity at both Kalakaua and Kuhio intersections. If Seaside is widened, then congestion will result only at the Kuhio intersection.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Clifford Nohara of the Department of Traffic, stated that the figures given of 5.3 vehicles per minute and 7.5 vehicles per minute mean that the two streets can handle that many cars. The 2.5 vehicles per minute and the 3.3 vehicles per minute figures are the actual count that was made of the traffic flow on both streets. In other words, for every minute, 2.5 vehicles move from Seaside Avenue to Kalakaua Avenue. This was taken on a theory basis. The count was taken during the week days between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. when traffic was felt to be most critical.

From the information given, Mr. Lemmon concluded that the present streets are capable of handling 100% more traffic than what they now produce. If that is so, he asked for the cause of the congestion.

Mr. Nohara stated that the congestion occurs when the show is over at about 10:00 p.m. or 10:30 p.m. and there is a surge of traffic onto the street. Widening of Seaside Avenue might handle the traffic at Kalakaua Avenue but there will still be some congestion at Kuhio Avenue.

The Director reported that the Department of Traffic also submitted a bar chart indicating the volume vs. capacity at 10:00 p.m. on Seaside Avenue at the Kalakaua Avenue intersection and at the Kuhio Avenue intersection. The chart shows the capacity on Seaside Avenue as it now exists with parking on both sides, if parking is removed, and if it is widened in the future. He noted that there will be more traffic congestion at the Kuhio Avenue intersection than at the Kalakaua Avenue intersection because Seaside Avenue does not cross Kalakaua Avenue.

In response to questions posed by Mr. Sharpless, Mr. Nohara, stated that traffic traveling on Seaside Avenue in both directions is relatively light so that there should not be too great a congestion for cars coming out of the Waikiki Theater parking lot and turning either right or left on Seaside Avenue. However, he again emphasized that an increase in traffic will result on Seaside Avenue when there is a surge of traffic after the show is over. A traffic signal light will soon be installed at the intersection of Seaside and Kuhio Avenues and the traffic assumption was based on this signal installation.

Mr. Lemmon recalled that when attending Waikiki Theater, he parked at the rear of the Theater and exited onto Kuhio Avenue near the Red Vest Restaurant and not onto Seaside Avenue. He asked whether that easement was considered. If that easement can be used, he believed that traffic congestion could be eased somewhat.

It was Mr. Nohara's understanding that they do not have the right to use that easement and for that reason, traffic is to be directed out to Seaside Avenue.

Mr. Morio Omori, attorney for Consolidated Amusement Co., Ltd., stated that a traffic study was made but this was not made by questionnaire of customers coming into the theater but from observation of the parking facility as it now exists. During the beginning of the matinee period which is between 12:30 p.m. to 1 p.m., 90% of the lot is used by non-theater patrons and 10% by theater patrons. In the evening, it is the opposite where 90% is theater patrons and 10% non-theater

patrons. Depending on the movie, the first evening show would start between 6:30 p.m. to 7 p.m., ending at about 9 p.m. or shortly thereafter; and the second evening show ending at about 11 p.m. or 12 midnight and sometimes at 12:30 a.m. or 1 a.m., again depending on the movie. The peak traffic periods occur at the end of the first evening show and after the second evening show.

In reply to questions, Mr. Omori stated that after the first evening show, there are vehicles leaving and also vehicles entering the parking lot for the second show. He stated that for the next theater complex, they plan to have egress and ingress movements from two ends of the building. In other words, there will be one access closest to Kalakaua Avenue and one closest to Kuhio Avenue off Seaside Avenue. Therefore, depending on what exit is used, traffic will either turn right or left onto Seaside Avenue to go toward Kuhio Avenue or Kalakaua Avenue.

As stated at the previous meeting, he stated that after discussions with the Traffic Department, his client decided to proceed with the parking facility separate from the City's public parking structure in the adjacent area because of legal problems involved. He does not know whether the Department of Traffic is adhering to the plan but it was his understanding that the 40-foot easement mentioned by Commissioner Lemmon is contemplated to be used and be made a part of the condemnation area for the parking facility. This easement goes out to Kuhio Avenue opposite Nohonani Street. Use of this easement will help ease the traffic at the corner of Kuhio and Seaside Avenues.

Mr. Omori stated further that according to the present plans, the parking complex will be operated by his client for the theater patrons and during off-hours to be used as a public parking service to restaurants, such as the Royal Lanai which validates parking. During the peak period, the parking complex will serve only the theater patrons. The original plan showed commercial shops to be located on the ground floor, but this plan has been abandoned and it will be strictly a two-theater complex with parking for the theater patrons.

When asked whether an effort was made to determine what percentage of the theater patrons come by car and what percentage is walk-in, Mr. Omori stated that based on the parking figure given of 90% of non-theater patrons during the day matinee hours, this indicates that majority is walk-ins. During the evening, it is the opposite.

Mr. Omori then corrected the seating capacity figure given previously for Waikiki Theater. He had given the capacity figure of 1,000 seats but the correct number of seats is 1,337. He based

his figure on 1,000 seats because after the wide screen came into existence, the 300+ or so of the front seats are not sold regularly unless there is a full attendance and the customers are willing to occupy the front seats. As far as the zoning requirement is concerned, the figure used is 1,000 seats.

The Commission requested Mr. Omori to submit a letter indicating the number of walk-ins and ride-ins as discussed today. Mr. Omori agreed to do so.

Replying further to questions from the Commission, Mr. Omori indicated that there will be approximately 350 parking stalls in the theater-parking structure. Although five parking decks were considered, the latest restudy indicates that they may need six decks. This would not vary from the last plan of the public parking facility which will have six decks.

Having in mind the traffic generating aspect of this application and also the present traffic situation in this part of Waikiki, Mr. Sharpless asked whether Consolidated Amusement has made any study to see how the traffic generated by the theater is going to be handled.

Mr. Omori stated that this project is being handled by a local architect and a special theater architect from Colorado who he assumed would be making the study. If a study were made, he has not seen it. He pointed out that if any decision on zoning is to be based on the peak of traffic generated by a theater or a stadium or some facility like HIC, there would be a ridiculous requirement for a wide street just to take care of the traffic. If that standard were applied, every street in the City and County of Honolulu will be substandard for the peak period of traffic.

Mr. Sharpless commented that traffic in Waikiki is at its peak every minute. Mr. Omori indicated that this is not so according to the traffic study made by the Department of Traffic. The Department of Traffic's study included both the proposed City and County parking structure and the consolidated's theater-parking structure.

Mr. Rutledge commented that there will always be a traffic problem no matter what is done. He believed that the applicant should have its architect consult with the Department of Traffic because the traffic problem exists now and will be aggravated further by the generation of 300 or more cars. According to the figures cited, most of the motorists will not be able to find a place to park their vehicles. He felt that people should recognize that the traffic problem is everybody's responsibility. People should not be allowed to construct a building and to let the City worry about the traffic situation.

Mr. Yamabe believed that much of the traffic problem facing Waikiki is one that cannot be solved by just one application or consideration by one or a few who decide to construct. He believed that the applicant is meeting the requirements of the City and by constructing the parking structure, the parking problem will be alleviated somewhat. He felt that this use might be more desirable than keeping the area in hotel and apartment uses.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, the Commission recommended approval to change the zoning from existing Hotel-Apartment District to Business District for six parcels of land totalling approximately 60,000 square feet, situated on the Diamond Head side of Seaside Avenue, between Kuhio and Kalakaua Avenues in Waikiki, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map of the Waikiki area. Mr. Lemmon cast a negative vote.

Mr. Rutledge made the observation that more and more traffic is being generated in an already congested area of Waikiki as a result of new developments. He wondered who is responsible to see that some solution is found to that problem.

Mr. Sharpless commented that this application will unquestionably provide a great deal more necessary parking stalls in the Waikiki area. However, he believed that the present problem is not the need for additional parking but how to move the vehicles on the streets once they get out of the parking stalls. He recognized that this is not the problem of the applicant but it is the problem of each affected City agency.

ZONING ORDINANCE OFF-STREET LOADING REQUIREMENTS

The Commission considered a proposed amendment to Chapter 21, Article 1, R. O. 1961, as amended, by amending the title of Section 21-1.2 and adding thereto a new section, to be numbered 21-1.2(3), relating to Off-Street Loading Requirements.

A public hearing was held on July 11, 1968, and the Commission deferred action for further study.

The Director briefly reviewed the points raised by the people who testified at the public hearing. He stated that there was a revamping of the off-street loading requirement ratio. Originally, 5,000 square feet lots of commercial were included but this was deleted. The Downtown Improvement Association has submitted a letter agreeing to this deletion. Victoria Ward, Ltd. felt that the height of 14 feet was too excessive and suggested a change to 12 feet. It also felt that the required number of spaces was too

excessive and had cited the Queen Emma Gardens Apartment as an example. The Director felt that the 6 spaces required for Queen Emma Gardens were not excessive because of use by mail trucks, delivery trucks and moving vans. He stressed that this proposed ordinance is identical to the one proposed in the Comprehensive Zoning Code which will be adopted by the City Council very shortly. He did not believe that any changes were needed at this time.

The Commission discussed the proposed ordinance.

ACTION: Upon the motion of Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Lemmon, the Commission recommended approval of the proposed ordinance to include a new section to be numbered Section 21-1.2(3) relating to Off-Street Loading requirement.

ZONING CLASS A AND CLASS A-2 RESIDENTIAL MAUNALUA OFF LUNALILO HOME ROAD IN HAWAII-KAI

The Commission again considered an application for a change in zoning from existing Farm District to Class A Residential and Class A-2 Residential zoning for areas of land totalling 115.231 acres, situated off Lunalilo Home Road in Hawaii-Kai, Maunalua. Of the total 115.231 acres of land being considered for rezoning, 6.073 acres is proposed for Class A Residential zoning, situated on the koko head side of Lunalilo Park Subdivision Unit 4, approximately 1,400 feet easterly of Lunalilo Home Road and southerly of the proposed freeway. The remaining 109.158 acres of land proposed for Class A-2 Residential zoning lies on property that is bounded on the south by the proposed freeway, on the northwest by Lunalilo Home Road, and on the northeast by the proposed Hawaii-Kai Drive extension, and includes all of Lunalilo Park Subdivision Units 5, 5-A and 6, covered by Tax Map Key 3-9-05, 3-9-14 and 3-9-19, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map of the Hawaii-Kai area.

A public hearing was held on April 4, 1968, and action was deferred pending clarification of the status of the farm occupants in the area under consideration for rezoning. Subsequent meetings were held on April 18, 1968 and July 11, 1968.

The Director reported that a letter has been received from Mrs. Lillie Wong indicating that the farmers have agreed to the proposals submitted by Hawaii-Kai.

ACTION: The Commission, on motion of Mr. Yamabe and seconded by Mr. Rutledge, recommended approval of the change in zoning from existing Farm District to Class A Residential and Class A-2 Residential zoning for areas of land totalling 115.231 acres, situated off Lunalilo Home Road in Hawaii-Kai, Maunalua. Mr. Chun abstained from voting.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND
USE MAP
(AMENDMENT)
ST. LOUIS
HEIGHTS-
PALOLO

The Commission again considered a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map and Development Plan of St. Louis Heights-Palolo, as follows:

a. Change in land use designation from Public Facility Use to Residential use by deleting the Hokulani School expansion area for properties covered by Tax Map Key 2-8-27: Parcels 2, 3, 4, 16, 17, 21, 23 and 38;

b. Delete proposed Kamakini Street extension from Hokulani School to Koali Road.

A public hearing was held and closed on May 2, 1968.

The Commission deferred action for receipt of additional information relating to the school expansion area and alternate proposals for extending Kamakini Street.

Based on school figures submitted, the Director reported that the student population for Hokulani School has decreased. The peak was in 1963-1964 with 515 students and in 1967-1968 with 439 students. The Department of Education has indicated that it does not need additional classroom space at this time and it will not be purchasing any additional land. The area that this school will serve can be controlled by district boundaries. If more space is needed in the future, it could be handled by redistricting of school boundaries or the possibility of using a portion of the park area which is not usable now. Most of the activities consisting of a ball field, picnic area, and so forth are located farther up.

Regarding the question raised by Mr. Ellis whether there is any State legislation requiring the State's compliance with the General Plan of the City in matters of land acquisition for public improvements, the Director stated that a legal opinion has been rendered by the Corporation Counsel's Office (Opinion #63-68) stating that the State would have to conform. He felt that the Attorney General may have a different opinion. The City Council suggested the deletion of the addition to the school because it felt that the State could purchase the land for school expansion purpose without this being shown on the General Plan.

Regarding the possible changes to the street pattern from that originally recommended, the Director stated that the proposal suggested by the Commission to extend Kanewai Street straight across the drainage canal to Old Waialae Road was discussed with the Department of Traffic. The Traffic Department strongly recommended against it because it would be too close to the Waialae-Kapahulu intersection.

The staff recommended two alternates. Alternate "A" shows the extension of Kamakini Street across the other portion of the drainage canal to connect with Kalei Road then out to Old Waialae Road. Alternate "B" shows no extension of Kamakini Street but the rounding of the corner of Kanewai and Kamakini Streets with a one-way driveway so that people dropping off and picking up children at the school could enter the driveway and out to go back on Kanewai Street. The present traffic problem is caused by the school traffic so that the proposal recommended might help alleviate the present congestion. Presently, there is part of a driveway within the park area used by the Parks Department. This driveway could be used during the peak periods but chained at other times.

If the proposed school expansion area reverts to residential, the Commission asked whether the present width of the road is wide enough to accommodate fire trucks, garbage trucks and other such vehicles.

The Director did not believe so but stated that he could make further checks. He recalled a comment made previously that the existing bridge had a weight limitation and as a result, during the last flood, emergency vehicles couldn't get into the Koali Road area. He further recalled that in the past, emergency vehicles entered the area through the park.

The Commission suggested to the Director that the staff study further a better access for the area and possibly propose street widening of existing streets in the area.

ACTION: The Commission, on motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, deferred action on this matter for further staff study.

ZONING MISC.
CEMETERY USE
NUUANU
MAUKA SIDE OF JUDD STREET, MIDWAY BETWEEN NUUANU AVENUE AND APIO LANE
SAMURO ICHINOSE

The Commission again considered an application for cemetery use on a 14,929 square feet parcel of land situated on the mauka side of Judd Street midway between Nuuanu Avenue and Apio Lane, adjoining the City Memorial Park, Inc., Cemetery in Nuuanu, identified by Tax Map Key 1-8-01: Parcel 3 within a Class AA Residential district.

The Director reported that the City Council by Committee Report No. 995, referred this application to the Commission for its consideration and recommendation. A public hearing was held and closed on July 13, 1967, and no action has been taken since then.

The Director stated that the applicant is proposing to construct a columbarium on the property. He recalled that at the public hearing, evidence was presented indicating the existence of a deed restriction on all of the lots fronting on Judd

Street adjoining the City Memorial Park Cemetery. The deed restricted the use of the properties to residential or non-cemetery purposes only, but he did not think that it prohibited commercial or apartment uses. A check made with the applicant last week revealed that he has not been able to have the deed restriction released from his property.

The Director indicated that the deed restriction mentioned is a private covenant and it has no legal effect on the decision to be made by the Commission whether to approve or deny the application. A copy of the deed is on file.

He stated that a study made on the number of existing cemeteries on Oahu indicated that there is no need for additional cemeteries until the year 2010. The study was based on the number of plots available, death rates, expected population growth, etc.

Mr. Chun inquired whether there were any other objections and whether all the lots involved were sold as cemetery uses.

The Director answered that only one lot is involved and objections were raised by the adjoining cemetery on one side and the property owners located on the other side of the proposed structure. The property owners objected because the proposed structure would result in a solid wall abutting their properties. They also felt that this was not an appropriate use in a residential area.

A sketch of the proposed structure was shown to the Commission.

ACTION: Mr. Lemmon made a motion to deny this application on the basis that there are adequate provisions for cemetery uses on this island and that it has been the policy of the Commission in the past not to allow any more cemeteries in this particular area. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried.

FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAMS
MAKAHA INTERCEPTOR SEWERS, SECTION 2
CITY & COUNTY DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS

In compliance with Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-754) the City and County Department of Public Works has referred to the Planning Commission for review, an application for federal funds to construct the Makaha Interceptor Sewers, Section 2.

The Director reported that the project achieves the intent of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu. The Detailed Land Use Map precisely identifies the placement of a sewage treatment facility in conformity with the General Plan designation and the Makaha Interceptor Sewer is part of this total system. He indicated

that this is the section from Makaha Valley Road, back to the Old Homestead Road to Waianae along Farrington Highway.

In response to an inquiry on the status of sewage treatment facilities in this area of Leeward Oahu, the Director stated that a new treatment plant has just been completed near Waianae and as soon as the lines are installed, the plant can be put into operation. However, he stated that it will not be in full capacity operation for possibly the next two to three years. There will probably be one or two lines installed on the town side of Waianae.

ACTION: The Commission, on motion of Mr. Lemmon and second of Mr. Rutledge, certified this project as being consistent and in consonance with existing planning programs.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, authorized the calling of public hearings on August 8, 1968, to consider the following proposals initiated by the Planning Director:

GENERAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN (AMENDMENT) UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN FARRINGTON STREET CLOSER AT WILDER AVE.	(1)	Amendment to the General Plan Development Plan for the University Community Plan by closing Farrington Street at Wilder Avenue within the University Apartment Area Improvement District.
ZONING APARTMENT DISTRICT C KANEOHE MAKAI-KAHUKU CORNER OF KAHEKILI HIGHWAY AND KEAAHALA ROAD HAWAII HOUSING AUTHORITY	(2)	Change in zoning from Class A-2 Residential to Apartment District C for an area of land comprising 14.761 acres situated at the northeast corner of Kahekili Highway and Keaahala Road in Kaneohe, in conformity with the General Plan.
ZONING INDUSTRIAL KALIHI-KAI 1911 AND 1917 HAU STREET MAGUIRE BEARING COMPANY, LTD.	(3)	Change in zoning from Class A Residential to Industrial for a 10,000 square foot parcel of land situated at 1911 and 1917 Hau Street in Kalihi-Kai in conformity with the General Plan. Water and sewer facilities are available and adequate.
ZONING BUSINESS HEEIA MAKAI SIDE OF KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY, NEAR HONEY'S STAR MARKET, LTD.	(4)	Change in zoning from Class AA Residential to Business for a 67,200 square foot parcel of land situated on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway same being the rear portion of the premises of the Lin's Supermarket in Kaneohe, in conformity with the General Plan.

The Commission upon the motion of Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Lemmon, authorized the calling of public hearings on August 22, 1968, to consider the following proposals initiated by the Planning Director:

ZONING BUSINESS
APARTMENT DISTRICT B
AND APARTMENT
DISTRICT C
WAIAWA
KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY
AND ROAD LEADING TO
MANANA CAPEHART
HOUSING
EASY APPLIANCE
PROPERTIES, LTD.

(1) Change in zoning from Highway and Rural Protective to Business, Apartment District B and Apartment District C for an area 26.7 acres situated at Kamehameha Highway and the road leading to Manana Capehart Housing in Waiawa.

Water is available. Although public sewerage facilities are presently not available, the Waiawa Stream Trunk Sewer which will provide public sewer service to the subject property is scheduled in the CIP for Fiscal Year 1967-68. The Bureau of Public Roads has approved the application for a 60-foot access to Kamehameha Highway.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP AND
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
(AMENDMENT)
ST. LOUIS HEIGHTS-
PALOLO
POOLEKA STREET
EXTENSION DELETION;
AHE PLACE WIDENING

(2) Amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and Development Plan of the St. Louis Heights-Palolo area by deleting the extension of Pooleka Street and widening of Ahe Place by 15 feet on the ewa side and 9 feet on the kokohead side for a 44-foot right-of-way.

ZONING CLASS A-1
RESIDENTIAL
MAKIKI
2028 MAKIKI STREET
L. D. HAXTON, ET AL

(3) Change in zoning from Class AA Residential to Class A-1 Residential for an area of 429,292 square feet at 2028 Makiki Street in Makiki. The proposal involves 45 parcels in the triangular area bounded by Makiki Street and Round Top Drive. This area adjoins a Class A Residential area.

STREET NAMES
PEARL CITY
MOMILANI SUBURB,
UNIT VIII
AND MANANA UNIT 2
SUBDIVISION

The Commission, on motion of Mr. Lemmon and second of Mr. Chun, recommended approval of the following street names:

a. Roadways within the Momilani Suburb, Unit VIII Subdivision:

KOMO MAI DRIVE - Extension of an existing roadway from Hoolaulea Street to Hoohulu Street.

HOOHULU STREET - Extension of an existing roadway from Hooiki Street past Komo Mai Drive.

HOOMALU STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a mauka direction.

HOOHAAHEO PLACE - Deadend roadway off Hoohulu Street between Hookani Street and Hoohakanu Place.

Meaning: Proud

HOOHAKANU PLACE - Deadend roadway off Hoohulu Street between Hoohaaheo Place and Hooia Street.

Meaning: Silent

HOOKANI STREET - Roadway running from Hoomalu Street to Hoohulu Street between Hooiki Street and Hoohaaeo Place.

Meaning: To touch

HOOHIAMOE STREET - Roadway running from Hookani Street to Hooia Street and between Hoohulu Street and Hooheke Street.

Meaning: To put to sleep

HOOHEKE STREET - Roadway off Hookani Street running in a mauka direction between Hoohiamoe Street and Hoomalu Street.

Meaning: To be shy

HOOIA STREET - Roadway running off Hoohulu Street in a Honolulu direction and between Hoohakanu Place and Komo Mai Drive.

Meaning: Truth

b. Roadways within the Manana Unit 2 Subdivision at Pearl City, Ewa:

HOOMOANA STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a Waipahu direction to tie into Kalauipo Street.

NOELANI STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a mauka direction to tie into Paaaina Street.

KALAUIPO STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a mauka direction to tie into Kaweloka Street.

KALAUIPO PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kalauipo Street between Palamoi Street and Kaweloka Street.

KUAHAKA STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a mauka direction thence in a Honolulu direction to tie into Waimano Home Road.

PALAMOI STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a mauka direction thence going makai to terminate at a deadend past Paaaina Street.

PUANANALA STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a mauka direction to tie into Kaumoli Street.

KAUMOLI STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a mauka direction to tie into Panee Street.

KAWELOKA STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a mauka direction to tie into Palamoi Street.

KAWELOKA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kaweloka Street between Kalauipo Street and Palamoi Street.

PAAAINA STREET - Roadway running from Kalauipo Street to Palamoi Street and between Hoomoana Street and Kalauipo Street.

Meaning: Landholder

PAAAINA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Paaaina Street between Kalauipo Street and Noelani Street.

PANEE STREET - Roadway running from Kaweloka Street to Palamoi Street and being between Paakamaa Street and Kalauipo Street.

Meaning: To move along

MISC.
1968 HAWAII
CONGRESS OF
PLANNING
COMMISSIONERS
AND DIRECTORS

The Director reported that the 1968 Hawaii Congress of Planning Commissioners and Directors Conference will be held on Maui on September 5, 6 and 7.

A progress report will be submitted by the Chairman and the staff will prepare an exhibit on materials to be distributed.

MISC.
PROPOSED DOWNTOWN PLAN
VICTOR GRUEN ASSOCIATES

The Director reported that a presentation will be made by Victor Gruen Associates on the downtown plan on Friday, August 9, at 1:00 p.m., in the City Council Chambers.

At a later date, the Detailed Land Use Plan and a report will be submitted to the Commission together with a copy of the report by Victor Gruen Associates.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott
Mitzie Abbott
Hearings Reporter

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
August 8, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, August 8, 1968, at 1:33 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Richard K. Sharpless presiding:

PRESENT:

Richard K. Sharpless, Chairman
Edward Brennan (present from 2:10 p.m.)
Philip Chun
Cyril W. Lemmon
Robert L. Muller
Thomas N. Yamabe II

Robert F. Ellis, ex-officio (excused at 3:35 p.m.)
Fred K. Kwock, ex-officio

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director
Denis Leong, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Arthur A. Rutledge

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
(AMENDMENT)
UNIVERSITY-MANOA
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
CLOSING OF FARRINGTON
STREET AT WILDER
AVENUE

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the Development Plan for the University Community Plan which covers Moiliili-University-Manoa Districts by closing Farrington Street at Wilder Avenue, in lower Manoa, and covered by Tax Map Keys 2-8-09 and 2-8-14.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 28, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, 15 affected property owners, and to three community groups. No letters of protests have been received.

From the map displayed on the wall, the Director pointed out the areas under consideration. The proposal is to close Farrington Street at the five-point intersection created by Wilder Avenue, Metcalf Street, and Farrington Street as part of the University Apartment area improvement district. He noted that the majority of the traffic travels on Wilder Avenue-Dole Street. The closing of Farrington Street would provide safer traffic movements through the intersection because of reduced number of conflicting movements. In addition, pedestrian movement will become much safer at the busy intersection.

Farrington Street had an access entry ramp onto Lunalilo Freeway, but this was closed last year by the State Highways Division as part of the safety improvement project in the general upgrading of the freeway.

The Department of Public Works is working on the improvement district plan for this area which is designated for apartment use. Some of the streets are substandard to adequately provide for the increased density and land uses. He hoped that the Commission would take action on this before the final plans are drawn; otherwise, the plan showing Farrington Street as a through street will be followed.

He stated that the existing right-of-way of Farrington Street is 50 feet with a pavement width of 24 feet. Under the improvement district, the curb-to-curb pavement will be widened to 26 feet. The Department of Traffic had submitted a proposed turnaround plan which was displayed on the wall.

In response to questions from the Commission, the Director stated that the closed portion of the 50-foot right-of-way will not be sold but will remain in public ownership. This portion is too small for a house lot and, furthermore, it would not be desirable to have a building on the substandard lot with a driveway access to the intersection. At the deadend of Farrington Street, the pavement width will be widened to allow better access to the last two lots. He did not feel that there was any need to reduce the present right-of-way width of 50 feet because this width is equivalent to some of the residential streets with a right-of-way width of 44 feet.

In answer to questions from the Commission, Mr. Clifford Nohara of the Department of Traffic replied that any five-point intersection is a dangerous intersection and should be eliminated. The subject area is developing into a higher density area and the flow of traffic will increase. The Department of Traffic felt that this was an opportune time to improve the situation by eliminating the intersection of Farrington Street and to have a regular four-point intersection. The closure of Farrington Street will also provide for safer traffic and pedestrian movements.

In response to an inquiry of whether the sidewalk area cross Farrington Street will be planted, Mr. Nohara stated that this project is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works. He would recommend that the sidewalk be planted.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mrs. Nancy Uno represented her mother who lives on Farrington Street. She asked whether the entrance of Farrington Street will be completely enclosed with a fence and whether parking will be permitted on both sides of Farrington Street

because it will become a two-way street. Presently, Farrington Street is a one-way street and parking is permitted on one side of the street.

Mr. Nohara did not know and stated that this also would be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion of Mr. Yamabe and second of Mr. Muller, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposal to close Farrington Street with Wilder Avenue intersection.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING INDUSTRIAL
KALIHI-KAI
1911 AND 1917
HAU STREET
MAGUIRE BEARING
COMPANY, LTD.

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing Class A Residential to Industrial for a parcel of land containing 10,000 square feet at 1911 and 1917 Hau Street, situated on the makai side of Hau Street and 100 feet ewa side of Mokauea Street in Kalihi-Kai and identified by Tax Map Key 1-2-09: 43, in conformity with the adopted General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 28, 1968 was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, Model Cities Office, four community associations, and to Attorney Thomas Flynn. No letters of protests have been received to date.

The Director reported that the adopted General Plan designates this area for Industrial use. The Detailed Land Use Plan for this planning area has not been completed and the map displayed on the wall is merely a proposal. Water and sewer facilities are available. Hau Street is an unimproved roadway without curbs, gutters and sidewalks and without a drainage system. The City Council, by Committee Report No. 1119, had recommended that the Commission initiate steps to rezone the subject parcel for Industrial use and also recommended to the Chief Engineer that he consider the feasibility of initiating an improvement district for this area. One or two applications for rezoning had been denied not only because of the street conditions but, in some cases, because the water and sewer lines were not adequate. There are a number of mixed uses in this area because previously under the zoning ordinance, all types of uses were permitted in an industrial area.

The applicant is proposing to construct a two-story warehouse building which will have a small sales area consisting of approximately 6,000

square feet per floor with an additional 4,000 square feet to be provided for parking purposes. It is presumed that the proposal will not substantially increase the traffic in the area. Although the streets are not improved to City standards, the Director recommended approval of this rezoning proposal as it conforms to the adopted General Plan for this area.

In response to questions from the Commission, the Director indicated that Mokauea and Puuhale Streets are proposed as 60-foot rights-of-way and the other streets in the area, such as Colburn and Hau Streets, etc., range from a right-of-way width of 44 feet to 50 feet. He felt that the 44-foot and the 50-foot rights-of-way would be inadequate to handle the traffic caused by the industrial uses and indicated that a 56-foot right-of-way is preferred. This could probably be done under the improvement district. He noted that there are some areas with industrial uses on a 50-foot right-of-way, making the traffic situation difficult. He indicated that the single-family residential uses are gradually being phased out and this area is developing into an industrial area. Approximately 50% to 60% are still in residential uses.

When asked by the Commission whether the City and County had made an overall study of the development plan for this area with consideration for industrial uses, the Director replied that the only work done was through correspondence with the Board of Water Supply and the Division of Engineering suggesting that an improvement district be initiated for this area. Since this was a recent request of the City Council to the Chief Engineer, he did not think that any work has been done.

Rather than to consider rezoning by parcels, Mr. Lemmon wondered whether it would be appropriate to consider the rezoning of the entire area together with the street widths. He felt that there will be no control over the street pattern if zoning is considered parcel by parcel.

The Director stated that the street pattern should be considered when the Detailed Land Use Map is presented to the Commission for adoption. It is anticipated that the Detailed Land Use Map will be presented to the Commission in late fall because the area above Dillingham Boulevard is involved in the Model Cities Program. At that time, the Commission may also recommend an improvement district for this area.

Mr. Yamabe inquired whether the applicant would have an economic size property to pursue the industrial operation, should a portion of the

property be taken for the street widening.

The Director answered that the applicant is acquiring two lots and parking will be provided in the front of the building. The street widening will not affect the applicant's operation but, in effect, will improve the traffic condition. Generally, for an industrial operation, a lot size of over 5,000 square feet is desirable. He expected that some of the small-sized lots in the area would be consolidated. He noted that some of the small lots will remain and this is always a handicap when an area subdivided for residential uses is to be zoned for some other use.

Mr. Muller inquired whether it was possible to stipulate the setback for eventual widening if the rezoning request is approved. The Director did not think so, but he indicated that the applicant is aware that the street conditions are not up to standard conditions.

No one spoke in opposition to this proposal.

Mr. Thomas W. Flynn, member of the Board of Maguire Bearing Corporation and General Counsel, stated that the applicant is willing to accept any conditions regarding a building setback. As stated by the Director, the operation is primarily a warehouse building for storing industrial supplies. The operation is a relatively clean and quiet one and not a crowded operation as far as traffic activities are concerned. The applicant is willing to conform to all requirements and to participate in an improvement district. The present operation located in Kakaako is overcrowded and his client has many supplies in Hilo which he would like to have stored in the proposed warehouse building. His client has been looking for a suitable location for a number of years and found this area in Kalihi to be suitable for his operation.

Mr. Yamabe informed Mr. Flynn that the Commission is not in a position to impose any conditions to zoning; however, since there is a good possibility that an improvement district will be initiated for the street widening, his client should have this in mind when constructing his building by leaving sufficient areas for the street widening.

Mr. Flynn stated that the street widening will not affect the warehouse operation since parking will be provided in the front of the building.

<u>ACTION</u>: The Commission, on motion of Mr. Lemmon and second of Mr. Muller, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in

zoning from Class A Residential to Industrial uses for land situated at 1911 and 1917 Hau Street in Kalihi-Kai.

The Chairman requested the Director to conduct an overall study of this area and determine whether this will become an industrial area.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING APARTMENT
DISTRICT C
KANEOHE
NORTHEAST CORNER
OF KAHEKILI HIGHWAY
AND KEAAHALA ROAD
HAWAII HOUSING
AUTHORITY

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing Class A-2 Residential to Apartment District C (medium density) for an area of land comprising 14.761 acres, situated at the northeast corner of Kahekili Highway and Keaahala Road in Kaneohe, covered by Tax Map Key 4-5-23: Parcel 8, in conformity with the adopted General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 28, 1968 was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, Kaneohe Community Council, Kaneohe Outdoor Circle, Chamber of Commerce of Windward Oahu, and to two community associations. No letters of protests have been received to date.

The Director presented the proposal to construct an 80-unit public housing project consisting of eighteen two-story apartment buildings. The public housing project is to be concentrated in the central portion of the property because the area is of rolling terrain. A stream is located on one side of the property and a picnic area is contemplated on the other side. The applicant is providing the necessary parking facilities and a connection is being made for water and sewer facilities. Construction bids have been let out and the applicant is ready to proceed with its project.

The proposed density and the heights of the buildings could be accommodated under the Apartment District B (low density) zoning classification, but since the Detailed Land Use Plan designates the area for medium density use, the Director explained that the public hearing notice was advertised in that manner. Since this proposal is in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Plan, the Director recommended approval of this rezoning proposal.

Mr. Yamabe inquired whether the project is to be a planned unit development and whether the entire property or just the area of the apartment buildings are to be zoned. He wondered whether it was possible to construct apartments in an open space area.

The Director replied that this is not a planned unit development and the entire property is to be zoned. Because of the topography of the land, the apartments are to be located in the central portion of the property.

Mr. John Bryan, a resident of Kaneohe, spoke in opposition to this proposal. He stated that this program was first brought to his attention some months ago at a meeting of the Kaneohe Community Council. It was pointed out that the areas that were not planned to be built upon were merely "pali" and that approximately eight acres out of the 14.761 acres were proposed for apartments. At that time, he was given the impression that this project was already established because the planning was completed and Federal aid was anticipated soon. He felt being "railroaded" at that particular point.

He indicated that one of the criteria mentioned by the representative of the Hawaii Housing Authority was that low cost, low income housing should be in an area close to employment and public transportation. He did not believe that these criteria were met for this project area. A problem will be created rather than solved. No indication was given whether school facilities will be available for the children. He noted that the existing schools in the area are already crowded. Employment and public transportation for the approximately 450 people scheduled to reside in the area are questionable. He asked from where are the people coming who are to be located in this housing project.

The Director stated his understanding from the Hawaii Housing Authority that applicants for the project are to be received from only the Windward area. This is done by screening the applicants. He stated that similar projects have been designed to serve various areas on the island; for example, one project in Wahiawa was completed two years ago, and one project is proposed in Halawa as well as this proposed project in Kaneohe. It is anticipated that there may be others in the outlying areas sometime in the future.

Mr. Bryan indicated that if the people in the Kaneohe area are to be centrally relocated, this would mean taking people out of their present housing and relocating them in new housing and having new people move into the old homes vacated, thereby creating again problems of schooling. There are no planned recreational facilities for this housing project although the Kaneohe Community is in the process of attempting to obtain a district park playground directly across the street from the housing project. This would be the only playground to serve these people.

As an individual and not representing the community council, he opposed the project because of his belief that proper planning was not given to the zoning of the area for a housing project and that no consideration was given to proper educational facilities for the children, proximity to employment opportunities, and the availability of public transportation. He felt that by allowing this project to proceed, a greater problem will be created than that which presently exists. He elaborated on his statement by indicating that if there are no recreational facilities for the children they might play on the busy highways. He felt that the district park planned across the street should be developed at the same time with the housing project to provide the necessary recreational facilities for the people.

When asked about the ownership of the proposed park, the Director replied that the area consists of approximately 26 acres and will be owned by the City.

Mr. Bryan also pointed out another failure in the planning program with reference to the parking facilities within the development. He did not believe that one-for-one parking has been provided.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Bryan stated that the community council meetings were held early this year attended by various groups, such as the PTA, Chamber of Commerce, etc., to discuss items relating to employment, park and recreational facilities, etc. The Hawaii Housing Authority took the position that this project was already planned, that this was the project location, and that the plans have already been submitted to the Federal agency in Los Angeles and funding was expected within a week to ten days.

Mr. Clayton Moe, Chief Engineer for the Hawaii Housing Authority, represented Mr. Yoshio Yanagawa, Executive Director of the Hawaii Housing Authority, who was unable to be present today. Mr. Moe stated that although he did not attend the meetings held with the community groups in the Kaneohe area, both Mr. Yanagawa and Mr. Ed Sato, Assistant Executive Director, attended the meetings. It was his understanding that the questions posed by the residents were answered at the meetings. Regarding recreational facilities, he stated that there is a small playground planned at the southeast corner of the property near Keaahala Road.

He pointed out on the map displayed a small play area which will contain playground equipment, such as swings, slides, etc., for the younger children. The area along the highway will be fenced. He indicated that one-for-one parking will be provided for the tenants. Regarding drainage, meetings have been held with the Department of Public Works, Drainage Division, to have a walled culvert. There is an 8 x 12 culvert bridge to take care of the water that flow down the mountains. They have also worked with the Department of Traffic regarding road construction in conformance with standards.

Regarding public transportation, he stated that residents of the housing project will have the same service as provided now for the residents of Kaneohe. There are other public housing projects on the Island; that is, two in Maili and two in Waipahu where public transportation is provided every 15 minutes. This area in Kaneohe was selected because it is close to public transportation and there is a need to provide public housing for the residents of Kaneohe. The Hawaii Housing Authority has worked for a year and a half with the Department of Education. He stated that 200 or more children are not being brought into the area because many children are already located in the area.

Mr. Yamabe asked whether any applications have been received and whether first preference is given to those residing in the Kaneohe area.

Mr. Moe replied that preferences will be established but approval must be received from the Federal Government which is providing the funds. The Federal Government conducted an economic survey or a market survey which determined that there is a need for a public housing project of 80 units for this area. Although some families are eligible to locate in the project area, they do not want to vacate from their homes.

Regarding the upkeeping of the small park and common areas, Mr. Moe stated that this will be the responsibility of the Hawaii Housing Authority. The tenants are to be responsible for the maintenance of their front and back yards.

He then explained that the selection of the project site is made by the Executive Director, Engineer, and the Hawaii Housing Authority Commission. One very important aspect in the selection of the project site is the cost. Other factors involved are whether the site can be purchased or whether it has to be condemned, and its location near to schools, shopping areas, and other neighborhood amenities.

ACTION: The Commission, on motion of Mr. Yamabe and second of Mr. Brennan, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Class A-2 Residential to Apartment District C for an area of land comprising 14.761 acres, situated at the northeast corner of Kahekili Highway and Keaahala Road in Kaneohe, in conformity with the adopted General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
HEEIA
MAKAI SIDE OF
KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY
STAR MARKETS, LTD.

Prior to holding of this public hearing, Mr. Brennan declared a conflict of interest since Mr. Richard Fujieki of Star Market is an associate of his, filed a declaration statement and left the room.

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing Class AA Residential to Business for rear portions of two parcels of land comprising 67,200 square feet situated 180 feet back of the makai side of Kamehameha Highway, same being the rear portion of Lin's Super Market premises in Kaneohe, and identified as Tax Map Key 4-6-02: portions of 2 and 13, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe-Heeia area. This is an extension of the existing Business District.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 28, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, T. F. McCormack, and to five community groups. No letters of protests have been received.

From the map displayed on the wall, the Director pointed out the area under consideration. Presently the Business zone extends 150 feet from Kamehameha Highway. The request is to rezone the remaining portions of Parcels 2 and 13 containing approximately 67,200 square feet from Class AA Residential to Business uses.

From the plot plan submitted, the Director indicated that the applicant is proposing to construct two "L" shaped buildings for commercial uses and to provide parking. At the present time there are some Business uses on the property.

The Board of Water Supply have indicated that utilities are adequate to support the proposed development. An agreement has been arranged with the adjacent developer on the sewer improvement. Since the proposed rezoning

conforms to the Detailed Land Use Plan for the Kaneohe-Heeia area which designates the area under consideration for Commercial uses, the Director recommended approval of the zoning change.

No one spoke in opposition to this proposal.

Mr. James H. Wakatsuki was present on behalf of the applicant, Star Markets, Ltd., the proposed Lessee, and on behalf of the owners, Y. Ah Lin, Limited, Evans Yim, Henry Yim, Walter Yim, Clarence Yim, and Herbert Yim. He had nothing new to present.

ACTION: The Commission, on motion of Mr. Lemmon and second of Mr. Muller, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from existing Class AA Residential to Business for the rear portions of two parcels of land comprising 67,200 square feet situated 180 feet back of the makai side of Kamehameha Highway, same being the rear portion of Lin's Super Market premises in Kaneohe, and identified as Tax Map Key 4-6-02: portions of 2 and 13, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe-Heeia area.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
WAIPIO, EWA
EAST SIDE OF KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY, HONOLULU SIDE OF THE ROAD LEADING TO MILILANI CEMETERY
STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (AIRPORT USE)

The Commission again considered an application for a Conditional Use Permit by the Airports Division of the State Department of Transportation to construct, operate and establish a general utility airport to accommodate small airplanes on a parcel of land comprising 79.5 acres, situated on the east side of Kamehameha Highway and on the Honolulu side of the road leading to Mililani Cemetery in Waipio, Ewa, more particularly identified as Tax Map Key 9-4-06: portion of Parcel 1.

A public hearing was held and closed on July 11, 1968, and the Commission deferred action to enable the members to study the material received from the State Airports Division and also for receipt of further information from the State.

The Director explained the application and reported that Mr. Headrick will be submitting a letter from the Waipahu Community Association. The Association is meeting tonight and its position on this application will be submitted later.

Regarding the question raised by the Commission earlier as to why the material submitted did not indicate any follow-up attempt to obtain Wheeler Air Force Base as a general aviation

field, the Director had checked with Mr. Owen Miyamoto of the State Airports Division who reported that the Defense Department has not changed its position about making the area available for a general aviation field.

When asked for confirmation by the Commission, the Director stated that this application is properly made under the Conditional Use Permit Ordinance No. 2423 which lists airports, heliports and landing fields as permitted uses under certain conditions.

The Chairman commented that once established, whether or not through a conditional use permit, the proposed use realistically would be a permanent type of use in the area; therefore, he suggested to the Commission that they weigh the pros and cons of the issues before deciding whether or not to permit an airport in the area. As planners, he asked the Director what items should they consider when making a decision. He also asked whether any long-range planning for the development of this part of Oahu for the next five to fifteen years has been made by the staff.

Mr. Brennan reported that in a recent conversation with Senator Inouye, the Senator indicated a distinct possibility that Bellows Field might become available to the State. Speaking of need, Mr. Brennan felt that he did not have sufficient information to permit him to make a decision that an additional airport at Waipio will be needed even though Bellows becomes available. He had spoken to several people in the flying field who have indicated their belief that Bellows would be far more desirable than Waipio as a general aviation airport. He expects to receive two reports from these bona fide airport users within the next 10 days stating to that effect. He might be able to obtain a written statement from Senator Inouye also, and added that the Senator did make such a verbal statement which appeared in the papers a few days ago.

In response to the Chairman's inquiries, the Director gave the following information:

1. The area under consideration is designated for agricultural use and it is anticipated that it will remain in agricultural use for some time because of the desire by both the State and the City not to permit the spreading of urbanization in the areas between Waipio and Wahiawa and to the Pearl City-Aiea areas. The State, through its land use laws, has not approved all the urban use areas requested by the developers of Mililani Town. The development of this

town will take several years; and if there is a need for more urban areas, the spread is not towards Honolulu but towards the mountain range.

2. Because of the noise factor, open air type of uses is preferred near an airport rather than urban use. The Conditional Use Permit Ordinance has the advantage of permitting the retention of agricultural uses and discouraging the encroachment of urban uses.

3. Once established, the airport can be considered as a permanent installation. Looking back 25 to 30 years, some of the airfields established are still in use while others, although not presently used, can be put into use. Therefore, placing the proposed airport use under the Conditional Use Permit would not make it a temporary use.

4. Another factor the Commission should consider is the increasing traffic at Honolulu International Airport. With the arrival of the jumbo jets, the number of flights will increase tremendously and this information is given in the material submitted by the State. The primary concern is the safety factor, and the State would like to get as much of the light plane activities away from Honolulu International Airport and thereby increase the capability of the Airport.

5. The State had investigated about 15 different sites for a general aviation field and for a variety of reasons, most of them were rejected. The use of Bellows Field was mentioned, but the State has indicated that there is a need for an airport site at Waipio even though Bellows should become available. The two areas are needed because they will be serving two different areas. A site nearer to Honolulu is desirable because flight instruction takes one hour and the present use of Dillingham Air Force Base allows the student pilots approximately 15 minutes of touch-and-go training because approximately 45 minutes is used in traveling time.

6. If the Conditional Use Permit is granted, the General Plan will be amended later to reflect public use for the area. This will give notice to prospective purchasers or developers that an airport will be located there on a permanent basis.

Mr. Lemmon made the observation that the Department of Transportation did examine 15

different sites and out of that number selected one, indicating that a thorough study for an airport site was made. He agreed that Bellows is desirable, but he also recalled the statement made by Mr. Alvey Wright about two weeks ago that there was a need for more than one additional airport. Therefore, he was inclined to approve the presently proposed site as well as Bellows and other additional sites should the State recommend them.

MOTION: Mr. Lemmon moved to recommend approval to the granting of a Conditional Use Permit to the applicant to establish and operate a general aviation airport on the subject property near Mililani Town in Waipio. The motion was seconded by Mr. Muller.

In the discussion that followed, Mr. Sharpless asked about the status of Dillingham Air Force Base.

Mr. Owen Miyamoto stated that Dillingham Air Force Base is presently owned by the Federal government and the State has use of the facility on a year to year lease basis when it is available. The Base is also used by the Hawaii National Guard for training purposes. The problem with this Base is the distance factor as mentioned by the Director. The State cannot establish hangar facilities at Dillingham because it does not own the property and it is reluctant to commit major capital investment in an area not owned by the State. Therefore, the flying time from Honolulu International Airport where the training flights start to Dillingham where the touch-and-go operations are practiced will consume most of the training hour of the student pilots. Should the necessary facilities be based at Dillingham, there is still another problem because of the distance the students must travel to get to Dillingham from Honolulu.

Mr. Miyamoto stated that certain areas within Dillingham Air Force Base have been declared surplus by the military but the airfield itself cannot be declared surplus because there is a need to retain it for military training purposes.

Since the training schools will still be based at Honolulu International Airport, Mr. Brennan indicated that an airport at Waipio would not solve the traffic problem at H.I.A. If that is the case, the use of Dillingham would be just as appropriate.

Mr. Miyamoto stated that in the early learning stage, an instructor goes along with the student pilot so that departure and arrival will be

well controlled. It is when solo status starts that the students are given authorization to move into a higher density airport, such as H.I.A. where they constantly practice their take offs and landings. It is this operation that causes congestion at the airport. It is anticipated that about 90% of this type of operation can be moved from H.I.A. He cannot say when, but eventually they hope to remove all of the training schools and training activities presently housed at H.I.A. This decision will be made administratively. In the long-range plan for the airport, the area presently utilized by the school is going to be changed into an air cargo facilities area.

Mr. Miyamoto stated that one of the problems of moving the training facilities from H.I.A. is financing. The schools not only operate as a school but conduct other activities, such as maintenance, repairs, air taxi service, and other related activities to make a profit. Therefore, unless the terms of the lease and other factors are favorable to them, it would be difficult to encourage their move. They would hate to do it but someday, the State might have to collect fees that will make it impossible for the light plane operators to continue to be based at H.I.A. The fees would be for facilities that the light plane operators would not use, such as a 12,000-foot runway, lighting, navigational aids, and so forth, the cost of which is usually divided among the users of the airport.

The Commission asked several questions of Mr. Miyamoto and Mr. William T. Klopp, General Aviation Officer with the State Department of Transportation.

When asked whether Bellows lends itself to this type of training, Mr. Miyamoto stated that for students flying from Honolulu to Bellows, this operation is not recommended because the flight over the mountain range constantly covered with clouds is not considered safe for the students. However, for the number of students living in Kailua and the Windward area, they would prefer a facility at Bellows if it were available. He still believed that a complete facility at Waipio and another at Bellows would be needed.

When asked for a statistical breakdown on the number of take-offs and landings per hour that can be consummated at any field, Mr. Miyamoto stated that for training operations on a single runway and with no conflict from other traffic, about 120 operations per hour can be accommodated.

With reference to Kunia Strip, Mr. Miyamoto confirmed that there was a fatal accident there. The problem there is the existence of a high powerline directly in the approach to the runway.

With reference to Wheeler Air Force Base, Mr. Klopp stated that the last correspondence with the Air Force was about 12 to 14 months ago. The Air Force reiterated its statement made earlier that upon return of the 25th Infantry to Schofield Barracks, it will become an aviation battalion and rotary aircrafts will be based at Wheeler where extensive training activities are to be conducted. This operation will not be compatible with civil aviation. Mr. Klopp stated that he is also the Plans Officer and Staff Operations Officer for the headquarters of the Hawaii National Guard. Dillingham Air Force Base is an integral part of the emergency war plans for the State of Hawaii and it is not available for transfer for civil purposes.

When asked about the cost difference between the Waipio strip and Dillingham, Mr. Miyamoto stated that Dillingham will definitely be much cheaper to develop because the major part of the cost will be in excavation work and development of the site. He confirmed that in an emergency involving national defense, the military has authority to take over any airfield that has been constructed through Federal aid.

Regarding relocation of the training schools, Mr. Miyamoto stated his understanding that at least one of the major flying school operators at H.I.A. will locate at Bellows if it became available. He would go there despite the fact that Waipio may become available.

Mr. Klopp knew of no operator who could not move his entire operation to Waipio for the economic reason stated. There is one or two operators who would want a branch operation at Bellows also.

Messrs. Brennan and Sharpless felt that more extensive study should be given to the use of both Bellows and Dillingham and recommended a deferral until more information can be received.

Mr. Klopp indicated that they are in constant communication with the Federal Aviation Administration and the U. S. Accounting Office as well as our Congressional Delegation regarding the use of Bellows. In personal discussions with the Senior Air Force Officers at Hickam, the position on Wheeler has not changed.

Should Bellows become available, Mr. Miyamoto indicated that they would still require Waipio because Bellows cannot take away enough of the activities at Honolulu International Airport to satisfy the present condition.

When questioned about the fiscal capability of the Department if Bellows became available tomorrow, Mr. Miyamoto stated that the appropriation for the development of a general aviation airport site on Oahu is broad enough to allow a certain amount of money to be diverted to Bellows to start its development but that would dilute the efforts for the Central Oahu Airport. They will be asking for additional funds in the next session of the Legislature to develop Bellows in anticipation that it will be turned over to the State.

To the suggestion made that the funds be reappropriated for development of Bellows, then later, should the need for a Waipio site become great, that further consideration be given at that time, Mr. Klopp stated that the change cannot be made because the Capital Improvement appropriation for a general aviation airport specifies a Central Oahu site. Federal funds committed also specifies a site in Central Oahu. He explained that as part of the National Airport Plan, since 1961, the need for a Central Oahu airport and a Windward Oahu airport in addition to Honolulu International Airport has been identified by the Federal government as well as the State government and appropriations for these needed facilities have been made since that time. This need has become greater and greater every year.

ACTION: A vote was taken on the motion made to recommend the granting of the requested Conditional Use Permit. The motion failed to carry upon the negative votes cast by Messrs. Brennan, Yamabe, Chun and Sharpless.

Mr. Yamabe stated his desire to have this matter studied further.

Mr. Sharpless felt that the use of Dillingham and Bellows had not been extensively pursued. He was willing to reconsider this site if this was proved to be absolutely the only site available and that the need was great. He had serious reservation about the location of an airport in an area where development for the next 10 to 20 years was not certain.

Mr. Brennan also felt that further studies should be given and testimony received from

other sources. Because of the possibility that Waipio might grow into a residential community as an extension of the residential uses in the surrounding area, he stated that further information must be gathered and extensive studies given to the most logical use for the area.

The Director reported to the Commission that two separate recommendations will be submitted to the City Council. One recommendation will be from the Commission accompanied by its reasons for the decision. The Director's recommendation is to grant the Conditional Use Permit. In instances where the Commission's recommendation is opposite to that of the Director's, the Chairman of the Commission may appear before the City Council to present the Commission's position on the matter.

ZONING BUSINESS
WAIKIKI
2229 KUHIO AVENUE
BENJAMIN AYSON, SR.

The Commission again considered a request for a change in zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business for a 3,595 square foot parcel of land at 2229 Kuhio Avenue, situated on the makai-Diamond Head corner of Royal Hawaiian Avenue and Kuhio Avenue in Waikiki, and identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-19: Parcel 8, in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for the Waikiki area.

A public hearing was held and closed on July 11, 1968. At the request of the Commission, letters were sent to 13 property owners in the entire block inquiring whether or not they would be interested in a change in zoning of their parcels from Hotel-Apartment District to Business District.

Testimony was received from the public in response to the letter.

Mr. Wong Wai Wing, owner of property off Waikolu Way, identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-19: Parcel 17, and having an undivided interest in the property on Royal Hawaiian Avenue identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-19: Parcels 15 and 16, stated that he is not interested in having his properties changed from Hotel-Apartment to Business zone since he is presently operating a hotel and apartment.

Mrs. Matsue Tagawa, owner of property off Lauula Way, identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-19: Parcel 12, stated that she is not interested in the change in zoning from Hotel-Apartment to Business.

Mrs. Dorothy Hee, who has a one-half undivided interest on an Agreement of Sale with Ronald Whitaker for property on Royal Hawaiian Avenue identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-19: Parcel 80, stated that she is not interested in the change

in zoning from Hotel-Apartment to Business. She indicated that the change in zoning will emanate more traffic, more noise and more people into Waikiki. She cited an example of the already noisy situation at the Polynesian Hotel on Kalakaua Avenue.

The Director acknowledged receipt of the following letters:

1. Mr. Don C. Hamilton of Henshaw, Conroy and Hamilton, attorneys for Mrs. Matsue Tagawa, indicating that she is not interested at this time in the change in zoning of her parcel of land from Hotel-Apartment District to Business District.

2. Mr. Henry B. Mau, President, Waikiki Seaside, Inc., owner of two parcels of land located off Seaside Avenue, indicating that they were in favor of the change in zoning.

3. Hawaiian Electric Co., Inc., owner of property on Kuhio Avenue, identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-19: Parcel 51, indicating that it has no objections to the proposed zoning change, provided its existing and future ability to supply electric power as required is not impaired.

4. Mrs. Jaimee Rich, owner of property at Royal Hawaiian Avenue, identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-19: Parcel 7, indicating that she is in favor of the change in zoning.

5. Mr. Stephen R. Farrand, President, Marine Surf Waikiki, Inc., located at the corner of Seaside Avenue and Kuhio Avenue, identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-19: Parcel 1, indicating that they are in favor of the change in zoning.

Mr. Lemmon inquired whether a high rise structure could be constructed after the Comprehensive Zoning Code becomes effective if the parcels were zoned for commercial uses. He felt that the property owners who did not favor the change in zoning might find themselves at a disadvantage later and suggested that after January 2, 1969, when the Comprehensive Zoning Code becomes effective, they should consult with the Planning Department as to the status of their properties.

The Director stated that it is possible to construct a high rise building depending on the size of the lot, but noted that the regulations for the proposed Resort-Commercial District are different from the Commercial District. For example, in a Resort-Commercial District, commercial use is limited to a floor

area ratio of 175% and the density for apartments is lower than the density permitted in a Hotel-Apartment or Hotel District. The possibility of consolidating the lots were discussed but he does not know whether development will be done on an individual basis or on a consolidated basis.

Mr. Yamabe asked whether the property owners may construct under the "grandfather clause" after January 2 if the properties remain in the Hotel-Apartment District.

The Director stated that after January 2, 1969, the Hotel-Apartment District will become H-2 Hotel District which is the high density hotel district. Those properties remaining in the Hotel-Apartment District classification will not be designated for commercial uses. Within a year, the staff will prepare a new map showing the zoning for the entire island.

Mr. Allen Marutani, representing Mr. Benjamin Ayson, Sr., had nothing further to add to his testimony given at the public hearing. He pointed out that the comments presented by the people were directed to their own particular properties and not necessarily to his client's property.

In response to an inquiry, Mr. Marutani stated that no structural alterations will be made to the building except for some refurbishing to permit commercial operations. He added that the apartment operation will be ceased and if there are to be any living quarters, this will be occupied by the owner.

With regard to considering the possibility of changing the zoning for the abutting three properties on Royal Hawaiian Avenue, the Director indicated that no response has been received from two property owners.

ACTION: The Commission, on motion of Mr. Lemmon and second of Mr. Brennan, recommended approval of the change in zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business for a 3,595 square foot parcel of land at 2229 Kuhio Avenue, situated on the makai-Diamond Head corner of Royal Hawaiian Avenue and Kuhio Avenue in Waikiki, in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for the Waikiki area.

Mr. Yamabe suggested to the Director that he pursue further the possibility of zoning the abutting three properties for commercial uses rather than keeping this general area in mixed uses.

The Director stated that a separate hearing must be held for the zoning of other properties in the general area. As replies are received from the property owners, he will report to the Commission.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
PLAN AND DEVELOP-
MENT PLAN (AMEND-
MENT)
ST. LOUIS HEIGHTS-
PALOLO
HOKULANI SCHOOL
EXPANSION AND
KAMAKINI STREET
EXTENSION

The Commission again considered a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan of St. Louis Heights-Palolo as follows:

a. Change in land use designation from Public Facility use to Residential use by deleting the Hokulani School expansion area; and

b. Delete proposed Kamakini Street extension from Hokulani School to Koali Road.

A public hearing was held and closed on May 2, 1968.

The Commission deferred action and had requested additional studies by the staff for several alternative street pattern proposals to help resolve the present traffic problems in the area caused by inadequate accesses and narrow streets.

The Director presented five alternatives as follows:

Alternative "E"

Deletion of Kamakini Street extension; retention of the existing narrow bridge over the drainage canal; and a proposal to extend the driveway within the edge of the school ground and also the park, then out to Dole Street in a one-way pattern with Kanewai Street.

Alternative "D"

Deletion of Kamakini Street extension and a proposal to extend Kanewai Street directly across the drainage canal to connect with Old Waialae Avenue with a proposed widening of Koali Street to 32 feet and connecting with Kanewai Street extension.

The Director noted that the Department of Traffic recommended against this proposal because the opening at Old Waialae Avenue would be too close to the Waialae-Kapahulu intersection.

Alternative "C"

Deletion of Kamakini Street extension and instead extending Kamakini Street across the north branch of the drainage canal to connect with Kalei Road.

The Director indicated that this proposal would still involve the acquisition of residential properties and isolate one residential parcel.

Alternative "B"

Retention of Kamakini Street extension with a proposal to widen Koali Road to 32 feet from its present width of 14 feet.

The Director explained that the street widening was proposed because the Commission had questioned the inadequacy of this width to permit access by emergency vehicles, garbage trucks and so forth.

Alternative "A"

Deletion of Kamakini Street extension with the rounding of the corner at the entrance to the school grounds to permit a circulatory movement within the driveway and a proposal to widen Koali Road to 32 feet and its entrance and the bridge to 40 feet.

After considering all five alternatives, the Director still felt that Alternative "A" provided the best solution to the present traffic problem at Hokulani School.

The Commission discussed the five alternatives and questioned the Director who reported that the proposed widening of Koali Road by the taking of 18 feet will involve about eight homes. The interior lots are served by a private right-of-way. Although the roads are substandard and cannot meet the present day City standards, the existing lots are of record and they can continue to be used for single-family residential dwellings.

The Director felt that Alternative "B" might be better; but because of strong objections from the property owners affected by the road taking, the City Council had agreed to delete the extension of Kamakini Street and to change the school expansion area back to residential use. By committee report, the City Council directed the Planning Department to make the two proposed changes. The Department of Education has now reported that it has no immediate plans for expanding the school.

In further discussing Koali Road widening, the Director stated that the property owners had asked that they be left alone. It was because the Commission had questioned the inadequacy of the road to permit fire trucks and other vehicles into the area that the staff had proposed a wider street. He indicated that the problem they are presently

trying to resolve is the congestion created in front of the school every morning and afternoon when school children are discharged or picked up by parents. The parking lot is so small that there is always a traffic congestion. Therefore, the staff's proposal is to round the corner at the driveway entrance to the school grounds for better movement and to allow only one side parking on Kanewai Street.

In view of the information just given, Mr. Yamabe believed that the Commission should confine its discussion to the traffic problem at the school.

Mr. Lemmon felt that as planners, the Commission should consider what is best for the area because there will be conflicting views from the people.

Under the present condition, Mr. Brennan asked how fire trucks or other emergency vehicles get into the area.

The Director stated that Kanewai Street is used and the vehicles can go through the school grounds or through the park. He does not know the weight limit on the bridge, but the residents use this access into the interior section.

MOTION: Mr. Lemmon moved to recommend denial of the two proposed amendments; in other words, to retain the public facility use designation for the school expansion area and Kamakini Street extension as shown on the Detailed Land Use Map. The motion was seconded by Mr. Muller.

In the discussion that followed, the Director, in reply to questions from Mr. Yamabe, stated that the latest information received from the Department of Education is that it does not need the school expansion area at this time because the student enrollment at Hokulani School has decreased in the past three years. The school could absorb about 100 more students and should there be a further increase, the school district boundaries could be adjusted to take care of that situation. The Director stated further that this entire area is improved with residential homes.

In view of the information just given, Mr. Yamabe asked whether Mr. Lemmon would be willing to amend his motion to provide for the deletion of the school expansion area and reverting its use to residential.

Mr. Lemmon had no objection provided that a better access to the lots could be created.

He was trying to avoid the retention of a substandard road in the area.

Mr. Chun asked whether an additional proposal could be made to include the driveway through the school and park areas as shown on Alternative "E".

The Director replied that through an agreement between the Department of Parks and Department of Traffic, the driveway through the school and park areas could be used without showing it on the map.

Mr. Lemmon accepted Mr. Yamabe's suggestion to take separate actions on the two proposals and withdrew his motion.

ACTION: Mr. Lemmon's motion to recommend the retention of Kamakini Street extension as shown on the Detailed Land Use Map was seconded by Mr. Chun and carried.

MOTION: Mr. Yamabe's motion to recommend approval of the proposal to change the land use designation from public facility use to residential use for the area proposed for expansion of Hokulani School was seconded by Mr. Brennan.

A vote was taken and the motion failed to carry lacking four affirmative votes. Commissioners Lemmon, Chun and Muller cast negative votes.

Mr. Chun felt that since this was a General Plan land use designation for school use only, the existing residential uses can continue until such time as the area is ready for expansion of the school and improvements of the streets. He indicated that no one is being displaced from the area.

The Director explained that when an application for a building permit is received for any of the properties indicated for school use, the application is deferred and referred to the Department of Education for purchase of the property. If the D.O.E. does not purchase the property, a recommendation is then sent to the City Council to allow the issuance of the building permit.

Mr. Yamabe was opposed to the retention of the school expansion area because of uncertainty that the area would be required for school purpose and the statement made by the D.O.E. that it had no present plans for expansion of the school. He felt that inadequacy of the access road should not be a criteria in the present proposal because it is an existing

condition and there are many other areas in the City and County of Honolulu with substandard roads. He felt that an unnecessary hardship was being placed on the property owners and for this reason the residential use of the area should not be changed.

Mr. Lemmon believed that the Commission should not permit the continuation of a substandard condition. He felt that the school use designation should be retained until such time as suitable ingress and egress solutions can be made to the properties.

Mr. Lemmon's motion, seconded by Mr. Muller, to recommend the retention of the public facility use designation for the school expansion area until such time as the present substandard access to the residential properties is improved was later withdrawn after further discussion.

Mr. Lemmon was agreeable to approving the reversion of the lots to residential status but with the addition of a requirement for access to one of the lots through a flag lot arrangement. Mr. Lemmon moved to so state, but at the request of Mr. Yamabe, yielded to allow Mr. Yamabe to make the motion.

ACTION: Mr. Yamabe made a motion to recommend approval of the proposal to change the land use designation from public facilities use to residential use by deleting the Hokulani School expansion area as shown on the Detailed Land Use Map with no conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Chun and carried.

In reply to Mr. Lemmon's inquiry, Mr. Yamabe stated that no condition was placed with his motion because he felt that the staff could work out some solution to the access problem.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL BUDGET ORDINANCE AND THE C.I.P. FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968-69 (SUPPL. NO. 1)

The City Council referred to the Planning Commission for its review and recommendation, Bill No. 130 entitled: "Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 1. An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 3188, as amended, relating to Capital Improvements of the City and County of Honolulu for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969". The proposal is to reappropriate $7,688,200 which is part of approximately $10,300,000 lapsed from last fiscal year's program. This would increase the 1968-69 C.I.P. from $35.4 million to $43.1 million. This amount is higher than those allotted in the last two years.

The Director reported that there are 13 projects in the following functional areas:

	No. of Projects	Amount
A. Public Safety	1	$ 80,000
B. Highways	2	107,200
C. Sanitation and Waste Removal	10	7,501,000
	13	$7,688,200

The single largest project is the incinerator at Waipahu which will require $5.3 million.

There is one new project which is the Hart Street Sewer Pumping Station and Forced Main estimated to require $80,000 for planning and engineering and is necessitated by the U. S. Corps of Engineers' widening of Kapalama Channel. The total cost is estimated to be $1,150,000 with the State sharing 50% of the cost except for engineering and inspection.

Mr. Sharpless inquired as to how this $43.1 million relates to the amounts allotted in the last two fiscal years.

The Director stated that $35.0 million were allotted for the last fiscal year and $36.0 million two years ago. Out of the $36.0 million, $10.3 million lapsed making the total expenditure at $26.0 million.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Brennan, recommended approval of Bill No. 130, Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 1.

FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAMS
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU
PUNANANI WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

In compliance with Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Act of 1966, the Board of Water Supply, through its Manager and Chief Engineer, George Yuen, has referred to the Planning Commission for review, an application for federal funds to construct the proposed Punanani Water Development Project.

The Director reported that the project is for a new potable water supply comprising a well field of six wells and pumps, a central control station building and 35,700 lineal feet of 36-inch diameter transmission pipeline connecting to the existing metropolitan distribution system. The City of Honolulu District will be the entire service area. The pipeline is located just outside of the Pearl Harbor area.

Projections of population growth and water use indicate that the sustainable capacity of existing sources will be reached in the next two years. This project will provide an average of 10 million gallons per day of sustainable capacity to the present 60 million gallons per day.

The project is part of an overall water master plan for Oahu and is reflected as a high priority item in the six-year Capital Improvements Program of the City and County of Honolulu. Although the project is scheduled for completion in 1972, the Board of Water Supply has indicated that the project could be completed in one year. This project is essential and implements the intent of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu in meeting its goals and objectives by providing adequate public facilities and utilities.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Brennan, certified this project as being consistent and in agreement with the long-range plans of the City and County of Honolulu.

FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAMS
STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
KAHALUU
CONSTRUCTION OF CONNECTION OF KAHEKILI HIGHWAY TO KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY

In compliance with Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, the State Department of Transportation, Highways Division, has referred to the Planning Commission for review an application for federal funds to construct the connection of Kahekili Highway to Kamehameha Highway in Kahaluu.

The project begins from where Kahekili Highway ends at the Ahuimanu Estates Subdivision sewage treatment plant to the Hygienic Store on Kamehameha Highway. The project is slightly over one mile and it achieves the intent of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu to provide for the most efficient circulation and transportation system.

The project is reflected in the State's Capital Improvement Program for construction in fiscal year 1967-1968 and fiscal year 1968-1969.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Muller, certified this project as being in consonance with the long-range proposals of the General Plan and consistent with the recommendations of the Oahu Transportation Study.

The Planning Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Muller, authorized the calling of public hearings on Thursday, September 19, 1968, to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director.

ZONING APARTMENT DISTRICT B PALOLO 1238 PALOLO AVENUE ROBERT AU	(1)	Change in zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District B, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 7,137 square foot parcel of land situated at 1238 Palolo Avenue in Palolo. Water and sewer facilities are available.
ZONING APARTMENT DISTRICT C 1825 POKI STREET WILLIAM Y. M. CHINN BY: KENNETH W. WONG, BROKER	(2)	Change in zoning from Medium Density Apartment Use to Apartment District C, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 9,375 square foot parcel of land situated at 1825 Poki Street in Makiki. Water and sewer facilities are available.
ZONING APARTMENT DISTRICT C PACIFIC HEIGHTS 1901-1901-A PACIFIC HEIGHTS ROAD SHIGEICHI NAKAMURA BY: T. C. YIM	(3)	Change in zoning from Medium Density Apartment Use to Apartment District C, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 8,241 square foot parcel of land situated at 1901-1901-A Pacific Heights Road in Pacific Heights. Water and sewer facilities are available.

MISC. CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT PRESENTATION VICTOR GRUEN AND ASSOCIATES	The Commission were reminded that the presentation on the Central Business District area will be made by Victor Gruen and Associates on Friday, August 9, in the City Council Chambers.
MISC. PASSAGE OF COMPREHENSIVE ZONING CODE	The Director reported that the Comprehensive Zoning Code was adopted by the City Council on Tuesday.
MISC. TEMPORARY RELOCATION OF MEETING PLACE	Due to the renovation of the conference room at City Hall Annex, the Commission will temporarily conduct its meetings at the Salvation Army Building Auditorium at 664 South King Street.
MISC. PROBLEMS OF PRIVATE PARKS IN SUBDIVISIONS	Mr. Brennan stated that he had made a request to the Director regarding the problems in private parks in subdivisions. He received a letter from the Director stating the reasons for the problems and Mr. Brennan felt that inasmuch as more requests will be received, a formula should be developed that would avoid

such problems. He suggested that copies of the Director's letter be sent to the Commissioners.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie M. Abbott
Hearings Reporter

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
August 22, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, August 22, 1968, at 1:35 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Richard K. Sharpless presiding:

PRESENT:

Richard K. Sharpless, Chairman
Philip Chun
Cyril W. Lemmon
Robert L. Muller
Arthur A. Rutledge
Robert F. Ellis, ex-officio

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director
Denis Leong, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Edward Brennan
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Fred K. Kwock, ex-officio

MINUTES:

The minutes of July 11, 1968, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Lemmon.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
(AMENDMENT)
ST. LOUIS HEIGHTS-
PALOLO
DELETION OF POOLEKA
STREET EXTENSION
AND WIDENING OF
AHE PLACE

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the Development Plan for the St. Louis Heights-Palolo area by (1) deleting the extension of Pooleka Street; and (2) widening of Ahe Place by 15 feet on the ewa side and 9 feet on the koko-head side for a 44-foot right-of-way, in Palolo and covered by Tax Map Keys 3-4-03 and 3-4-07.

The notice of the public hearing published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of August 11, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, Palolo Civic Organization, Palolo Community Council, and to nine property owners. No letters of protests have been received.

From the map displayed on the wall, the Director pointed out the area under consideration. He stated that at the time the General Plan was adopted, there were some parcels with a 999-year lease arrangement with the State but the State has since sold some of the parcels.

Since the lots in the back of proposed Pooleka Street Extension have been subdivided with access off 10th Avenue, the Public Works Committee of the City Council had requested the Department to consider whether the extension of Pooleka Street was necessary or some changes could be made in the street pattern.

The Director reported on the proposal to delete the extension of Pooleka Street since the subdivided lots in the back have access off 10th Avenue and

off Ahe Place, making the extension of Pooleka Street unnecessary to service these lots. Only one lot would benefit by this extension but other means of access can be provided.

The other proposal is to widen Ahe Place from a right-of-way width of 20 feet to a right-of-way width of 44 feet by widening 9 feet on the kokohead side and 15 feet on the ewa side. Ahe Place is an unimproved road serving the lots on the kokohead side. The Palolo Public Housing located on the ewa side of Ahe Place, is serviced by Ahe Street. The proposed widening of Ahe Place will provide access to the Palolo Public Housing and the residential lots on Ahe Place.

Mrs. Louise Brown of 2270 Pooleka Street, with a lot area of 9,109 sq. ft., whose home fronts on Pooleka Street and the back portion on Ahe Place, opposed the proposal to widen Ahe Place for the following reasons:

1) She has just completed paying the improvement district assessment of $4,359.10, since 1964, which does not include the interest charges of 5-1/2%. Ahe Place was part of that improvement district and now it is proposed to be widened. If Ahe Place is widened, it will affect her sewer connection and will also involve the lost of some of her land. She inquired who will pay for these new improvements.

She stated that there is no need to widen Ahe Place since her home and that of her relatives face on Pooleka Street.

2) Under the Palolo Improvement District No. 3, her property was bi-sected by Ahe Street and Pooleka Street and this involved the lost of land for her family and the family of Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Brown of approximately 12,581 sq. ft. from an area of 39,833 sq. ft. If Pooleka Street extension is deleted, she would like to be compensated for the valuable land that was taken from them.

In pointing out her property on the map displayed, Mrs. Brown stated that when she purchased the remnant portion at the corner of Ahe Place and Pooleka Street, she had requested a subdivision of her property into three lots, but the City denied the request because one lot was a substandard lot. She, therefore, had it subdivided into two lots but before this was approved, she had to pay the improvement district assessment. This new proposal did not make any sense to her because she had just completed paying the improvement district assessment and now the City is proposing to delete the road extension.

When asked whether the present width of Ahe Place can accommodate City service vehicles, the Director stated that the refuse vehicles do not have any difficulty going through the area although Ahe Place is a narrow lane.

Mrs. Barbara Brown, who owns the parcel of land at the corner of Pooleka Street and Ahe Place and Mrs. Louise Brown's neighbor, stated that she did mail a letter to the Planning Commission indicating her views on this proposal. She stated that she and her husband oppose the proposal for the following reasons:

1) When they purchased their lot for $15,000, the City and Country Treasurer's Office informed them that the purchase price included the improvement district assessment for Ahe Street, Pooleka Street and Ahe Place. Since all the improvement costs were paid by their relatives and their share included in the purchase price of the lot, she could not understand why she should pay a total of approximately $20,000 for Pooleka Street which is a deadend street. To her, this is not good planning.

2) They do not use Ahe Place which is located in the back of their lot. She stated that the refuse vehicles encounter no difficulty traveling on Ahe Place. The tenants of the Palolo Public Housing park their vehicles on both sides of Ahe Place.

3) The proposed widening of Ahe Place will take about 500 sq. ft. of their property making their lot substandard. Since their request for a subdivision of their property into three lots was denied because one lot was to be a substandard lot, she could not understand how the City could propose to widen Ahe Place at its convenience and create a substandard lot.

4) They are in the midst of constructing a two bedroom home which was designed to fully use their property with plans for an additional bedroom later. Any loss of land will prevent them from making this addition later. They cannot afford to pay for any more improvements.

5) The proposed widening of Ahe Place will benefit only one lot. It was her understanding that Ahe Place will be a deadend road and it will not lead to a school or connect with some other street. She questioned why Ahe Place was not widened at the time the sidewalks were constructed. Since Pooleka Street has the required width, is a deadend street, and the improvement district assessment paid, she inquired why Pooleka Street could not be extended as planned instead of deleting it as proposed.

The Director reported that Ahe Place is intended as a deadend street. The width of Ahe Place in the back of the Browns' properties is wide but it narrows down to a 20-foot right-of-way which is below the City standard of 44-foot right-of-way for residential streets. The sidewalks were constructed only up to the Browns' properties and beyond that it narrows. Although this proposal for widening is being made, he did not know whether the improvement district will be initiated.

Mr. Albert Brown, husband of Mrs. Barbara Brown, registered the same protest as his wife.

Mr. Thomas Mui, attorney for two property owners, Mr. Rutkowski and Mr. B. T. Okazaki, stated that he had requested the deletion of Pooleka Street extension and the widening of Ahe Place because the extension of Pooleka Street will divide the property of Mr. Rutkowski, leaving one parcel with 4,000 sq. ft. which cannot be utilized properly because of its size. He felt that with the widening of 10th Avenue and the surrounding streets, it would be more effective to widen Ahe Place instead of constructing a street where none exists now.

Since the Browns' properties will be affected by the widening of Ahe Place, Mr. Mui suggested that possibly Ahe Place could be widened on the ewa side only and no land be taken from the Browns' properties. He felt that existing Pooleka Street could be declared as surplus and returned to the Browns if loss of land had occurred for them.

Mr. Rutledge suggested that the staff study the matter further and submit a new recommendation that would be satisfactory to the property owners so that none would be greatly inconvenienced.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Lemmon.

In the discussion that followed, the Director was asked whether there was a possibility of resolving the problems with the property owners.

The Director gave an affirmative reply and stated that he will also check whether there are any plans for extending the improvement district farther up the valley.

The Commission deferred this matter until such time as the Director reports back to the Commission.

PUBLIC HEARING ZONING BUSINESS, APARTMENT DISTRICT B AND APARTMENT DISTRICT C WAIAWA KAM HIGHWAY AND ROAD LEADING TO MANANA CAPEHART HOUSING EASY APPLIANCE PROPERTIES, LTD. BY: GEORGE T. NAKAMURA, ATTORNEY

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing Highway and Rural Protective to Business, Apartment District B and Apartment District C for an area of land containing 26.7 acres situated at the mauka-ewa junction of Kamehameha Highway and the road leading to the Manana Capehart Housing in Waiawa, and identified as Tax Map Key 9-7-24: Parcel 28 in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Plan for the Waiawa to Halawa area.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of August 11, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant's attorney George T. Nakamura, applicable governmental agencies, and to three community associations. No letters of protests have been received.

The Director pointed out on the proposed development plan submitted, the various uses which are in conformity with the uses reflected on the Detailed Land Use Map adopted for the area. He stated that the area shaded in green is designated for open space or preservation but it is not to be used for park or recreational purposes. It is needed for drainage of the water coming down from the upper properties and eventually going into Pearl Harbor.

The Bureau of Public Roads has also approved the application for a 60-foot access road (located on the Ewa side of the property) to Kamehameha Highway.

Water facilities are available. The Department of Public Works has indicated that sewer lines will be available by the time the project is completed. The Director recommended approval of this request.

The Commission inquired further about the traffic situation and drainage.

The Director stated that the State previously did not approve the 60-foot access road to Kamehameha Highway but it has now granted this permission with a divider at the medial strip so that traffic can make left turn movements into and out of the 60-foot roadway. However, for the present, no control is proposed through traffic lights.

The Director did not believe that drainage will be a serious problem. This question came up at the time the Hawaii Council for Housing Action's proposal in the adjoining area was being considered. During the heavy rainfall that damaged the Pearl City Shopping Center, its engineers checked the area and proposed a type of drainage system similar to a swale rather than lined concrete walls. They felt that during the non-rainy season, the area could be used as a recreational area. This same type of swale is proposed for this area and a solution has been reached with the Division of Engineering. He could not say how effective this type of drainage system is because it has recently been developed. Improvements in the culverts have been made at certain sections by the Hawaii Council for Housing Action, but whether or not any further widening would be required under the highway, he could not say. It was his understanding, however, that the Division of Engineering had approved a proposal for such widening underneath the highway.

No one spoke in opposition to this proposal.

Mr. George T. Nakamura, attorney for Easy Appliance Properties, Ltd., stated that this same matter was heard about 3-1/2 years ago when the General Plan change was being prepared. All this time his client had been attempting to satisfy Federal, State and local agencies with respect to utilities and engineering problems. After the problems were solved, they were faced with the problem of assisting other subdividers in the upper area who had a drainage problem to his client's property. He stated that

Mr. George Houghtailing, Consulting Engineer for the applicant, is present to answer any questions regarding drainage.

Mr. Houghtailing, in response to the Commission's inquiries on the drainage and traffic problems, stated that when this problem was first brought to his attention, he worked very closely with the Chief Engineer because of the drainage extending from the upper area to the applicant's property. As the Director stated, a channel is provided through the property for the drainage that comes from the property up above and eventually goes into Pearl Harbor.

Regarding the traffic problems, Mr. Houghtailing stated that an agreement was reached with the State to convey all the access rights to the State of the Waiawa Cut-Off Road and along the frontage on Kamehameha Highway east to the Capehart Housing Access Road. This will eliminate the direct access and will minimize traffic problems along Kamehameha Highway. With the development of the H-1 Highway, the traffic on Kamehameha Highway will be minimized. The property owners across the street have been very patient and have worked with the governmental agencies. He felt that this is a solution which will benefit all concerned.

ACTION: The Commission, on motion of Mr. Lemmon and second of Mr. Rutledge, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Highway and Rural Protective to Business, Apartment District B and Apartment District C for an area of land comprising 26.7 acres situated at the mauka-ewa junction of Kamehameha Highway and road leading to the Manana Capehart Housing in Waiawa.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING CLASS A-1
RESIDENTIAL
MAKIKI
2028 MAKIKI STREET
L.D. HAXTON, ET AL

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing Class AA Residential to Class A-1 Residential for an area of land situated at the mauka northerly end of Makiki Street and bounded by Makiki Street and Round Top Drive in Makiki, and identified as Tax Map Key 2-5-07: Parcels 1-12, 14-23, 25-35, 37-48, in conformity with the adopted General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of August 11, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to Mr. Haxton, applicable governmental agencies, and to all the property owners in the block.

The Director acknowledged receipt of a petition bearing the signatures of most of the property owners in the block supporting and approving Mr. Haxton's effort to have the zoning of his property established as Class A-1 Residential.

The Director pointed out the subject parcel under consideration and the surrounding streets. There are 39 lots in the block which include the lot at the end of Round Top Drive owned by the State of Hawaii. The proposal is for a change in zoning from Class AA Residential regulations of 10,000 square feet to a Class A-1 Residential regulation of 7,500 square feet. As shaded in red on the map, there are eight large parcels which could be subdivided into two or more lots under the Class A-1 zoning. This would then increase the number of lots from 39 to approximately 51 or 52 lots; an increase of 13 or 14 lots.

The Department of Public Works has indicated that there are no improvement district projects scheduled for this area. Makiki Street has a right-of-way width of 50 feet, a pavement width of 20 feet and is listed as in good condition. The Board of Water Supply has indicated that its facilities are available and adequate.

Since the land use plan indicates this area for residential use although it does not indicate the type of residential classification, the Director stated that the proposed zoning is in conformity with the General Plan. Adjoining areas are zoned Class A and Class AA Residential. All of the lots within the triangle of Round Top Drive and Makiki Street are zoned Class AA Residential. There are some lots which have an area of 7,700 square feet, 4,000 square feet, 5,000 square feet, and one lot as small as 3,600 square feet.

Testimony was received from the audience.

Mrs. Harriet Duncan, 2343 Round Top Drive, requested a deferment on this application on her own behalf and that of several of her neighbors. Everyone whom she talked to and who signed the petition which was circulated by Mr. Haxton requesting the change in zoning, received the assurance that the request involved only his property as he wanted to construct another dwelling unit for he and his wife.

Upon reading the hearing notice thoroughly, she realized that the request involved more than just Mr. Haxton's property. Upon checking with the Planning Department, she found that the proposal involved the entire block. She is requesting the deferment to have a better understanding of the whole situation of why the whole area is being considered and not Mr. Haxton's property only.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mrs. Duncan stated that a deferment of one or two weeks would be sufficient to allow her to find out why the Planning Department recommended that the entire block be rezoned. She was informed by the Planning Department that this was for better planning. She is concerned that there will be more traffic congestion. Presently, she does her irrigating in the evening because the water pressure is not too strong. If ten or fifteen more homes were added in this area,

the water pressure for her home and several others will be involved. She noted that several other property owners are also concerned about this problem.

When informed that the next regular meeting of the Commission will not be held until next month because of a conference of the Planning Commissioners, Mrs. Duncan stated that this was satisfactory to her and it will give her an opportunity to find out the reaction of others who signed the petition circulated by Mr. Haxton.

Mrs. Dolan, whose property adjoins Mr. Haxton's property, wanted to know why she should be prevented from constructing another home if Mr. Haxton is allowed to construct another home on his property. Her lot area is 17,598 square feet. She felt it appropriate to rezone the entire block instead of just one lot.

Mr. Louis Haxton, 2028 Makiki Street, stated that he requested this rezoning change because of the hardship encountered since his retirement two years ago due to increase in taxes and the cost of yard and maintenance services. His property consists of 45,130 square feet. Since the lots across the street on the Diamond Head side of Makiki Street are zoned Class A Residential, he did not feel it inappropriate to request the Class A-1 zoning.

He stated that there are 39 lots in this block. Of the 39 lots, only 16 lots conform to the Class AA zoning while 23 lots are under 10,000 square feet.

The petition was signed by 35 property owners supporting the proposed request with the exception of four property owners who could not be contacted.

Mr. Haxton stated that he may construct two additional homes under the Class AA zoning but he does not intend to do so. He believed that the addition of ten more homes in the area will not be an overload. He then read the petition at the request of the Commission.

Regarding the rezoning request, the Director replied that upon reading the petition and noting that the property owners were in favor of Mr. Haxton's effort, the Department interpreted this to mean that the property owners did not oppose rezoning of the whole block. The Department does not favor rezoning only one parcel and since the zoning across the street is Class A and farther up on Round Top Drive, the zoning is Class A-2, the proposed Class A-1 zoning would be in conformity.

In view of the Director's reply, Mr. Lemmon saw no benefit to be derived from a deferral.

The Chairman stated that the only reason for the deferral would be to allow those who feel that the matter was not presented correctly an opportunity, if they so desire, to testify at the next meeting.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion of Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Muller, kept the public hearing open to allow the opponents an opportunity to testify at the next meeting.

The Commission, on motion of Mr. Lemmon and second of Mr. Muller, authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director and authorized the Director to set the dates of the public hearings:

ZONING BUSINESS PEARL CITY 921 KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY WAIPAHU GARAGE, LTD. BY: WALLACE T. MIKAMI, SECRETARY-MANAGER	(1) Change in zoning from existing Highway Protective to Business, in conformity with the General Plan, for land containing an area of 54,854 square feet situated at 921 Kamehameha Highway in Pearl City. Water and sewer facilities are available and adequate.
GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE PLAN CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT	(2) Adoption of the Detailed Land Use Plan for the Central Business District. The Director reported that the Development Plan for the Central Business District showing the size, location or boundaries of public facilities, streets, parks and utilities had been approved previously by the Commission. This is the land use portion of it. The Plan reflects a portion of the report prepared by John Carl Warnecke and Associates covering the Civic Center area, and a portion of the report prepared by Victor Gruen and Associates covering the Central Business District area. Details of the Plan will be explained at the public hearing.
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT MAUNALUA HAWAII-KAI MARINA, UNIT 1-F KAISER HAWAII-KAI DEVELOPMENT BY: HONG AND IWAI, ATTORNEYS AT LAW	(3) Conditional Use Permit to construct and operate a private community recreation center in conjunction with the proposed condominium development, "The Moorings", situated within Hawaii-Kai Marina, Unit 1-F, occupying approximately 13,204 square feet of land, on the southwesterly side of Hawaii-Kai Drive directly across Pohoiki Place.
ZONING BUSINESS WAIANAE 87-2070 FARRINGTON HIGHWAY NAKATANI ENTERPRISES, INC.	(4) Change in zoning from existing Highway and Rural Protective to Business for land containing 6.25 acres situated at 87-2070 Farrington Highway in Waianae, in conformity with the General Plan.
ZONING BUSINESS MAILI 87-860 FARRINGTON HIGHWAY AH HOON DANG BY: RICHARD KAGEYAMA	(5) Change in zoning from existing Highway Protective to Business for land containing 11,478 square feet situated at 87-860 Farrington Highway in Maili, in conformity with the General Plan.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
WAIANAE
MAKAI OF FARRINGTON
HIGHWAY IN PROXIMITY
TO MAUNA LAHILAHI
BEACH PARK
MANOA INVESTMENT CO.,
ET AL
BY: JAMES Y.
SHIGEMURA,
ATTORNEY

(6) Amendment to the Detailed Land Use Map for Waianae Kai by changing the land use designation from Park and Low Density Apartment uses to Resort-Hotel use for area of land containing 5.56 acres situated makai of Farrington Highway in proximity to Mauna Lahilahi Beach Park in Waianae.

ZONING ORDINANCE
(ORDINANCE NO. 3234)
COMPREHENSIVE ZONING
CODE

(7) An Ordinance to amend the R. O. 1961, as amended, by renumbering and redesignating the existing Section 21-1.7 relating to Penalty, to Section 21-1.8; and by adding a new Section 21-1.7 thereto, providing for an option to comply with regulations of Ordinance No. 3234 in lieu of the requirements of this chapter.

The Director stated that this is a proposed amendment to the existing ordinance which will be in effect until January 2, 1969. When the Comprehensive Zoning Code was prepared, the Corporation Counsel had advised that there should be a provision that, during the transition period of approximately five months, any applicant for a building permit may have the option to conform to the existing ordinance or the provisions of Ordinance No. 3234 and advised that the existing ordinance be amended.

As an example, the Director cited the planned unit development section of the Ordinance which can be used by a developer if he desired upon adoption of the proposed amendment.

FEDERAL GRANT
PROGRAMS
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
WAIAU INTERCHANGE
CANE HAUL ROAD
CONSTRUCTION

In compliance with Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (P. L. 89-754), the State Department of Transportation, Highways Division, had referred to the Planning Commission for review, an application for federal funds to construct the Waiau Interchange, Cane Haul Road with H-1 Highway.

The Director stated that the Waiau Interchange is presently indicated on the Detailed Land Use Map as the H-1 and Kamehameha Highway intersection. Since the adoption of the Detailed Land Use Map, the State and City agencies have agreed to relocate the interchange to the Cane Haul Road area. This will alleviate the traffic congestion at the Waimano Home Road and Kamehameha Highway intersection.

This project is part of the major street system and is delineated on the island-wide General Plan and is in consonance with the long-range proposals of the General Plan.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Lemmon, certified that this project is in consonance with the long-range proposals of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu and consistent with the Transportation Systems Planning Office's recommended plan.

The Director explained that the interchange will affect one of the proposed school sites but the Department of Education is aware of the situation. Several meetings have been held and the Department of Education is seeking an alternate school site and is also considering a combined elementary-intermediate school site. A proposal to amend the Detailed Land Use Map on the school site will be presented to the Commission as soon as an alternate site for the school is selected.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie M. Abbott
Hearings Reporter

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
September 19, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, September 19, 1968, at 1:40 p.m., at 664 South King Street (former Salvation Army Building) with Chairman Richard K. Sharpless presiding:

PRESENT:

Richard K. Sharpless, Chairman
Philip Chun
Cyril W. Lemmon
Arthur A. Rutledge
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Victor Givan, ex-officio (Acting Managing Director)

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director
Denis Leong, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Robert L. Muller (on trip)
Edward Brennan (resigned)
Fred K. Kwock, ex-officio

PUBLIC HEARING ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 21, ARTICLE 1

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposed ordinance to amend Chapter 21, Article 1, of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu, 1961, as amended, as follows:

a. By renumbering and redesignating the existing Section 21-1.7 to read:

"Sec. 21-1.8 Penalty"

b. By adding a new section 21-1.7 to read:

"Sec. 21-1.7 Permitted regulations in lieu of the requirements of this chapter.

Any applicant for a building permit, at his option, may substitute the provisions of Ordinance No. 3234 (Comprehensive Zoning Code) in lieu of the requirements of this chapter; provided, in making the substitution all the applicable provisions of said Ordinance No. 3234 shall be effective."

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of September 8, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, the Chamber of Commerce, Oahu Development Conference, Downtown Improvement Association, and the Pacific Business News. No protests or comments in writing have been received to date.

The Director explained that the purpose of the amendment is to permit any applicant for a building permit to have an option to either build in accordance with present regulations or under the new regulations of the Comprehensive Zoning Code to be effective on January 2, 1969. A combination of both regulations cannot be used. A number of

persons including the City Council have expressed the thought that it might be desirable to give this option during this transition period. The Planned Unit Development provisions of the ordinance, for instance, is a new district that some people have expressed a desire to follow. Also, there have been some interest to establish the Historic and Cultural District before January.

There was no one to speak either in favor of or in opposition to the proposed amendment.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Chun, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposed ordinance to amend Chapter 21, Article 1 of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu, 1961, as amended.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING APARTMENT
DISTRICT C
PACIFIC HEIGHTS
1901-1901-A
PACIFIC HEIGHTS
ROAD
SHIGEICHI NAKAMURA

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to change the zoning from existing Class B Residential to Apartment District C for a parcel of land containing 8,241 sq. ft. at 1901-1901-A Pacific Heights Road, situated approximately 500 feet mauka of Kuakini Street and on the waikiki side of Pacific Heights Road in Pauoa, identified by Tax Map Key 2-2-08: Parcels 19 and 93, in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Plan for the Lower Pauoa area.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of September 8, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies and to the Pacific Business News. No letters of protest or comment have been received to date.

The Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the property and reported on the applicant's plan to convert an existing single family dwelling into a duplex unit. The owner has no immediate plans for building an apartment building. The Board of Water Supply has reported that its facilities are adequate to serve the proposed development. The Department of Public Works has reported that sewers are available and adequate for the proposed development. Pacific Heights Road is an improved street with curbs, gutters and sidewalks. At the rear of the property is an easement in favor of the City and County of Honolulu for Pauoa Stream maintenance purpose. The consolidation of the two parcels was approved on February 8, 1968. Since the proposed rezoning is in conformity with adopted plans and public utilities are available, the Director recommended approval.

No one spoke either in favor of or in opposition to the proposed rezoning.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Lemmon.

The Commission considered this matter later.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission recommended approval of the change in zoning from Class B Residential to Apartment District C for a parcel of land situated at 1901-1901-A Pacific Heights Road in Pauoa.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING APARTMENT
DISTRICT C
MAKIKI
1825 POKI STREET
WILLIAM Y. M.
CHINN

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District C for a 9,375 sq. ft. parcel of land at 1825 Poki Street, situated on the Kokohead side of Poki Street between Dominis Street and Nehoa Street, in Makiki and identified by Tax Map Key 2-4-23: Parcel 8, in conformity with the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of September 8, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, the Central Honolulu Community Association and the Pacific Business News. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

The Director reported that the proposed rezoning is in conformity with the adopted General Plan. The Detailed Land Use Plan for this planning area has not yet been adopted and the staff is presently preparing such a plan in consultation with the Central Honolulu Community Association. The owner of the land proposes to construct a three story walkup apartment containing 15 units with 18 parking spaces. The Board of Water Supply has reported that its facilities are adequate to serve the proposed use. The Department of Public Works has reported that sewers are available and adequate. In accordance with Ordinance No. 2412, the owner will be required to construct a concrete sidewalk along the lot frontage. He pointed out the other lots in this immediate vicinity which are presently zoned Apartment District C or Hotel and Apartment.

No one spoke in favor of or in opposition to the proposed rezoning.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District C for a parcel of land at 1825 Poki Street in Makiki.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING APARTMENT
DISTRICT B
PALOLO
1238 PALOLO AVENUE
ROBERT AU

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District B for a 7,137 sq. ft. parcel of land at 1238 Palolo Avenue, situated on the north side of Palolo Avenue and approximately 320 feet mauka of Waialae Avenue, in Palolo, and identified by Tax Map Key 3-3-02: Parcel 18, in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Plan for the St. Louis Heights-Palolo area.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of September 8, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, the Pacific Business News, the Palolo Community Council, and the Palolo Civic Organization. No protests or comments in writing have been received to date.

The Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the property and noted that the property is situated within the area designated for low density apartment use on the adopted detailed land use plan for the area. The Board of Water Supply has reported that its facilities are adequate and the Department of Public Works has reported that sewers are available and adequate to serve the proposed development. Palolo Avenue is an improved street with curbs, gutters and sidewalks. A building setback line from the stream has to be established in coordination with the Division of Engineering. The owner proposes to construct a two-story, four-unit apartment building which will meet the spacing requirements and the parking regulations. He recommended approval of the rezoning.

No one spoke either in favor of or in opposition to the proposed zoning.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District B for the parcel of land situated at 1238 Palolo Avenue in Palolo.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
PEARL CITY
921 KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY
WAIPAHU GARAGE, LTD.

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Highway Protective to Business for a 54,854 sq. ft. parcel of land at 921 Kamehameha Highway, situated on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway and 150 feet southwest of the corner of Kamehameha Highway and Lehua Avenue in Pearl City, and identified by Tax Map Key 9-7-22: Parcel 8, in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Plan for the Waiawa to Halawa area.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of September 8, 1968,

was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the Pearl City Community Association, and the Pacific Business News. No protests or comments in writing have been received to date.

The Director presented the proposal by pointing out the subject property situated on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway adjacent to Pearl City Tavern. The subject parcel has been used for business purpose for over 30 years by the Waipahu Garage, Ltd., as its auto repair and parts department in conjunction with the new and used car sales lot directly across the street on the mauka side of Kamehameha Highway. There are three structures on the premises and the owner proposes to reconstruct the whole business complex in the future because the buildings are considered too old for renovation work. The owner of the adjoining Pearl City Tavern property was asked to join in this rezoning proposal but he declined because of difficulty at this time to convert the frame buildings to meet fire code regulations.

The Director reported that water and sewer facilities are available and adequate to serve the area. Kamehameha Highway fronting this property has a right-of-way width of 112 feet with standard curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Fourth Street which serves the back of this property has a right-of-way width of 60 feet with a pavement width of 27 feet in fair condition. There are no curbs, gutters and sidewalks on Fourth Street. The State Department of Transportation, Highways Division, has reported that it has no objection to the proposed zoning change. However, it stated that access into and out of the property will be restricted to right turn movements only on Kamehameha Highway because of the medial strip. The Director recommended approval of the rezoning proposal.

No one spoke either in opposition to or in favor of the proposed rezoning.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Highway Protective to Business for a parcel of land at 921 Kamehameha Highway in Pearl City.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING CLASS A-1
RESIDENTIAL
MAKIKI
MAKIKI STREET
AND ROUND TOP DRIVE
L. D. HAXTON,
ET AL

A public hearing, continued from August 22, 1968, was held to consider a proposed change in zoning from Class AA Residential (10,000 sq. ft. minimum) to Class A-1 Residential (7,500 sq. ft. minimum) for an area of land situated at the mauka northerly end of Makiki Street and bounded by Makiki Street and Round Top Drive in Makiki, identified by Tax Map Key 2-5-07: Parcels 1-12, 14-23, 25-35, 37-48, in conformity with the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu. The Commission had kept the public hearing open to permit those who felt that the proposal was not presented correctly an

opportunity to discuss it further.

The Director briefly explained the proposal and pointed out the area under discussion. He noted that Mr. L. D. Haxton had submitted an application to have his property containing an area of 44,650 sq. ft. zoned to Class A-1 Residential. However, rather than rezoning one parcel, he had initiated the rezoning to encompass this entire triangular block area based upon the submission of a petition bearing the signatures of most of the property owners in the area supporting the request for a change in zoning. At the public hearing, some of the residents objected because it was their understanding that the rezoning was to involve only Mr. Haxton's property and not the entire block.

Since the previous meeting, the Director reported that Mr. Haxton has submitted a letter and a petition bearing the signatures of 30 property owners in the area favoring the proposal to rezone their properties to Class A-1 Residential. Out of the 38 resident owners in this block, Mr. Haxton could not contact 8 owners because some were out of the State. The 30 owners represent an area of 437,488 sq. ft. while the 8 owners represent 54,765 sq. ft. The petition was read by the Director.

If the rezoning is accomplished, the Director estimated that about 12 additional parcels could be created. Some of the lots are smaller than 7,500 sq. ft. He also acknowledged receipt of a letter signed by Mary Alice Booth Carr and Freddy Sue Hillmann in opposition to the proposal to rezone the entire block to Class A-1 Residential.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mrs. Harriet Duncan, owner of a parcel of land on Round Top Drive and containing an area of 10,000 sq. ft., stated that since the last hearing, she spoke to some of her neighbors and learned that they were of the same opinion as her that they had no objection to helping Mr. Haxton obtain his request for a variance but they were not in favor of rezoning the whole area. She attempted to contact all of the property owners but was successful in talking to only 25. Some of the people who signed the second petition thought that they were supporting the rezoning of Mr. Haxton's property only while others changed their mind after learning that about 13 additional lots could be created. Only three were in favor of the rezoning. Some were neutral indicating that they didn't care whether the area was left in Class AA or rezoned to Class A-1.

She then read and submitted a petition bearing the signatures of 12 persons who represent 11 parcels. These owners indicated that they had signed the petition circulated by Mr. Haxton supporting his request for a variance to have his parcel rezoned to Class A-1, but had they known that the rezoning would cover the entire block, they would not have signed the petition. She noted that the petition

filed by her bears a later date than the petition filed by Mr. Haxton.

Mrs. Duncan then mentioned her reasons for opposing the rezoning. She was afraid that they would no longer enjoy the dignity of a quiet neighborhood if 13 additional lots are created. Traffic certainly would increase. Because of the narrow streets, parking for visitors or guests is difficult to find. The situation would become worse. The water pressure in the area is not at its maximum and at times it is difficult to take a shower. The addition of 13 homes will make the pressure even less. She noted that the Sanitation Division commented that the proposed rezoning would not create any environmental health hazard. She confirmed that it won't because the area has cesspools and not sewers. Because of the loose soil condition in the area, she was afraid that the use of bulldozers to create new lots would jeopardize the safety of residents below. For resale purpose, a Class AA zoned lot carries a greater value than a Class A-1 lot.

She then submitted a petition signed by some of the residents living in the upper portion of Round Top Drive indicating their opposition to the proposed rezoning. Although she spoke to some of the residents in the makai section, she did not have sufficient time to obtain their signatures on a petition. They were not aware of this rezoning proposal and all favored leaving the area in the Class AA zone. If she had sufficient time, she was sure that she could obtain many more signatures in opposition to the rezoning proposal.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mrs. Duncan stated that she had no objection to zoning Mr. Haxton's property to Class A-1 Residential because he indicated his desire to build an additional home on his property since he and his wife had retired. Many people signed the petition because of this representation. She then inquired whether the Class A-1 zoning would permit Mr. Haxton to subdivide his property into several lots.

Upon being informed by the Director that Mr. Haxton can subdivide his property into five lots, Mrs. Duncan stated her unawareness of this fact. She did not know how the other residents would react to this information. She realized the situation of the people who have large parcels of land, but at this time she could not say whether or not she would object to their subdividing their parcels into two or more lots or to build additional homes without knowing the topographic condition of their lands. For example, she would object to the subdivision of Dr. Mirikitani's property containing 15,660 sq. ft. into two lots because he would have to bulldoze the area to create the second lot. However, for the Louis A. Dolan's property, because of its gentle slope, a second house could be built without a great deal of bulldozing.

Mrs. Virginia McBride, owner of a 5,433 sq. ft. parcel of land on Round Top Drive, stated that she was one of the persons who signed Mr. Haxton's petition because she was informed that the rezoning involved Mr. Haxton's property only. She had no objection to his request but would seriously object to the rezoning of the whole area because some of the new lots to be created would have access on Round Top Drive. This would create an increase of traffic on this very narrow street which is not wide enough to handle too much traffic. In one situation, a car had left the road and would have landed on her roof if she did not have heavy foliage to stop the car. She is increasing her planting. She felt that widening of the road would be quite hazardous because the destruction of the root structures would cause erosion and sliding of the black sand which this area is composed of.

Mr. Louis Haxton referred to the second petition filed by him and bearing the signatures of 30 out of the total of 38 property owners in the area. He stated that these 30 owners are also requesting that their properties be zoned to Class A-1. Eight owners could not be contacted because some were out of the State.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Haxton explained that his original request intended to cover the entire block because in speaking to his neighbors, they wanted their properties included in his rezoning request but through some misunderstanding, the person who drafted the letter did not make this fact very clear. Therefore in circulating the second petition, he made it clear to these people what the rezoning proposal involved and 30 people signed the second petition. He stated that the topography of his land is a gentle slope. He does not know the percentage grade. He plans to subdivide his property into two and retain the back lot for construction of a small home for himself and dispose the front lot with four houses. He does not intend to construct any more houses. He was willing to file a bond or surety to guarantee that he was going to construct only one house. He did not bring his proposed subdivision plan but he could make it available to the Commission.

He believed that the people had the wrong impression about the area. Besides his lot, he noted that there are only seven other lots which have an area of 15,000 sq. ft. or more and upon which an additional house could be built.

Mr. Lemmon inquired whether under the advertised public hearing notice, the Commission could act only on Mr. Haxton's property.

The Director replied that the Commission could act on a smaller area because the public hearing notice mentioned the entire area.

Mr. Robert Bunn, attorney, represented Mr. Harold J. Heide, Dr. Hans Zimmerman and Mr. Louis A. Dolan. He emphasized the point made by Mr. Haxton that the original application for rezoning intended to cover the entire area and not just Mr. Haxton's property. His clients did not file their own applications for rezoning because it was their understanding that Mr. Haxton's request would cover the entire area including their properties. It was also their understanding that the Commission usually does not act on one lot rezoning but takes into consideration a much larger area; therefore, his clients would be prejudiced if action is taken on Mr. Haxton's property only.

He confirmed the statement made by Mr. Haxton that only 8 lots in the area have areas in excess of 15,000 sq. ft. Majority of the lots are less than 10,000 sq. ft. with a few lots having areas of 3,000, 4,000, or 5,000 sq. ft. Mr. Haxton wanted to subdivide his property into two by creating an irregular boundary line but apparently this is not allowed. A straight boundary is required and because of this fact, he required a rezoning of the area in order to build another house in addition to the four that exist there now.

Mr. Bunn indicated that Mr. Frank Fasi has a lot area of 15,602 sq. ft. with two houses; and adjoining lot with only 9,676 sq. ft. has three houses; the Tinker lot with 7,322 sq. ft. has two houses; and Mr. Mirikitani's lot with 15,660 sq. ft. has two houses on it so that a subdivision would not be of any benefit to him. This count was taken through a visual inspection made of the area. His estimate is that if this rezoning should be accomplished, not more than 8 additional homes can be built in the area. He pointed out that the area across Makiki Street is zoned Class A Residential or a minimum lot size of 5,000 sq. ft. There are no house lots on the upper side of Round Top Drive because that is State land. He requested approval of Mr. Haxton's request including the rezoning of his clients' properties.

When questioned by the Commission, Mr. Bunn stated that Mr. Heide's lot contains 25,279 sq. ft. It could be subdivided into two lots because presently there are two dwellings on it and actually only one more house or one more lot can be created. Dr. Zimmerman is not interested in subdividing his property but he can have one more house in addition to the present two that he has. Mr. Dolan can have one more house on his 17,598 sq. ft. lot. Regarding Mrs. McBride's concern about access, he noted that only two houses would have access on upper Round Top Drive. The rest would have access on lower Round Top Drive and on Makiki Street.

Mrs. Munro represented her aunt, Ruby Munro, owner of a 7,785 sq. ft. parcel of land on Makiki Street. She had no objection to the proposed rezoning because the area on the other side of Makiki Street is zoned Class A Residential. She noted that this zoning was done without notification to the people

involved or the adjoining areas. In this instance, they have been properly notified. She did not believe that the Class A-1 zoning would hurt property values.

MOTION: Mr. Yamabe's motion to close the public hearing and to take the matter under advisement was seconded by Mr. Chun.

Mr. Lemmon questioned the opponents whether or not they had any objection to the rezoning of Mr. Haxton's property and Mr. Bunn's clients' properties only while retaining the present zoning for the rest of the area.

Mrs. Duncan did not believe that she would object to such a proposal based on her knowledge of the topographic condition of the area.

Based on information given that only two more lots would have access on Round Top Drive, Mrs. McBride had no objection.

In view of their change in position, Mr. Yamabe asked the two opponents what is their objection to zoning the whole area to Class A-1.

Mrs. Duncan explained that she took the no objection stand because Mr. Bunn had reported that Mr. Heide's property has two homes. She was a little confused about Dr. Zimmerman's property because when she spoke to him, he said that he was not in favor of the rezoning for the whole area and that he had no intention of subdividing his property. She was referred to Mr. Heide because he represented Dr. Zimmerman. One of her concerns as well as of others is that if the entire area is zoned Class A-1, sometime in the future should there be a change in ownership, the new owner might actually subdivide the property even though the present owner stated that he does not propose to do so. Also, someone might purchase several abutting properties and subdivide those lots into several lots. When she first checked with the Planning Department, she was informed that the new zoning would allow about 21 more lots but when Mr. Skrivanek presented his report at the public hearing, he stated that 13 more lots would be created. This is their concern that based upon the zoning which would permit 7,500 sq. ft. lots, a maximum density would be the end result for the area. Her answer should have been no rather than yes to the rezoning proposal involving only the four subject properties mentioned.

When asked whether she had any idea as to how many more homes can be constructed under the Class A-1 zoning, Mrs. Duncan had no idea, but based on information given, it could be from 13 to 21 more homes.

If the analysis show that only 5 to 8 more homes can be built, Mrs. Duncan was asked whether she would still object.

Mrs. Duncan replied that she would, based upon the fact that Class AA zoning has a greater value than Class A-1 zoning.

When asked for her comments, Mrs. McBride had none except to reiterate her concern about sand erosion if any excavation or road widening work is done.

Mr. Heide confirmed that his property has two houses and Dr. Zimmerman also has two houses on his property.

ACTION: A vote was taken and the motion to close the public hearing and to take the matter under advisement carried.

MOTION: In considering this matter later, Mr. Lemmon made a motion to recommend approval of the change in zoning from Class AA to Class A-1 Residential for Mr. Haxton's property and the three properties represented by Mr. Bunn and to retain the remainder of the area in Class AA Residential zone. Mr. Chun seconded the motion for discussion purpose.

The Commission discussed whether or not this was the proper action to take in view of the fact that this would leave only four other lots of sufficient size that can be resubdivided. Majority of the lots in the area are substandard under the present Class AA zoning and even under the Class A-1 zoning so that the rezoning should not greatly affect the value of the area.

In view of the objections against the rezoning of the entire area, Mr. Lemmon felt that only those property owners who specifically requested the change in zoning should be granted their requests while the rest of the area should be retained in Class AA zoning.

Mr. Yamabe believed that the opponents did not really understand the actual situation. They seemed to be under the misconception that the rezoning would result in a tremendous increase in population when actually this is not so. When considering the fact that majority of the lots are substandard and some of the large sized parcels already have two or more houses on them, he felt that not too many homes can be added to the area. He suggested that the staff meet with these opponents and explain the situation to them. If the Commission took action on only the four properties, he felt that it would be subject to severe criticism about poor planning and spot zoning.

The Director was agreeable to a deferral and in the meantime, he will check with Mr. Haxton about his proposed subdivision plan. If his proposal can be accomplished without the rezoning, the zoning of the area will not be changed. He was also against the rezoning of only four parcels and preferred that the entire area either be retained in the

Class AA zoning or changed to Class A-1 zoning.

Mr. Lemmon thereupon withdrew his motion and Mr. Chun his second thereto.

The Commission suggested to the Director that he meet with Mrs. Duncan, Mrs. McBride and the other opponents and explain the situation to them.

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION WAIPAHU BETWEEN KUNIA ROAD AND WAIKELE GULCH, INLAND OF H-1 HIGHWAY ROBINSON TRUSTS AND HSM VENTURES (URBAN DISTRICT)

The State Land Use Commission had referred to the Planning Commission for its comments and recommendation, a petition submitted by the Robinson Trusts and HSM Ventures for an amendment to the Land Use Commission District Boundary by changing the district classification from Agricultural to Urban for 316.4 acres of land situated between Kunia Road and Waikele Gulch, mauka of the H-1 Highway in Waipahu, identified by Tax Map Key 9-4-02: Parcel 17.

The staff's report was submitted to the Commission. The Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the subject property and reported that a similar request for the same land was considered by the Commission about a year ago. At that time, the staff recommended against the change except for about 11 acres situated makai of the H-1 Highway, but the Planning Commission had recommended the granting of the change for the entire 352 acres requested. The State Land Use Commission denied the request except for the 11 acres, consistent with the recommendation of the Planning Department staff.

Displayed were a map of Waipahu showing the boundary of the land under consideration, the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the area, the existing zoning map and the existing land use map of the area.

The Chairman inquired whether a copy of the staff's report was made available to the applicant. The Director replied that a copy was given to Mr. Stanley Mukai, attorney for the applicants, just before the meeting.

In response to an inquiry from the Commission, the Director stated that the Commission has within 45 days from receipt of the petition to forward its comments and recommendation to the Land Use Commission. The petition was received on July 23, 1968. Since the time limit has expired, the Commission may ask for an extension of time to submit its recommendation to the Land Use Commission.

Testimony was heard from the petitioners.

Mr. Mukai represented HSM Ventures, the petitioner and prospective developer of the land. He introduced Mr. Frank D. Gibson, attorney for the Robinson Trusts, owners of the land; Mr. Larry Matsuo, engineer with Park Engineering Inc.; Mr. J. Humme, Vice President of Oahu Sugar Company; and Mr. Herbert Horita, general partner in HSM Ventures

as witnesses to speak in support of the petition. As stated by the Director, he indicated that this petition covers substantially the same land requested for urban use about a year ago. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the petition but the Land Use Commission had denied it. The petition is being resubmitted at this time based on additional facts that there is a real need and demand for residential homes in the Waipahu area.

Mr. Gibson represented the Robinson Trusts which consist of the following:

a. Bishop Trust Company, Limited, and Lilla May Robinson, Trustees under the Will and of the Estate of James Lawrence P. Robinson, deceased;

b. First National Bank of Hawaii, Successor Trustee under the Will and of the Estate of Caroline J. Robinson, deceased;

c. Chinn Ho, Mary K. H. Robinson and Herman G. P. Lemke, Trustees under Deed of Trust of Mark Alexander Robinson and Mary K. Hart Robinson; and

d. James Robinson, Ltd., a Hawaii corporation.

Mr. Gibson gave a brief history of land ownership by the Robinsons since the late 1800s. Their lands basically were in cane and pineapple cultivation under lease to Oahu Sugar Company, Ewa Plantation and Dole Company. At the present time, the Trusts own about 4,042 acres in land zoned for agricultural use in addition to the 341 acres not under lease to Oahu Sugar Company. As far back as the 1950s, he stated that studies conducted indicated that there would be a substantial demand for uses other than agriculture in the vicinity of Waipahu and, as a result, the lease with Ewa Plantation for about 200 acres of land was not renewed. This is the industrial zoned lands situated from Pearl Harbor mauka to Waipahu Road, on both sides of Farrington Highway and presently completely developed. About 10 years ago, the lease with Oahu Sugar Company for about 341 acres was withdrawn and Oahu Sugar Company is presently in the area on a crop to crop basis. Approximately 500 acres were withdrawn from agricultural use at that time and the first residential subdivision was started in 1960 with Mr. Q. C. Lum developing approximately 62 acres. During this period, they were able to develop the land for residential purpose because the zoning on the land is Rural Protective, but it was not until passage of the Land Use Act that they have encountered this problem to have the land designated for urban use.

He explained that prior to development, it was necessary for the Trustees to clear title to the land through a petition suit filed in 1959 and the Trustees bought 877 acres including all of the lands in that petition action for $7,200,000.

In 1967, the Trustees entered into a development agreement with Mr. Herbert Horita and his associates to develop 478 acres of land which include the 137 acres below the H-1 Highway and the 341 acres above the highway. It was his understanding that before the end of this year, all of the lands below the H-1 Highway will be completely leased out and homes built. This shows a substantial need and demand for urban residential lands in this area for the moderate income families and unless more lands are made available, this need cannot be met. In a very short time, no lands will be available for urban development. He commended Mr. Horita for doing an excellent job in meeting the housing market.

Regarding Oahu Sugar Company, he stated that in 1967, 1,500 acres of agricultural lands were added to their lease. He stated that the objective of the Trustees is to try as hard as they can to meet and satisfy the demands of the people for homes in the Waipahu area.

Mr. Larry Matsuo stated that Park Engineering Inc., is the engineering consultant for the developer of this area under consideration and presently zoned Rural Protective. In 1960, when Robinson Heights was being developed by Q. C. Lum, he stated that the area now under consideration was included in that residential plan as evidenced by the size of the sewer lines that were installed. Subsequent to that the adjacent area was developed and they also installed a size of sewer line that would accommodate this area. A few months ago, they installed a 12 inch sewer line across H-1 Highway because of construction in the area and not at the request of the State Highways Division. He mentioned this fact to indicate that sewer facilities are adequate to serve the area. There is a sewage pumping station in the Waipahu Industrial Tract to pump sewage from the area to the sewage treatment plant.

Mr. Matsuo reported on the completion of engineering plans for a complete water system to serve this area and also the area below the H-1 Highway. The plans include two deep wells, a 1700 gallons pump, a hundred million gallon reservoir and transmission main. This system is estimated to cost in excess of $700,000 which would be borne by the developer. This system will serve approximately 311 lots presently being developed below the highway and served temporarily by the lower water system. Until the new system is installed, approximately 48 lots cannot be developed because of inadequate water pressure. This new system will also serve all of the 316 acres proposed to be developed. After completion, the system is to be turned over to the Board of Water Supply.

Referring to a map of Waipahu, Mr. Matsuo stressed the need for more urban lands in Waipahu by pointing out those lands presently in the urban district and zoned for residential use but not used for this purpose. These lands presently owned by the Oahu

Sugar Company are presently in cane cultivation, and he proceeded to read the field numbers, the acreages, and the dates of harvest which are staggered every two years. He also pointed out other urban lands zoned either for residential or apartment uses under various ownership but not used for the purposes zoned. Based upon this information, he emphasized that there are not enough vacant urban lands available in Waipahu for immediate development.

Mr. Mukai then called upon Mr. J. Humme, Vice President of Oahu Sugar Company to testify. He noted that Oahu Sugar Company has submitted in writing its support and assistance in this petition to have the subject area reclassified to urban use.

Mr. Humme reported that Oahu Sugar Company leases a great bulk of their sugar cane lands rather than own them in fee title. They have also engaged in joint ventures to develop residential house lots on former cane lands extending from Halawa, Aiea to Pearl City, indicating that they have participated actively and have experience in developing lands for uses other than sugar cane. They intend to continue this type of diversification in the future because economics will dictate what they do with their lands.

Regarding the subject area under consideration, he stated that it has not been under lease to Oahu Sugar Company for the past 10 years. It was withdrawn from their lease but they are in the area on a crop to crop basis with the knowledge that this land was eventually to be developed for some type of urban use. This fact was known to them prior to enactment of the Land Use Act. They have had good relationship with the people who will be developing the land and Oahu Sugar willingly endorses the application before the Commission.

When asked to comment about the land owned by Oahu Sugar Company within the urban district and under cane cultivation as reported by Mr. Matsuo, Mr. Humme stated that economics will eventually put that land into urban use. The land is presently in cane and they are taxed at the agricultural rate. Should the tax increase, they certainly could not afford to keep the land in cane but would develop to some type of urban use.

When asked whether the land is dedicated for agricultural purpose, Mr. Humme replied in the negative.

Mr. Herbert Horita presented statistical data on housing construction, demand, and other information as follows:

<u>HARBOR VIEW SUBDIVISION</u>

1. HSM Ventures has the development right to develop the Robinson Trusts land below the H-1 Highway to Waipahu Street between Kunia Road and the Robinson Heights Subdivision. The area known as Harbor View Subdivision has been under development since February, 1967 and since that date, they will

have developed 137 acres and moved families into 549 homes by the end of this year.

2. The homes are offered at VA financing with no down payment and FHA financing with a low down payment. The low sales price of $21,000 to $27,450 for the leasehold and home is meeting the demand for housing in the Leeward area. This sales price is about the lowest on Oahu.

3. The remaining 48 lots at the corner of Kunia Road and the H-1 Highway cannot be developed until the water reservoir is constructed and the pump station line installed. The cost of this water system will be borne by the developer. They are committed to the FHA and the VA standards as well as the Board of Water Supply to construct these facilities as soon as possible. If their request for a change in land use classification is not approved, the developer will suffer financial hardship by not being able to recoup the cost of constructing the water reservoir in the amount of $700,000.

4. The general contractor, a partner in this development venture, has done a marvelous job in completing the new Honowai Elementary School within this subdivision to open in time for the September school term.

5. There is a park site in this subdivision which he believes has been acquired by the State and plans are now being prepared for its development.

6. This subdivision is within the near vicinity of many commercial developments along Farrington Highway and within the Waipahu Industrial Park subdivision. Many others are under construction. By the end of 1968, approximately 200 new home sites will be needed for the population increase resulting from these new business establishments.

POPULATION

1. There was a population increase of 51,197 persons in 1967 for a total population of 839,783 persons in 1968 for the City and County of Honolulu. Out of this increase, 41,432 was the result of direct in-migration with the influx of new residents and service personnel and their families in the Leeward area. Majority usually move into the Waipahu area indicating that Waipahu will need in 1969 a minimum of 600 new home sites and apartment units to meet the housing demand.

STATISTICS ON HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

1. The June report by the Bank of Hawaii, "Construction in Hawaii 1968" gave the following report:

Housing Units Authorized in Hawaii

Year	Private SingleFamily	Private MultiFamily	Govt	Total
1961-1964	4,350	3,288	137	7,775
1965	5,486	6,055	1,304	12,845
1966	3,953	6,629	842	11,424
1967	3,926	3,395	319	7,640

2. The economists at the First National Bank say that we need an annual rate of 10,000 residential homes for the next 5 years. Based on the statistics just read, this need has not been met during all of the past years. One of the reasons is the lack of available land for development. Many of the urban lands cannot be developed because they are held by a few developers. For example, Hawaii-Kai will take approximately 8 years for completion of development. Mililani Town will take about 15 years because one developer can develop only so much of the land within a given period of time.

3. A contractor's financial capability is not geared to be able to build in one area the number of houses that are needed. If all funds needed were available, the amount would be immense. Only one or two developers can do this, but their residential homes are selling at a much higher price than Harbor View and they are not meeting the need for low priced residential homes.

4. The following statistics were also obtained from the Bank of Hawaii report on the price range of housing units sold in tract subdivisions.

Year	Under $20,000	$20,000 to $30,000	Over $30,000	Total
1964	390	1,028	68	1,486
1965	110	1,933	412	2,455
1966	181	1,030	864	2,075
1967	31	736	1,207	1,974

The above statistics show that new homes at a price of $20,000 or below are almost non-existent.

5. In order for anyone to qualify for their low priced home of $21,000, he must be able to meet the monthly payment of $166 which is all inclusive of principal, interest, insurance and lease rental and have a net monthly income of $666 after deduction of fixed obligations and income taxes. Anyone who cannot afford to purchase a home in Harbor View, he assumed, could never buy a home anywhere else and must rent.

6. If their request is not approved, the demand for low priced single family residential homes would not be met and this will place an additional burden on public agencies to find this type of housing units for the people.

Mr. Horita then commented on the staff's report as follows:

1. The staff stated that H-1 Highway is the logical boundary for separation of urban and agricultural lands. He noted that on the General Plan and the zoning maps, highways and streets are represented by colored lines. With the authority of the Commission to recommend and the power of the City Council to approve the various land uses and decide where the boundaries are to be set, he believed that a highway should not be the determining factor. In planning, the various land uses do not require a highway for their boundary.

2. Regarding public schools, the staff stated that land acquisition for the second school is tentatively estimated for fiscal 1970 and construction for fiscal 1973. He assumed that this report was made a few years ago because whatever studies made then are now obsolete. The latest report made by the School Board indicated that the present projection of the school population would double within the next nine years.

3. Staff stated that there is ample urban lands in the urban district to adequately sustain the present rate of development in Waipahu to December, 1974. Even if there is enough land in the urban district, he felt that this was still inadequate because the past performance of the large estates and the developers who have the development rights show that they have not met the demand of the single family residential market. This is even after the rise in development within the last eight to ten years.

4. The staff stated that the cost of homes has gone up; that is, in 5.2 years, the price increased by 36%, but in comparison, the construction cost index took from 1958 to 1968 to increase this same percentage.

He indicated that they have not raised their sales price in Harbor View any higher than 3%. He stressed that in good faith, they are trying to meet the housing demand in the low price range. He believed that they are one of the few developers who have been doing this for the last year and a half. He further believed that the City and County and other governmental agencies should cooperate and encourage private enterprises to be active in the housing industry. Comments are constantly made in the newspapers and other media about the rising cost of residential homes and that studies should be made by government and private industry to do something about it. Without any type of publicity, he emphasized that they can develop in Waipahu, low

cost residential homes without any State, City or Federal subsidy.

5. The staff's report shows that in March, 1967 homes in Harbor View Subdivision were advertised for $20,900 and up and on July 1, 1967, advertised for $21,000 and up. He noted that after three and a half months and after selling 130 homes, they had raised their price by only $100.

6. The staff's report indicated that the average income of families on Oahu between 1964 and 1966 was $7,633 a year or a gross income of $636 per month. After taxes and provided that there are no other expenses, the net is estimated to be $500. The lending institute says that a person can qualify for a loan based upon not his gross but his net income which is after taxes and other obligations, and that net income must be a ratio of four to one of monthly payment or for a net of $500 a month, he can afford a monthly payment of $125. At Harbor View, the following would be the breakdown of what a person can afford to pay: Property tax of $18 per month; insurance, $6 per month; lease rental of $140 a year for 40 years which is lower than at Crestview where it is $150 to $160 a year for 30 years; and with the principal and interest payment of $89, the total monthly payment would be about $125. This person can mortgage, amortize and afford a payment of $125 a month on his net income of $500 a month. This is at the FHA rate of 6-3/4%. Other conventional loans are at 7-1/2% to 8% for 30 years. The per thousand rate of $6.50, principal and rate, will allow an individual only $89 and qualify him for a loan of only $13,700 which is the sales price of a home about 8 years ago.

7. With the assistance of Robinson Estate, he felt that they have done a tremendous job in offsetting housing cost and inflation. They have taken the burden of providing public housing away from the State and City agencies. He knows that this is what the governmental agencies wish to have participation by private developers.

In the interrogation that followed, Mr. Horita was asked whether he had discussed the staff's report and conclusions with any of the staff members.

Mr. Horita replied that the staff's report was not made available to him until just before the meeting. However, he did meet with the staff to discuss generally the housing demand.

Mr. Rutledge commented that he saw no reason why the staff's report could not have been made available to the applicant earlier because obviously it is not a confidential report. The staff's report mentions the high cost of housing while the applicant states that there are no lands available to build the cheaper homes. He could not understand why the staff is recommending against the request made by the applicant and asked whether the statistics quoted and the proposed development of the applicant

were made known to the staff.

Mr. Horita felt that what he proposes to do is of public knowledge because he has already done it. Some of the information given were submitted to the staff while the statistics quoted were taken from the Bank of Hawaii economic index report.

Mr. Rutledge asked for further information about his housing development.

Mr. Horita believed that many of the developers and builders are not aware of the present housing market. He had made a more extensive study of the situation. As a result, he was able to pre-sell in the first week, 71 houses. Since then, his problem has been to build those houses as fast as he could. He has not caught up with construction yet.

Should the land use boundary be changed to urban, Mr. Horita was asked for a time table for actual development of the area.

Mr. Horita replied that he could start within six months. This would include completion of engineering plans, financing, awarding of contracts for road improvements, design of the new model homes, getting the loans, etc., in six months.

When asked whether he had completed the development of houses in his subdivision, not including the 11 acres, Mr. Horita replied that he has not. He explained that they in the housing industry are not geared to sell and build houses like those on the mainland. They have pre-sold without the roads being in so that their problem is to catch up. For instance, in the subdivision tract of 192 lots, the day after the subdivision was approved and without any type of improvement started, they sold their model homes upon their representation that the land is at 3% grade, FHA standard with a typical plan showing exactly how the house and lot would look. Because the demand was so great, people were buying the homes without looking at the lot. They were also selling Unit 7-A of 57 lots without a paved road. The construction of houses is almost finished in this area. They are building at a rate of better than one house a day. This is without roads or full service or utilities. They have been piping water in. They are building under adverse conditions but are maintaining a schedule because of this tremendous demand for houses.

Questioned further about his development, Mr. Horita stated that he is able to build the low cost homes only upon this parcel of land because it is lease land. They apply directly to the Robinson Estate and because of the Estate's fine cooperation, they are able to obtain the land at the lowest cost to them with hardly any premium. There is no middle man. If it were fee simple land, there would be a built-in profit by several people so that the cost of the homes would rise. He felt that the Trustees of the Robinson Estate have done a marvelous job

in helping promote the development of low priced residential homes and from all indications, they intend to do the same in cooperation with the City and other governmental agencies.

Mr. Horita further stated that there are other factors involved that make them able to build the low priced homes. In contracting for the first 50 houses, they lose money because it takes that long to mobilize, but once mobilized, overhead and operational costs drop; that is, labor, engineering cost, bids for the improvement work, etc. Even the financial institutions give them a preferred rate with hardly any service fee because they know that requests for financing will be forthcoming. With this tremendous cooperation from private industry, they are able to work on a smaller margin of cost and make the low priced homes available to the people. He can supply the product only if land is made available to him where the need for housing is the greatest.

If the combination of factors mentioned by Mr. Horita can be found elsewhere, Mr. Yamabe saw the potential of bringing about a better development and commented that possibly this is the area to which the Commission should be concentrating. If it is possible to build the low priced type of homes mentioned, it might be better to take a much larger area, for instance, 1,000 acres instead of 300 acres and start development by sections. He felt that the basic determination to make is whether or not this type of area exists, and if it does, where is it.

Mr. Horita indicated that presently there are many available lands in the urban district, for instance, the area extending from Enchanted Hills Halawa to Pearl City. Over 14,000 acres were sold to a developer but nothing has been done for 10 years now. He believed that land availability should not be given all to one person because many times, he would not be able to complete the development in his lifetime. Instead, such land should be made available to everyone.

He did not believe that part of land planning should involve just the drawing of a line and saying that all lands on this side of the line should be urban with no consideration given to demand. Land planning should consider where the demand is and not because it would be orderly. If there is no demand, one could put in all the improvements but still wouldn't be able to get the buyers. His position is that he is here now, he is doing it now and meeting that demand. Others have all the opportunity to do so but haven't. Upon checking with FHA, they learned that they are one of three developers who are meeting the need for low priced homes.

Mr. Mukai summarized some of the points brought out by the witnesses and he also commented on portions of the staff's report.

1. The staff's report implies that because there are approximately 183 acres of urban land available below the H-1 Highway, no expansion should be made above the Highway. He felt that this type of thinking seems to give a particular land owner the discretion of determining when other lands should be urbanized. He contended that that particular urban land can be kept in the urban district indefinitely and not used for any urban purpose while other lands which can be developed for urban purpose and meet a need must wait.

2. Mr. Humme testified that Oahu Sugar Company has been aware for the past 10 years of the proposed urban development of the subject area. Mr. Horita testified that he can move into the area within six months which is much sooner than most other developments which usually take about 2-1/2 years before actual construction can be started because of engineering and construction plans that must be prepared, obtaining of financing, and so forth.

3. Assuming that lands in the urban district can be developed now and houses available to the purchasers in approximately 2-1/2 years, within that time period, developable urban lands would be depleted and by not granting the petitioners' request now, the tendency would be to inflate land costs when lands are ready to be placed in the urban district.

4. He noted that the Land Use Commission regulations state that in considering the establishment of the urban district boundaries, those lands that are now in urban use and a sufficient reserve to meet a 10-year projection should be taken into account. He felt that the 183 acres presently in the urban district might not be sufficient reserve for the 10-year period. Knowing the demand for housing that exists in the State, he did not believe that the demand can be met by keeping the 183 acres in reserve. Mr. Humme had also made a point that Oahu Sugar does not know whether that urban land would be placed in residential use or developed for commercial purposes.

Mr. Mukai was asked for his comment should the Land Use Commission state that in accordance with statutory provisions it will be reviewing all of the district boundaries, for instance, next year, so in the meantime, all petitions for boundary changes must wait until this review is completed to determine whether or not more lands in the urban district would be needed.

Mr. Mukai indicated that the Land Use Commission statutes mandate a consideration of a petition on its own merits. Their concern is that there is no assurance that such a study would be conducted and a definite report made. Assuming that such a study was made and completed in 1969 or 1970 and the recommendation was favorable to the petitioner, he indicated that the developer is delayed that long and construction of homes delayed further. He does not know what Mr. Horita would do then or how fast he can get the residential homes on the market.

Mr. Sharpless assumed his statement to mean that the demand for houses would still be present between now and the time of completion of the review. Mr. Mukai replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Gibson stressed that unquestionably there is an immediate and large demand for housing in the Waipahu area and this demand is not going to be satisfied unless this petition is granted. It is anticipated that by the end of this year the Harbor View Subdivision will be completed, and if nothing is done until completion of the Land Use Commission study, the people would no longer be afforded the opportunity to purchase a low priced home in the Waipahu area. He did not believe that this was fair to the people.

Mr. Mukai felt it relevant that the Commission consider the fact that Mr. Horita is able to meet the demand for low cost housing. This is a good public service and he should be permitted to continue this service. If there is a stoppage now, later, when construction is started again, the cost to the people would be quite high.

Mr. Rutledge asked Mr. Mukai whether he had any objection to meeting with the staff and discussing the matter further in view of the many discrepancy in information given by both sides. Mr. Mukai had no objection to meeting with the staff.

The Director then explained the staff's analyses and reasons for recommending against the change, as follows:

1. The staff approached this problem as a planning function by considering factors relating to our economy and our physical development.

2. The purpose in establishing the Land Use Commission act was to prevent urban sprawl and to conserve our natural resources, of which prime agricultural land is one of our irreplaceable natural resources. Within the State, Oahu and Molokai have the vast majority of the prime agricultural lands. Certain agricultural pursuits are effective only on these prime agricultural lands and the staff has taken the position that agriculture is still a major element of our economy and will continue to be so for a number of years. Even if the land is not used for sugar cane, there is reason to believe that it should be reserved for other types of agricultural uses.

3. The applicant indicated that this land is highly suitable for residential use and the staff quite agrees. Generally, agricultural lands can be converted rather easily to residential use because there are no topographical problems and development is much easier.

4. Regarding urban sprawl, the H-1 Highway was established as a logical boundary line. Although it is a man-made major physical feature, it cannot be repeated easily farther up in the mauka direction.

Kunia Road acts as another man-made barrier to contain the urban development.

5. The applicant's proposal has no logical boundary. It tends to bring out the questions: "Why stop here? Why not go another few 1,000 feet or another mile?"

6. Any major urban development presents problems of providing public facilities, utilities, and a system of transportation. Transportation is a major issue facing this community at the present time.

7. If a pattern of urban development is continued in an area which does not lend itself to providing these public services at a lower cost, then we must pay the price for them.

8. If there is to be an extension of the urban use in this area, the more logical pattern would be to go in the ewa direction but still staying below the H-1 Highway. Upon discussing this with the applicants, they indicated that the property owner in the area was not interested in leasing land for residential use but would be agreeable for commercial or industrial uses.

9. Essentially, the property owners are attempting to determine the pattern of urban development; however, the staff believes that its function is to determine what is the best pattern of development and not by ownership of land.

10. As mentioned by the applicant, the FHA has indicated that there are three developers who are producing houses at the lower price. These three are the applicant, Finance Realty Company, and Hirano Brothers. Apparently they are in a highly competitive situation to provide houses at the lower level and this is good because such houses are being provided. However, based on the middle income families on the island, staff analyses show that the homes produced by the three are still beyond the reach of the average family.

11. Other efforts to provide these lower level houses are being made through non-profit organizations and others.

12. The applicant indicated that urban lands in Waipahu are not being made available for development. As stated in the staff's report, the staff has presently under study, a request from the Oahu Sugar Company to change the land use plan around the Sugar Mill to provide for 208 acres of single family residential homes, 26 acres of low density apartments, and 53 acres retained in industrial.

13. The basic question to be answered is: "If we have enough urban lands on the island, should this all be allocated in the area where there is a need? Then beyond that, what sort of pattern of urban development do we want?"

14. The staff is quite concerned about this urban spread up above H-1 Freeway and into the Kunia area. Is this the pattern of development that is desirable?

15. The staff still feels that there is enough land available within the urban district to meet the growth pattern of Waipahu up to 1974.

Mr. Yamabe asked why there is a discrepancy of information between the staff's report and the testimony given by the applicant. For instance, the applicant stated that Oahu Sugar Company's land is still in cane cultivation and that Oahu Sugar did not know when it would develop the land for urban purpose, but the staff says that Oahu Sugar Company has submitted an application for an urban development.

The Director confirmed that an application for rezoning of its land had been submitted by Oahu Sugar Company, but upon obtaining the zoning, he reported the possibility that Oahu Sugar Company might not develop the land right away. This is true of many property owners, but the staff must proceed on the basis that the Company is going to develop the land.

Mr. Rutledge commented on the statement made by the Director that the prime agricultural lands could be put to agricultural uses other than sugar cane. He did not know how much research had gone into a crop change other than sugar cane, but he noted that an Estate is making lands available for urban development and as a result, people who need houses are able to purchase in the area. The staff, however, is recommending against making more land available and hopes that other property owners who have lands within the urban district would decide to make their lands available. In the meantime, those who want this type of housing can't get it. He did not understand this planning concept used by the staff. By taking such a position, the staff is withholding land which can be made available to the people who desire the lower cost homes and is seemingly perpetrating the high cost of land. He noted that the average family does not make $10,000 a year. Unless the staff can find a better solution to meeting the need of the people, he felt that an opportunity should be given to the applicant to continue the type of development he is doing now.

The Director had discussed this with the applicant previously and when asked why some of the other urban lands were not available, obtained the reply that the land owner in the particular section was not interested in residential development but only for commercial or industrial uses. The Director believed that the land owner was not looking at the situation realistically because the area simply cannot support that much commercial or industrial development. The demand for such uses are not present but the demand for residential use is. Recognizing the need to make more land available for residential use, he believed that the Legislature

enacted an Act to encourage the availability of more fee simple land, however, whether or not this method should be considered at this time he could not say. There apparently is a demand for low priced homes because property owners in other areas are making lands available and developing this type of homes, but this still is not meeting the need because one community can produce only about 1,000 homes a year. With the growing population, even the production of 8,000 homes a year might not fully meet the demand of those who cannot purchase in the higher priced areas and those who are displaced from substandard areas. He appreciated the fact that the Robinson Trusts have made some of their lands below the H-1 Highway available for housing, but when it starts to go above the highway, this then raises a number of questions which must be answered.

Mr. Rutledge was under the concept that the role of the Commission is to plan for the public good. If the people need the lower priced homes in this specific area and a developer is present who says that he can provide this type of homes, he could not understand the staff's position in saying no.

Mr. Lemmon commented that a great deal of research was done in determining the needs of the various communities at the time the island-wide General Plan was prepared. The projections were made for 1980, but about a year ago, the Commission agreed that the projections were out-dated because of numerous developments on the entire island and had requested the staff to make a restudy of the Waipahu area. He had no objection to the use of this subject land for residential purpose provided that available land is depleted. To him, the mere fact that a developer states that he can build so many houses is not proper proof or reason for making more land available for urban development. He required from the staff, its new projection for the Waipahu area because obviously there are other needs for the area besides housing. He was confused by all the figures given by Mr. Horita and he felt that if they could be capsuled and compared with the staff's findings, it would help him come to some sort of conclusion.

Mr. Sharpless asked the Director what is meant by the terms "prime agricultural land" and "urban sprawl".

The Director explained that the Land Study Bureau had made a study of the soil condition of lands in the entire State and classified the soils into different categories. The top three are the high quality soil for agricultural pursuits. Most of Mililani Town is prime agricultural land except for the upper northwest area. The area proposed for the general aviation airport at Waipio is also considered prime agricultural land.

Urban sprawl is used when a pattern of urban development takes its own course of action without any logical pattern to follow so that the necessary public services and facilities can be provided to

meet the needs of the area. These services include water, sewer, libraries, a system of streets, etc. The end result would be to have the people pay for these necessary services through higher taxes.

Mr. Rutledge suggested that the staff meet with Mr. Horita and after comparing their figures, they might come to some agreement.

Mr. Yamabe believed that the basic difference was in the planning concepts used by both sides. He did not believe that this can be resolved through comparing of figures. Even if their figures agree, they might not agree with someone else's. He felt that the Commission should be concerned with the principles of planning and attempt to determine which one of their concepts is correct.

Mr. Lemmon did not believe that a decision can be made through determining whose planning concept is right. In looking at the map, there obviously is a need for more residential homes but in adding to a community, he indicated that other basic needs, such as schools, stores, the necessary utilities and so forth must be taken into consideration. He wanted this matter approached from the planning standpoint supported by figures from the staff.

The Director replied that the staff could attempt to prepare a model for Waipahu by projecting the need for single family residential, apartment and other uses and determine the need for additional schools, playgrounds, fire stations, commercial areas, etc., to service that community. Industrial use is variable because through this use, should Waipahu become a major employment center, it will alter the demand for apartments and houses again. Basically, this is to be patterned as a planned community with or without an employment source. His conclusion was that the applicant's petition is based primarily on marketability; whereas, the staff's report is based primarily on planning. He did not know how soon he could develop such a planned community for the Commission's review.

Replying to questions from Mr. Chun, the Director stated that lands on the ewa side of Kunia Road and below the H-1 Highway are all agricultural land. The soil condition is fair but the area below Farrington Highway is considered as lower quality. The H-1 Highway and Kunia Road were used as logical existing boundaries, whereas, under the applicant's proposal, there is no man-made or natural feature to follow as a boundary. By looking at the General Plan map, the question to consider is whether the urban expansion should be made in the upper direction toward Kunia or in the ewa direction to join the development in the Ewa Beach area.

Mr. Horita clarified a few points brought out. He stated that a conference was held with Mr. Skrivanek and a member of his staff with Mr. Mukai and himself

present. During the discussion, he asked the Planning Director whether planning takes into consideration need and demand and the reply received was "no". The Director stated that planning is consideration of overall factors or facilities, the General Plan, and everything else but need, and therefore need was not discussed. His contention is that in planning, need was most important because if you have a plan made but there is no need, why plan at all.

If the definition of urban sprawl is the lack of facilities and no consideration for need, then he pointed out that Hawaii-Kai and Mililani Town can be considered urban sprawl because they do not have the facilities that Waipahu has built up for over 100 years. Waipahu may not have a fire station but it will have one soon because a site has been acquired. Waipahu has a daycare center, a community center, and more professional, business and commercial enterprises than Hawaii-Kai or Mililani Town. Therefore, he did not believe that urban sprawl, meaning the lack of facilities, can be applied to Waipahu. He emphasized that need created by public demand should determine where the development of residental houses should go. The need is here now and not in other areas unknown to people.

Mr. Rutledge again suggested that the developer and the staff meet in an attempt to come to some agreement on their differences. Mr. Lemmon concurred and noted that the Commission cannot completely disregard the staff's analyses and report.

Mr. Chun believed that there was a definite need for housing but whether or not that need is sufficient to take agricultural land out of this use and put in urban is a question, he felt, must be answered. Another question is where to provide for that need knowing that one can drive from as far as Hawaii-Kai to the employment centers at Honolulu or Pearl Harbor. He wondered whether there are other criteria to consider when trying to determine whether or not that need should be met.

The Chairman announced the deferral of this item and requested the staff to meet with the applicant. At the same time, he stated that a request should be forwarded to the Land Use Commission for an extension of time for submitting its comments and recommendation.

FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAMS STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NEW WILSON BRIDGE IN WAHIAWA

In compliance with Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, the State Department of Transportation, Highways Division, has referred to the Planning Commission for review and certification, an application for Federal funds to conduct preliminary engineering studies for a new bridge off Wilson Bridge on Kamehameha Highway in Wahiawa.

The Director reported that this new bridge off the existing Wilson Bridge will be three lanes wide, at the same elevation as the existing bridge, and will be the Wahiawa bound lanes of an ultimate six lane divided highway. When the need arises, a new three lane bridge for the Honolulu bound traffic will be constructed to replace the existing Wilson Bridge. The Detailed Land Use Plan of Wahiawa-Whitmore Village indicates this bridge widening to an 80-foot width. The project is also consistent with the Transportation Systems Planning Office's recommended highway network.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission recommended that this project be certified as implementing the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu, being in consonance with the long-range proposals of the General Plan, and consistent with the Transportation Systems Planning Office's recommended plan.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Chun, authorized the Planning Director to schedule the public hearing dates to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director:

GENERAL PLAN DLUM AMENDMENT WAIMANALO KALANIANAOLE HWY SEWAGE PUMP STATION	(1) A proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waimanalo by changing the land use designation from Military to Public Facility use (Sewage Pump Station) for a 12,523 sq. ft. parcel of land situated off Kalanianaole Highway in Waimanalo.
GENERAL PLAN DLUM AMENDMENT KANEOHE TO KUALOA RIGHT-OF-WAY WIDTH OF KAMEHAMEHA HWY.	(2) A proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe to Kualoa by reflecting a right-of-way width of 84 feet along Kamehameha Highway from Waikalua Road to Lilipuna Road instead of the proposed 100-foot right-of-way.
ZONING BUSINESS WAIKIKI ROYAL HAWAIIAN AVENUE, KUHIO AVENUE, SEASIDE AVENUE AND WAIKOLU WAY BENJAMIN AYSON, SR., ET AL	(3) Change in zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business, in conformity with the General Plan, for six parcels of land containing a total area of approximately 43,159 sq. ft. for land bounded by Royal Hawaiian Avenue, Kuhio Avenue, Seaside Avenue, and Waikolu Way in Waikiki.
GENERAL PLAN DLUM AMENDMENT WAIAWA TO HALAWA OFF LIPOA PLACE APARTMENT USE (ISLAND CONSTRUCTION CO., LTD.)	(4) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa to Halawa by changing the land use designation from Industrial use to Apartment use for a 27,744 sq. ft. parcel of land situated off Lipoa Place within the Kalauao Industrial Park at Kalauao.

ZONING APARTMENT
DISTRICT B
PALOLO
1216 PALOLO AVENUE
HOWARD CHUN

(5) Change in zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District B, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 10,798 sq. ft. parcel of land situated at 1216 Palolo Avenue in Palolo.

STREET NAMES
KANEOHE
BAY VIEW ESTATES
SUBDIVISION

Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Lemmon, the Commission recommended approval of the following street names for roadways within the Bay View Estates Subdivision at Kaneohe, Koolaupoko, Oahu:

MALULANI STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a Kaneohe direction and then intersecting with Kaneohe Bay Dr.

MIHA STREET - Roadway extending from Kaneohe Bay Drive in a mauka direction between Moakaka Place and Kokokahi Place.
Meaning: Silent; quiet

MIMO PLACE - Deadend roadway off Malulani Street between Kaneohe Bay Drive and Miha Street.
Meaning: Gentle; quiet

MOAKAKA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kaneohe Bay Drive between Miha Street and Namoku Street.
Meaning: Clear; plain

MOAKAKA WAY - Deadend roadway off Moakaka Place across Moamahi Way.

MOAMAHI WAY - Deadend roadway off Moakaka Place across Moakaka Way.
Meaning: To cherish and cultivate

NAMOKU STREET - Extension of an existing roadway from Keana Road to Kaneohe Bay Drive.

NEEMUA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Namoku Street between Kaneohe Bay Drive and Neepapa Place.
Meaning: Advance; go forward; progress

NEEPAPA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Namoku Street between Neemua Place and Neepu Place.
Meaning: To move as a whole or unit

NEEPU PLACE - Deadend roadway off Namoku Street between Neepapa Place and Keana Road.
Meaning: To move together

ADJOURNMENT: The Meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima

Carole A. Kamishima
Secretary-Reporter II

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
October 3, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, October 3, 1968, at 1:30 p.m., in the former Salvation Army Auditorium, 664 South King Street, with Chairman Richard K. Sharpless presiding:

PRESENT:

Richard K. Sharpless, Chairman
Philip T. Chun
Cyril W. Lemmon
Robert L. Muller
Arthur A. Rutledge
Thomas N. Yamabe II

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director
Denis Leong, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Robert F. Ellis, ex-officio
Moses Lum Hoy, ex-officio

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT
MAUNALUA
HAWAII-KAI MARINA,
UNIT 1-F
HAWAII-KAI DRIVE
(PRIVATE RECREA-
TIONAL CENTER)
KAISER HAWAII-KAI
DEVELOPMENT CO.

A public hearing was held, pursuant to the provisions of Ordinance Nos. 2423 and 2448, to consider an application for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction and operation of a private recreational center in conjunction with the proposed condominium development "The Moorings" situated within Hawaii-Kai Marina, Unit 1-F, on the southwesterly side of Hawaii-Kai Drive directly across Pohoki Place in Hawaii-Kai and identified by Tax Map Key 3-9-29: 76, within an Apartment District B zone.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of September 22, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant and to the applicable governmental departments. No written comments or protests have been received to date.

The staff's report explaining the proposed development and recommendation for approval with the attachment of several conditions was distributed to the Commissioners.

The Director reported on the proposal as follows:

1. The proposed recreational center will cover an area of 13,204 square feet and is to be an integral part of the condominium development known as "The Moorings" presently under development on approximately 5 acres of land.

2. The recreational center is located within easy walking distance from the apartment units it will serve, and therefore, the setting aside of 15 parking spaces for the center is considered sufficient. Within this condominium development, two parking spaces are being provided for each unit although the present requirement is only one space for each unit.

3. As shown on the plot plan submitted, the center will consist of a main building containing a meeting and activity room, a kitchen, and restrooms, a swimming pool, a tower, and a patio and play area.

4. The area is designated for low density apartment use and zoned Apartment District B.

5. Water and sewer facilities are adequate. On-site improvements are about 50% completed.

6. The recreational center will be a common element and the ownership will be vested in the unit owners in undivided shares.

7. The applicant has submitted a copy of the by-laws of the Association of Apartment Owners as set forth in the Declaration of Horizontal Property Regime. Under the by-laws, the Association will be responsible for the administration, regulation, maintenance and repair of the center.

The Director indicated that the condominium development is in conformity with the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu, and the proposed community recreational center use is compatible with the overall marina type residential development of the area. In order to insure the orderly growth of the community and to promote public convenience and welfare, he recommended approval of the application with the attachment of the following conditions:

1. The development plan submitted with the application shall be made a part of the permit and the development of the recreational center shall conform substantially to said plan and a minimum of 15 parking spaces be reserved for the users of the recreational center.

2. The schedule for the use of the recreational center shall be in the best interest and acceptance of the surrounding residential neighborhood.

3. The recreational center including the building, play area, patio, wall, parking area, swimming pool and other facilities shall be maintained in good order and neat and attractive condition, harmonious and compatible with the surrounding residential character.

4. There is adequate assurance for perpetual maintenance of the recreational center by recorded covenants running with the land which:

   a. Obligate the purchasers and occupants of the apartment units to maintain the recreational center in perpetuity,

b. Empower the City, as well as other purchasers and occupants in the apartment units to enforce the covenants to maintain,

c. Authorize the performance of maintenance work by the City in the event of failure by the purchasers and occupants to perform such work and permit the subjecting of various units in the apartment to a lien until the cost of the work performed by the City has been paid.

5. The Planning Director or the Planning Commission may impose additional conditions necessary for the protection of persons using the facilities of the center and/or the occupants of adjacent residential properties.

6. The City Council may, at any time, upon finding that any of the conditions imposed are not being complied with, authorize the Planning Director or the Planning Commission to revoke the permit or to suspend such operation until compliance with said conditions is obtained.

The Director reported that there is limited experience in community recreational center operations in the City. Earlier ones approved seem to be operating successfully but one of them had difficulty in maintaining the center and, as a result, the authority for the City to perform the maintenance work in the event of failure by the Homeowner's Association was added as a necessary protection for the owners. No restriction on hours of operation or control on noise and nuisance factors was included because these could be controlled through the by-laws of the Association.

In reply to questions from the Commission, the Director stated that the six conditions cited had been discussed with the applicant. This is the first time that authority for placing of a lien against the purchasers for maintenance work done by the City had been added as a condition. He believed that this was enforceable because a similar provision is written into the Cluster Development Ordinance. The City's legal counsel has advised that it was enforceable although this has not been tested in the courts. He hoped that the home owners would maintain the center so that the City would not be forced to intervene in its maintenance.

Testimony was heard from the public. No one spoke in opposition to the application.

Mr. Donald Iwai, attorney, represented Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company, the applicant. He did receive the recommendation of the Director and took exception to some of the conditions mentioned, as follows:

1. Condition 4 provides for maintenance of the recreational center in perpetuity by recorded covenants running with the land. Since the development is a leasehold condominium project with lease terms of about 55 years, this would mean that the maintenance requirement would be extended beyond the 55 year lease period when actually there would be nothing to maintain because at the end of the lease term, the condominium project including the recreational center is dissolved. Any covenant running with the land can only run as long as the term of the lease; therefore, the perpetuity condition should be eliminated.

2. He questioned the advisability of imposing a condition which would authorize the City to enter an area and do maintenance work if the owners failed to do so.

He explained to the Commission the basic concept of a condominium as being ownership of apartment units by several people and those owners having an undivided interest in the common elements, such as the roadways, in the present case, the recreational center, and if it is a condominium of one high-rise structure, the swimming pool. He did not believe that the City would care to enter into a situation where it would enter a condominium development and state that unless you maintain your swimming pool, the City will maintain it at your expense. Similarly, in this instance of a horizontal condominium, he did not believe that the City would care to involve itself in the maintenance of the recreational center.

He indicated that purchasers of a condominium unit automatically become a member of the Association of Apartment Owners and make payment into a maintenance fund for maintenance of all the common elements. This provision is written into the document establishing the condominium project and in the by-laws of the Association.

He contended that the present situation is different from a cluster development where a developer is permitted to reduce the size of the lots by 20% and set aside an equivalent amount for a common recreational area for use by the residents. This type of development was done in Ahuimanu with the formation of a Homeowners' Association. In compliance with the provisions of the ordinance, the covenant contains provisions for maintenance of the recreational area by the Association and the authority of the City and County to enter and do necessary maintenance work if there is failure to do so. In that instance, it appears that the City should have the authority to enter and maintain the area because actually nobody owns the recreational area except the Association. However, in the present case, the recreational center, as well as the roadways and other common elements,

is owned by the apartment owners and will be maintained by the owners.

As additional assurance of maintenance, he stated that annually, the Association will meet and set the assessment rate for maintenance of the common elements for the coming year. Each owner will be required to pay that assessment and if there is failure, a lien is placed upon that person's unit and the Association is empowered to sell that unit if that assessment is not paid within a certain period of time.

He contended that maintenance of the recreational center is entirely within the realm of the Association to administer and the City should not involve itself in such private matters.

In the interrogation that followed, Mr. Iwai explained that his reference is to Condition 4, subsections a, b, and c. The provision for maintenance should be until the expiration of the lease or termination of the use, whichever is shorter, and elimination of Condition 4 in its entirety. He had no objection to the remaining conditions because they are in conformity with the provisions of the Conditional Use Permit Ordinance.

He stated that a copy of the declaration of covenant and the by-laws of the Association have been submitted to the Planning Department. The lease document does not mention specifically the maintenance of the recreational center but mentions the maintenance of the common elements of which, the recreational center is one element. The assessment charge involves the maintenance of all the common elements and not exclusively the recreational center. He stated that the assessment charge will most likely be on a monthly basis. If a person fails to pay the assessment, the condominium statutes permit the placing of a lien on that person's unit and to sell that unit if no payment is made. He understands that the lending institutions check the condominium statutes and advise prospective purchasers of the provisions of the statutes and their rights as an owner.

Mr. Yamabe was of the understanding that the Conditional Use Permit Ordinance authorizes the City to revoke a Conditional Use Permit issued if there is non-compliance with the conditions of the Permit or that the City finds the operation to be objectionable so that the controls proposed to be established through Condition 4 might not be necessary.

The Director replied that the revocation provision can be applied. However, he visualized the development of some problem which some of the owners might ask for the City's intervention for correction. He realized that through the by-laws and condominium statutes, the Association can handle their own

problems. He noted, however, that the project is designed in such a way that sometime in the future upon expiration of the lease or by mutual agreement of all, the condominium could become a townhouse development. He was trying to avoid this type of situation by including a safety factor. It is possible that he is being overly cautious.

Mr. Iwai believed that the basic question involved was whether or not the City should take it upon itself to assume the responsibility of seeing that a private recreational center is properly maintained. If the City takes the responsibility, the situation then becomes no different than an individual owner of a house and lot saying that his back yard needs maintenance and asking the City to do the work and he paying for that service.

In the event the monthly assessment is not paid, Mr. Iwai was asked whether subsequent payments would be increased to that delinquent owner.

Mr. Iwai did not know whether the condominium document provided for such a situation but he noted that such a provision can be written into the document.

In further discussing the perpetuity clause, the Director felt that the applicant's arguments had merit and proposed that the Conditional Use Permit could be coordinated with the length of the lease which is about 55 years or as long as the use is in operation. Regarding the placing of a lien against the apartment units until the cost of the maintenance work performed by the City is paid, he indicated that this particular question was raised by one of the Councilmen and, therefore, a further check was made. It seems that the condominium document has no provisions for collection of the assessments or empowering the Association to sell the unit for non-payment of assessments. However, if the Commission feels that revocation of the permit is adequate assurance for the maintenance work, the Commission may so recommend.

With respect to attachment of a lien on maintenance, Mr. Chun asked what standards are to be applied in determining the degree of maintenance work required. He asked whether standards are to be applied on painting of a common element or that the water in the swimming pool should be up to certain chlorine standard.

The Director indicated that no such standards are being applied.

Mr. Sharpless believed that the proposed control is something that the City should involve itself as little as possible. He felt that the condominium document should be examined to determine whether or not there is sufficient protection within the

Association itself. If the Commission feels that there is insufficient protection, the permit could be denied or if the Commission feels that there is sufficient protection through the revocation process or that the document provided sufficient protection, then the permit could be issued.

There being no further testimony from the public, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun.

In discussing this matter later, the Commission agreed that the condominium document should be examined by the Corporation Counsel to see whether or not there is sufficient protection of the unit owners to each other so that there would be no necessity for the City to intervene in the maintenance of the recreational center. It also agreed that the permit should be attached to the length of the lease term or until expiration of the use, whichever is shorter.

ACTION: Mr. Lemmon moved to defer action and to refer this matter to the Corporation Counsel for study of the condominium document and covenants with respect to adequacy of protection to the unit owners, and also to establish the time limit of the permit to be the length of the lease term or as long as the use is continued. The motion was seconded by Mr. Chun and carried.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
WAIMANALO
KALANIANAOLE HIGHWAY,
EAST OF KAHAWAI
STREAM
SEWAGE PUMP
STATION SITE

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map for Kailua, Lanikai, Maunawili, and Waimanalo, by changing the land use designation from Military use to Public Facility use (Sewage Pump Station site) for a 12,523 square foot parcel of land situated on the north side of Kalanianaole Highway and approximately 150 feet easterly of Kahawai Stream in Waimanalo, and identified by Tax Map Key 4-1-15: portion of Parcel 1.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of September 22, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, and to the various community and civic organizations in the Kailua-Waimanalo area. No letters of comment or protest have been received to date.

The Director reported that the request to establish a sewage pump station on this particular site originated from the State Department of Land and Natural Resources. The land, under Federal ownership, was approved by the military for a long term use as a sewage pump station site. The pump station, to be constructed by the State and turned over to

the City and County of Honolulu, will intercept the sewage presently flowing into the existing sewage treatment plant and pump station located adjacent to this site. The new pump station will replace the treatment plant and pump station presently serving the area and sewage will be pumped along Kalanianole Highway to the newly constructed treatment plant at the east end of the Waimanalo Core Development. This pump station is needed to further implement the State development in the Waimanalo area.

The Director pointed out the site located on the Kailua side of the entrance to Bellows Air Force Base. The Waimanalo Core Development is across the street with agricultural farm lots in the back. He recommended approval of the proposal to establish the sewage pump station on the particular site.

No one responded to the Chairman's call for testimony in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. K. C. F. Monckton, President of the Waimanalo Community Council which represents 15 organizations in the Waimanalo Valley area, did not object to the installation of a pump station on this site as long as it did not look objectionable. There is a power station just at the tip outside of Bellow's Gate and the Council members were of the opinion that this might be a better site for the pump station so that these type of uses would be grouped together. They also questioned the reason for having a pump station. They are concerned because the proposed shopping center is near this site and they had also heard of plans to bring some cows into the area.

The Director noted that the letter from the State indicates that this pump station is to serve the Waimanalo Core Development and to replace the existing pump station. He was not aware of any major changes to the overall development plans for the Core area developed by the State several years ago. He suggested that Mr. Monckton contact Mr. Sunao Kido, Chairman of the Land Board, to see whether or not there had been any changes made to the Core Plan.

The Commission asked the Director whether there is a possibility that the pump station can be located elsewhere and why it is to be placed right off a major highway.

The Director did not know whether the pump station could be located elsewhere, but if the State had concluded its negotiation with the military for use of the site, he doubted that the State would care to change the site. He presumed that the State did work with the Division of Sewers in selecting this site because this pump station is to replace the existing one. He noted that under the General Plan, Kalanianaole Highway will become

a local street because the new alignment of the highway will extend farther in the mauka direction.

The Commission suggested that a representative from the State Department be invited to explain the proposal and how this particular site was selected.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Lemmon, the Commission continued the public hearing and requested the presence of a representative from the State Department of Land and Natural Resources at the next meeting of the Commission.

PUBLIC HEARING ZONING BUSINESS WAIANAE FARRINGTON HIGHWAY AND LUALUALEI NAVAL ROAD NAKATANI ENTERPRISES, INC.

A public hearing was held, pursuant to the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Highway and Rural Protective to Business for two parcels of land totaling 6.25 acres, situated on the mauka side of Farrington Highway, Honolulu side of Lualualei Naval Road in Nanakuli, same being the premises of the Nakatani Shopping Center, in Waianae, and identified by Tax Map Key 8-7-08: parcels 12 and 13, in conformity with the adopted General Plan Detailed Land Use Plan for the Waianae area.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of September 22, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies and to the various community and civic organizations in the Waianae area. No comments or protests in writing have been received to date.

The Director presented the following as background information:

1. Presently, portions of the property is zoned for business use. As shown on the map displayed, those areas where the business buildings are located are zoned business while the remainder is covered by a variance permit for off-street parking use.

2. A request for a variance to permit the construction of a post office building on a portion of the property set aside for off-street parking use was denied by the Zoning Board of Appeals about a year ago. At the public hearing to consider the variance application, the Nanaikapono Community Association objected to the location of the post office.

3. In the meantime, a rezoning application to business for the entire parcel was under study by the staff. The Nanaikapono Community Association and the property owner were asked to meet with the staff to review the overall plans for the area. A letter was sent to the Association in October, 1967, and again in December, 1967, but no response has been received.

4. The proposed plan was discussed with the Model Cities Planning Committee in Waianae and the Committee raised no objection and instead supported the proposal because of a need for a well-developed modern shopping center in the Waianae area.

5. On the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the area, the subject property is designated for commercial use.

6. Water facilities are available to serve the development. Public sewerage facilities are not available but the owner will use the Cavittete system in conformity with standards of the Board of Health.

7. A letter was sent to the Navy for comments because large trucks carrying ammunition use Lualualei Naval Road and an access point onto this road is indicated from the subject parcel. To date no objection or comment in writing has been received from the Navy.

Referring to the proposed development plan submitted of the area, the Director pointed out the location of the super market, a restaurant-cocktail lounge, bowling alley, small shops and office spaces, a service station and a large parking area in front. An existing drive-in restaurant is to remain. The building plans will be checked at the time of application for a building permit. Since the proposal conforms to the General Plan and public facilities are available, the Director recommended approval of the zoning change.

No one spoke in opposition to the rezoning proposal.

Mr. Jon J. Chinen, attorney, represented the Nakatani Enterprises, Inc. He believed that the proposed development will greatly improve the Waianae area. Regarding the access right to Lualualei Naval Road, it was his understanding that at the time the road was widened, Nakatani Enterprises conveyed a portion of its land to the Navy, however, reserving the right of access to that road from its property. He stated that his client is also willing to accept the recommendation of the State Department of Transportation to reduce the access points on Farrington Highway from the present five to three.

When asked for some legal document to verify his client's right of access to the Naval Road, Mr. Chinen reported that in 1955, all legal papers were stolen from the Nakatani's office and he regretfully could not produce the legal papers. The road is owned by the Navy and he reiterated that Nakatani Enterprises was granted the right of access to that road. He indicated that a service entrance to the stores is required from the Naval Road. The public will use the entrances from Farrington Highway.

When asked why the intersection of the Naval Road with Farrington Highway is at a 90 degree angle, the Director reported that the roadway was constructed in that manner because of an existing railroad right-of-way. This railroad is used occasionally by the Navy.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Muller, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Highway and Rural Protective to Business for the two parcels of land situated at the mauka-Honolulu corner of Lualualei Naval Road and Farrington Highway in Nanakuli, Waianae.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
MAILI
87-860 FARRINGTON
HIGHWAY
AH HOON DANG

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Highway Protective to Business for a 11,478 square foot parcel of land at 87-860 Farrington Highway, situated on the mauka side of Farrington Highway and 265 feet on the Waianae side of Hookele Street, in Maili, and identified by Tax Map Key 8-7-20: 15, in conformity with the adopted General Plan Detailed Land Use Plan for the Waianae area.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of September 22, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the Model Cities Field Office, and to the various community and civic organizations in the Waianae area. No comments or protests in writing have been received to date.

The Director reported that the Model Cities Planning Committee in the Waianae area was apprised of this rezoning proposal. The subject parcel is improved with a non-conforming business structure used as a mercantile store for a number of years and two single family residential dwellings. The buildings are quite old and the owner has expressed a desire to rebuild and, as a result, required the business zoning. The General Plan Detailed Land Use Plan of the area designates the subject property for commercial use. Water facilities are available to serve the proposed development of the area. Public sewerage facilities are presently not available, but the owner will use the Cavittete system as approved by the Board of Health. The property fronts on Farrington Highway but because the highway is under jurisdiction of the State, the provisions of Ordinance No. 2412 requiring frontage improvement would not be applicable.

No one spoke either in support of or in opposition to the rezoning proposal.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Muller, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the zoning change from Highway Protective to Business for the subject property at 87-860 Farrington Highway in Maili, Waianae.

ZONING CLASS A-1
RESIDENTIAL
MAKIKI
2028 MAKIKI STREET
L. D. HAXTON,
ET AL

The Commission again reviewed a proposal to change the zoning from Class AA Residential to Class A-1 Residential for an area of land situated at the mauka northerly end of Makiki Street and bounded by Makiki Street and Round Top Drive in Makiki, identified by Tax Map Key 2-5-07: Parcels 1-12, 14-23, 25-35, 37-48, in conformity with the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu.

The public hearing held on August 22, 1968, was continued to September 19, 1968, and after closing the hearing, the Commission deferred action pending receipt of further information from the Planning Director.

The Director reported on Mr. Haxton's proposal to subdivide his 44,650 square foot parcel of land into two and selling the larger portion containing 35,464 square feet with four houses and retaining the smaller portion containing 9,666 square feet for construction of a new house. This proposed subdivision could not be accomplished under the present Class AA zoning of the area and, as a result, he had made the request for rezoning to Class A-1 Residential.

Previously, the Director did not know of Mr. Haxton's proposal because no subdivision map was submitted, but upon meeting with Mr. Haxton and learning of his proposal, he observed that there are other requirements of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations that must be met and which would prevent Mr. Haxton from proceeding with this subdivision. In order for Mr. Haxton to proceed with his subdivision, an existing 16-foot right-of-way must be widened to 24 feet or 32 feet because this right-of-way presently serves six lots and the proposed larger parcel can be further resubdivided. He did not believe that the property owners on the kokohead side of the right-of-way would be willing to relinquish land for the widening; therefore, the widening must be taken from Mr. Haxton's property, further reducing the size of his property and affecting two existing dwellings which must either be moved or demolished. Therefore, the Class A-1 zoning will not help Mr. Haxton in his subdivision proposal but would help only in the fact that he can have another dwelling on the property. Mr. Haxton's reaction to that information was one of disappointment. He did not indicate whether or not he would withdraw his rezoning request.

In the discussion that followed, the Commission noted that the rezoning proposal included the entire triangular block bounded by Makiki Street and Round Top Drive and only about eight lots are of sufficient size capable of being resubdivided into Class A-1 lots. Approximately 13 to 14 more homes can be added in this area which has about 38 homes. At the previous meeting, the misunderstanding expressed by some of the property owners was clarified to the satisfaction of the protestants. Besides Mr. Haxton's request, Attorney Robert Bunn represented three property owners and had requested that his clients' properties also be considered in the rezoning proposal. His clients' lots have areas in excess of 15,000 square feet while most of the other lots have areas of 10,000 square feet or less so that the rezoning to Class A-1 would have no affect one way or the other.

The Director noted that two other parcels would face a similar access problem as Mr. Haxton. He recommended to the Commission that it not consider the rezoning of only Mr. Haxton's property or of the other three parcels. The rezoning should either cover the entire triangular block or none at all. He made a proposal to check further with Mr. Haxton and obtain his decision on whether or not to proceed with his proposed subdivision plan and provide for the wider right-of-way.

The Commission accepted the Director's proposal and suggested that he also check with the other owners who had made the same request for rezoning, particularly those who would have difficulty in subdividing their properties.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission deferred action on this matter until the next meeting.

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION WAIPAHU BETWEEN KUNIA ROAD AND WAIKELE GULCH, INLAND OF H-1 HIGHWAY ROBINSON TRUSTS AND HSM VENTURES (URBAN DISTRICT)

The Commission again reviewed a petition submitted by the Robinson Trusts and HSM Ventures for an amendment to the Land Use Commission District Boundary by changing the district classification from Agricultural to Urban for 316.4 acres of land situated between Kunia Road and Waikele Gulch, mauka of the H-1 Highway in Waipahu, and identified by Tax Map Key 9-4-02: Parcel 17. The Commission had deferred action and requested the Director to meet with the petitioner in an attempt to come to some agreement on their differences as to whether or not there is sufficient justification to add more lands in the urban district.

The Director reported on the result of the meeting held with Mr. Herbert Horita, general partner in HSM Ventures, and Mr. Stanley Mukai, attorney for the petitioners. The staff had approached this request as it relates to planning while the petitioners based their argument on marketability. The

Director did not dispute their contention that there is a need for housing in this area. The petitioners have a good product and they are selling their homes quite successfully. However, the staff's concern is the pattern of urban development on the island as reflected on the General Plan. The petitioners' request does not follow that pattern, and the staff's position is that if there is to be an expansion of the urban pattern that it extend in the ewa direction below the H-1 Highway instead of above the highway toward Kunia. The developer is faced with the problem of not being able to obtain the development right for land below the highway. Robinson Estate apparently owns land only in the area above the highway. Because of the two different approaches to this application, they could not come to any agreement.

Mr. Muller, who was not present at the previous meeting of the Commission when this was discussed, recalled that sometime last year a similar application was considered and the Director had recommended against the change. The Commission, however, had recommended approval of the change. The Director had mentioned urban sprawl as the basis for his denial recommendation. Mr. Muller asked why it is not considered good planning to expand in the direction above the highway.

Referring to the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu, the Director pointed out the urban areas of Waipahu and also the agricultural areas. He reminded the Commission that one of the biggest issues in the current political season is the problem of transportation. Because of our particular configuration, Honolulu can provide for a corridor system of transportation. In this Waipahu area, the corridor can be extended from the Pearl Harbor basin area on toward Ewa Beach and beyond and also through urbanization, link the urban areas of Waipahu with the Makakilo City and Ewa Beach areas, but still staying below the highway. If this corridor pattern is broken at Kunia Road and extended in the upper direction, it would be most difficult to provide for the necessary public facilities and utilities, such as water, sewer, schools, parks, and so forth.

He stated that another concern relates to the phasing of urban development. It's quite possible that within a period of 25 years, the area between Kunia Road and the H-2 Highway might be completely urbanized. The question that should be answered is whether or not our economy has sufficiently diversed or was strong enough that we can release prime agricultural land and still have sufficient balance of payment. He noted that the prime agricultural lands are located on Molokai and Oahu. On Oahu the prime agricultural lands are located in this central area. The applicant's property is prime agricultural land and so is the Mililani Town Development which occupies about 3/4 of the

prime agricultural land. The questions that then arise are what sort of urban pattern should we have to meet the requirement for public facilities and whether there are other areas which should be developed in advance of this area.

He recalled that two other petitions for urban use covering agricultural lands were considered by the Commission last year. This is for the area lying between Pearl City and Halawa and the staff had recommended approval only up to the boundary of the General Plan designation for residential use and retaining the agricultural use in the upper area. The staff, however, anticipates the eventual phasing out of the agricultural use because it is bounded on three sides by urban uses. Another pocket of agriculture in the upper Halawa area is expected to remain because of a quarry operation and an institutional use or jail site which do not afford the best situation for urban type of use. To continue the urban pattern, he preferred seeing these agricultural pockets urbanized first.

In Waipahu, the extension should be in the ewa direction but the problem seems to be the reluctance of the property owners to release their lands for residential development. In that event, he believed that the State law should be applied to make these lands available for residential use. Because of this unwillingness of some of the property owners to urbanize their lands, his concern was whether or not planning should be sacrificed by starting the urban pattern extension in a different direction.

When questioned by the Commission, the Director still felt that the urban extension should not be in the upper direction. He noted that there is no logical boundary, either a major man-made feature or natural feature, to stop that extension once it is started. He mentioned the significance of having a mass transportation system to the Leeward and the Windward areas by reporting that under the Model Cities Program and through a grant from the Federal government, a study is presently being made to provide for some type of transportation for depressed areas in terms of employment opportunity and people being able to get to such schools as the Leeward Community College. Presently, there are no bus services to the two areas and this has presented a real problem. The residents are imploring the City to do something about the transportation problem as quickly as possible.

He realized that there is a demand for housing in the price range made available by the applicant. He emphasized that it is not the City that is hindering people from obtaining this type of housing but it is the owners of land that could be utilized for that purpose and who choose not to develop their land for residential purpose. Beyond making the land owners aware of the present

situation, he did not believe that the City or the State could go in and condemn the land for residential purpose. The public purpose provision of the law must be clearly established before the land can be condemned.

Mr. Lemmon who previously had doubts about the need for housing in this area was satisfied with the answer given by the Director that there is a demand for housing in this area. He was given to understand from past experiences that in planning the rural areas, it was better to have a planned community rather than a ribbon type development along existing highways. He made the observation that creating a planned residential community in the Kunia section seemed preferable than continuing the residential community on both sides of a major highway.

In reply to questions raised by Mr. Yamabe, the Director indicated that there is both a need and a demand for housing in the price range proposed by the applicant, not only in the Waipahu area but all over the island. He noted that the housing vacancy ratio now is about 1.9%. This is normal considering an extremely tight market coupled by a tight money market which do not give sufficient flexibility to the individual owner or renter to make a choice. He is aware that the Waipahu area has been developing rapidly and every house built has been sold. He indicated that this is happening all over the island; therefore, he assumed that if other areas were developed with houses in the same price range as the applicant's, those houses would also sell readily. The question, therefore, is whether or not the housing market should be all allocated in this Waipahu area.

He further stated that if all the urban lands designated on the General Plan were to be developed, approximately one million people can be accommodated, but because there are a number of factors involved, he cannot state positively that yes, we have sufficient areas designated for urban use. Even if the land is designated for residential use, some property owners choose not to release the land for residential use while other large areas are under development by increments so that they are not supplying the homes in sufficient number to meet the housing market in the price range that is in demand.

Mr. Yamabe was in agreement with the Director's concept on planning, and therefore, he was not in favor of the type of zoning to be created by this application. Recalling the information given that the State Land Use Commission will be reviewing its district boundaries in a few years, he asked whether the present tight housing market is so acute that a delay might create problems.

The Director replied that the study has been started by the Land Use Commission but the report probably will not be submitted until next spring. What its recommendation will be or how long it will take to implement the new plan he could not say. He also could not give a positive reply whether or not the tight housing market is that acute that a delay would create problems. For instance, he noted that building permits issued for single family residential dwellings numbered from 6,000 to 7,000 a year. However, for the past couple of years, the situation has reversed and more building permits for apartments rather than residential units have been issued.

Noting the applicants and their representatives in the audience, the Chairman called upon them for presentation of new evidence.

Mr. Stanley Mukai, attorney, had nothing new to add and was ready to answer any questions from the Commission. He confirmed that they did meet with the Planning Director and his staff and they could not come to any sort of agreement. He requested the Commission to act favorably upon their application.

In reply to Mr. Muller's inquiry, Mr. Humme, Manager of Oahu Sugar Company, stated that the position of Oahu Sugar has not changed and that it still endorses the applicant's request.

ACTION: Mr. Muller moved to recommend to the State Land Use Commission that the petitioners' request for an amendment to the Land Use Commission District Boundary by changing the district classification from Agricultural to Urban for 316.4 acres of land situated between Kunia Road and Waikele Gulch, mauka of the H-1 Highway in Waipahu be approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried. Mr. Yamabe voted in the negative.

Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director and authorized the Director to set the dates of the public hearings:

ZONING APARTMENT DISTRICT C PALOLO 3324 SIERRA DRIVE EDWARD R. AOTANI	(1)	Change in zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District C, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 14,618 square foot parcel of land at 3324 Sierra Drive in Palolo. Sewer and water facilities are available and adequate to serve the proposed development of a three-story, 12-unit apartment building.
ZONING BUSINESS KAPAHULU 2848 KIHEI PLACE DAVENROY DRYCLEANERS	(2)	Change in zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 5,407 square foot parcel of land at 2848 Kihei Place in Kapahulu. Water and sewer facilities are available and adequate to serve the area.

ZONING BUSINESS
WAIKIKI
KOA AVENUE AND
PRINCE EDWARD
STREET
KAHILI HOTEL, LTD.

(3) Change in zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business, in conformity with the General Plan, for land situated at Koa Avenue and Prince Edward Street in Waikiki. Water and sewer facilities are available and adequate to serve a proposed commercial-apartment structure.

ZONING CLASS A, A-1
& AA RESIDENTIAL
MAUNALUA
OFF LUNALILO
HOME ROAD
KAISER HAWAII-KAI
DEVELOPMENT CO.

(4) Change in zoning from Farm District and Unrestricted Residential to Class A, A-1 and AA Residential for 795.515 acres of land situated off Lunalilo Home Road in Maunalua within the Hawaii-Kai Development.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
MOANALUA
OFF SALT LAKE
BOULEVARD
FIRE STATION
SITE AND MEDIUM
DENSITY APARTMENT
USE

(5) Amendment to the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Aliamanu-Salt Lake by changing the land use designation from Public Facility use to Medium Density Apartment use and establishment of a Fire Station site on land situated off Salt Lake Boulevard in Moanalua.

MISC.
SPECIAL MEETING
ON THURSDAY,
OCTOBER 24, 1968

Due to a backlog of items to be heard at public hearings, the Commission decided to hold a special meeting on Thursday, October 24, 1968, at 9:00 a.m., in the Assembly Room of the City Council, Honolulu Hale, to consider several proposals for changes initiated by the Planning Director.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima
Carole A. Kamishima
Secretary-Reporter II

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
October 17, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, October 17, 1968, at 1:35 p.m., in the former Salvation Army Building, 664 S. King Street, with Chairman Richard K. Sharpless presiding:

PRESENT:

Richard K. Sharpless, Chairman
Philip T. Chun
Cyril W. Lemmon (excused at 4:15 p.m.)
Robert L. Muller
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Robert F. Ellis, ex-officio (excused at 3:00 p.m.)
Moses Lum Hoy, ex-officio

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director
Denis Leong, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Arthur A. Rutledge

MINUTES:

The minutes of July 25, 1968, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND
USE MAP
CENTRAL BUSINESS
DISTRICT

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu and the adoption of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for the Central Business District, for an area bounded by Nuuanu Stream, North King Street, Liliha Street, School Street, Nuuanu Avenue, Pauoa Road, proposed Pauoa Road-Auwaiolimu Street connector, Auwaiolimu Street, Prospect Street, Ward Avenue, Ala Moana Boulevard, Kewalo Basin and the ocean.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 6, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the different community associations in the Central Business District and surrounding areas, and to the various interested civic groups and organizations.

The Director explained the proposed plan by first noting that the Development Plan showing the street pattern and public facilities has already been adopted for this district and the land use proposals were designed to fit that plan. The DLUM was prepared for a 20-year span with the

knowledge that changes are inevitable and that adjustment in land use boundaries will be made after careful examination of the changes as they occur.

Referring to the Detailed Land Use Map of the Central Business District Planning Area, he reported that the area has about 1,350 acres and it includes the central business core as well as other commercial uses in the periphery, the Civic Center area housing the Federal, State, and City and County agencies, and the redevelopment project areas of Kukui and the Kauluwela neighborhoods. The two redevelopment project areas are located in the Model Cities Program area and discussions have been held with the proper agencies in reviewing the proposal. The Plan reflects some of the proposals prepared for the State by the consulting firm of John Carl Warnecke and Associates for the Civic Center area and the proposals prepared by Victor Gruen Associates for the downtown area.

One of the objectives of this particular plan is to develop a system of land uses, and a number of factors are involved to make the central core a vital shopping area because of its importance adjacent to the Civic Center. The recently adopted Comprehensive Zoning Code includes a new Central Business District zoning which will allow a variety of mixed land uses. It is believed that this will help revitalize a greater portion of the downtown area. The staff's report indicates the general breakdown of the existing land uses and the future land uses for this planning area.

At the instruction of the City Council, he reported that some changes were made on the original Development Plan which was submitted to the Commission. Some of the major changes are as follows:

1. The original plan showed the closure of Punchbowl Street between Beretania Street and Vineyard Boulevard and the extension of the Capitol Mall up to Vineyard Boulevard. The Council felt that until there is some assurance that the South Street Connector will be built, it would be inadvisable to close Punchbowl Street. Therefore, Punchbowl Street was kept open and the Capitol Mall ends at Punchbowl Street.

2. In accordance with the recommendation of the consultant, Halekauwila Street between Kakaako and Richards Streets was deleted on the original plan but it was retained on the plan adopted.

The Council felt that this street should remain open until a complete review of the downtown corridor is made and its ability to handle traffic is proven.

3. Under the Warnecke plan, Kapiolani Boulevard Extension was shown as closed but the staff did not agree and showed it as open on the Development Plan. The City Council agreed with the staff and it is shown open on the Plan. The reason for this is to permit the flexibility of a one-way couplet without using the South Street Connector in the event Beretania Street is converted into a one-way street along with the present one-way pattern of King Street.

4. At the Capitol Mall, the two lanes going under Beretania Street and into the parking garage below the Capitol were eliminated because those lanes are not being constructed.

5. Other minor changes involve the width of Beretania Street from the original 76-foot width to 78-foot, and the width of Queen Street near the intersection of Ala Moana and Nimitz Highway from 56-foot to 44-foot because of merging traffic and the inability of that many lanes to merge into Nimitz Highway.

The Director then pointed out the future land use proposals for the area. Besides the Central Business core and the Civic Center area, the other predominant land uses are parks, open spaces, and apartment uses.

The Director acknowledged receipt and summarized the contents of the following letters received in connection with this proposed plan:

1. The Outdoor Circle supported the alignment of Miller Street at the intersection of Beretania Street--the Capitol Mall--as shown on the Detailed Land Use Map for the Central Business District.

2. Mr. Arthur H. Spitzer, owner of the Blaisdell Hotel property on Fort Street, expressed his objection to the proposed downtown plan and reiterated some of the objections made at the time the Fort Street Mall was being considered for adoption on the Plan. He specifically objected to:

a. The lack of proper vehicular access to the Blaisdell Hotel property over the Fort Street Mall.

The Director noted that there will be vehicular access to the Hotel but it will be within the Mall alignment and not as a regular street.

b. An inadequate traffic pattern to get cars in and out of the downtown district.

c. The lack of adequate parking in the downtown area. He felt that the parking spaces should be more conveniently located because people will not walk a great distance to do their shopping.

d. The several mall proposals which are crossed by roads in several places. This cuts their continuity as a mall and does not make them an integral unit.

(Commissioner Lemmon was present from about this portion of the discussion.)

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. Arthur Spitzer, whose letter was just read, elaborated on the objection made about the lack of adequate parking facilities in the downtown area. If downtown is to be the shopping area, he felt that there should be more parking facilities designated within the area of Fort Street and Bishop Street which are the heavy shopping areas. He did not believe that people would care to walk the distance from the Alakea Street parking garage, the Beretania Street parking area at the upper end or the Bethel Street parking garage at the lower end.

Mr. M. L. Randolph, speaking on behalf of the Downtown Improvement Association, supported the proposed plan for the Central Business District with the following comments:

(1) Off-Street Parking

He agreed with Mr. Spitzer that one of the main problems of downtown is parking. He reported that the DIA worked with the City agencies in the location of the off-street parking facilities. In addition, private enterprises, such as the AmFac building, the Campbell Estate building and others, have provided for their own parking facilities so that he believed that the program of parking should be adequate over the next possibly 10 years. He also believed that the location of the parking facilities was correct, that such facilities should be on the periphery streets.

(2) Mass Transit Alignment

The DIA has taken the position that the future location of the mass or rapid transit line through downtown should be shown on the Detailed Land Use Plan and recommended that this be shown along Hotel Street. The line should go underneath Hotel Street which is proposed as a mall.

He stressed that the problem of downtown cannot be resolved by automobiles alone. Service by bus or some other means of rapid transit system must be provided to get the people to the shopping areas. He supported the Hotel Street route recommended by both the consultants for the Civic Center area and the Downtown area. The consultant for the Oahu Transportation Study had recommended Beretania Street route but finally agreed that Hotel Street is the better location. He indicated that the Hotel Street route would allow for excavation of the mass transit system at the same time as the mall construction without disrupting vehicular travel because Beretania and King Streets can be used. On the other hand, a Beretania Street route would greatly impair traffic flow. It would also result in a different plan for the downtown area. A study conducted by the DIA showed that 92% of the people would be better served by a Hotel Street route than a Beretania Street route. If the problem of engineering is of concern, he reported that the consulting firm of DMJM reported no great problem in construction on Hotel Street over that of Beretania Street. He did not believe it premature to show a rapid transit route on the Detailed Land Use Map and urged the Commission to make this designation on the map.

Mr. KeNam Kim, Chairman of the Civic Center Policy Advisory Committee composed of representatives from the Federal, State and City and County, noted the presence of Mr. H. Iwamoto, Public Works Engineer, and Mr. A. Levine, Chairman of the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Civic Center Advisory Committee.

Mr. Kim reported the Committee's favor of the proposed Detailed Land Use Plan for the Central Business District, but with the following suggestions:

(1) Civic Center Boundary

They proposed the creation of a special Civic Center District within the Central Business District. (The boundaries were outlined on the map displayed by Mr. Iwamoto.) The area could be designated as

Historic, Cultural and Scenic District under Article 12 of the recently adopted Comprehensive Zoning Code. This District will permit the Planning Director to adopt and apply special design standards for all buildings or development within this boundary by controlling not only massing and height limitations but also concepts and details of development. There should also be a provision requiring the approval of all plans for development within the area by the Civic Center Policy Committee.

(2) Traffic Pattern

They proposed that certain vehicular and traffic patterns be maintained. Specifically:

a. The eventual closing of Punchbowl Street from Vineyard Boulevard to Beretania Street;

b. The eventual closing of Kapiolani Extension from Beretania Street to Kapiolani Boulevard;

c. The eventual closing of Halekauwila Street between Ala Moana Boulevard and Punchbowl Street;

d. The designation of an alignment for mass transit underground along the Hotel Street alignment;

e. A proposed realignment of Beretania Street between Punchbowl Street and proposed South Street Connector; and

f. The conversion of Kawaiahao Street between King and South Streets into a pedestrian mall.

The closing of the aforementioned streets will ensure that the Civic Center is left as free as possible of criss-crossing traffic patterns that tend to segregate and isolate.

(3) Setback and Open Space

They proposed that the following setbacks and open spaces be mapped in order that rights-of-way can be assured for the future:

a. Setback extending along Mililani Street in line with the face of the existing Federal Building through to Halekauwila Street;

b. Indicate the open space extending through the Federal property in line with the waikiki property line of Mililani Street;

c. Define street setbacks on Ala Moana, South Street and other internal streets within the Civic Center;

d. Designate the Plaza or open space in front of the Armed Services YMCA as park for development of an urban plaza in conjunction with the Hotel Street Mall; and

e. Indicate the extension of the Capitol Mall through to Vineyard Boulevard. The open space should include the triangular block of land between Punchbowl Street and Miller Street, ewa of Queen's Medical Center.

When questioned by the Commission, Mr. Kim stated that they do not have any objection to leaving Punchbowl Street and Kapiolani Boulevard Extension open at this time and until such time as it is determined that the traffic pattern is favorable to permit the closures. However, when considering long-range planning, they are suggesting that the closures be indicated on the Plan at this time. Regarding the proposal for setbacks, he noted that some governmental lands as well as private lands are involved. Private lands would involve the setback on South Street, the YMCA property and the Punchbowl Mall area.

He explained that the proposed Civic Center District boundary extends all the way to Punchbowl to be in accord with the plan adopted to protect the view plane of the Capitol. The Civic Center Plan was adopted in principle by the past Legislature.

Mr. Aaron Levine, Chairman of the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Honolulu Civic Center Advisory Committee, emphasized three recommendations for consideration by the Commission, as follows:

1. Establishment of the Civic Center Boundary and the ground rules to apply to the area;

2. Designation of the proposed circulation changes as recommended by Mr. KeNam Kim; and

3. Designation of the proposed rapid transit alignment along Hotel Street.

He reported that the new Comprehensive Zoning Code to be effective January 2, 1969, has provisions for creating a Historic, Cultural, and Scenic District that could be applied to the Civic Center area.

Rather than wait until January 2nd, he believed that necessary work should be started immediately to apprise both the public and the private property owners of the regulations that would be applicable to the area.

Regarding the proposed circulation changes, he felt that these could be indicated on the Plan at this time similar to the mall designations shown because the Plan is for the future and not to show present conditions. This would then give ample notice to the public and provide for orderly development. However, it must be understood that the timing of the street changes will occur only upon completion of other parts of the overall traffic system.

Since the Oahu Transportation Study, an official study, had produced a firm proposal for a rapid transit system, he recommended that the alignment of the rapid transit line be shown on the Plan. Studies further indicated that the preliminary alignment should be along Hotel Street to best serve the Civic Center and the downtown areas. This type of facility will not only reduce some of the demand for highways and parking structures but it can also generate tremendous land uses. The impact on zoning and development would be tremendous.

He noted that these recommendations were not prepared overnight but represent several years of careful consideration by many groups in this City. He hoped that the Commission would give full consideration to these recommendations and adopt them on the Plan.

In the interrogation that followed, Mr. Levine was asked whether there might be any detrimental effect should the transit system be shown on the Plan but not made a reality.

Mr. Levine believed that there might be a detrimental effect if the transit system is not shown on the Plan and as a result, development occurred. Studies made so far indicate that there is going to be a definite need for a transit system and also denote where the line should go. Goals have been set and access to public buildings and public areas prepared. There is greater testimony of need rather than of no need for a rapid transit system.

Assuming that the rapid transit line goes along Hotel Street, the Director asked how will this alter the Plan.

Mr. Levine indicated that along with the alignment of the transit system, there will be a requirement

for transit stations to serve the land uses. If the transit lines were located along Hotel Street with the location of the stations, extensive studies would have to be made to relate those to the higher density development because of the access points. The street accesses, the subsurface connection between buildings, and the land uses should be connected to the proposed transit stations well in advance; otherwise, it would cost a tremendous amount of money to go back and make these designations. For instance, it would be very difficult later to make a subway connection to the State Capitol from the transit station.

The Director believed that those are individual design problems and should be determined as the individual buildings are constructed. He did not believe that those designations later would cause a great deal of change in the land use pattern.

Mr. Levine believed that it would and cited as an example, the San Francisco transit study which indicated a much higher density permitted along the transit stations. One supports the other, especially as it relates to the mass transit system.

When asked whether the study of the mass transit system is advanced enough to indicate not only the line but the stations and other related needs, Mr. Levine replied that the Oahu Transportation Study included a study conducted by the engineering firm of DMJM which not only gave the alignment but also the profile of the line and the location of each station. Under the leadership of the City, this is the first preliminary study conducted by a reputable engineering firm.

When asked to elaborate on the proposed boundary of the Civic Center area, Mr. Levine indicated that the map displayed shows the boundary recommended under the Warnecke Plan and which Plan was adopted in principle by the State Legislature. Within that boundary, limitations involving height, standards of development and such other restrictions should be imposed based on the fact that the State, Federal, and City and County government will be spending tens of millions of dollars in new buildings. With that type of investment in the Civic Center area, there should be some public response for establishing standards and conditions within that area. The boundary suggested is the one supported by the Citizens Advisory Committee.

He was pleased to note that the CZC has included the Historic, Cultural and Scenic District which could be applied to the Civic Center area. Some

of the suggested standards to be applied are tree plantings on Beretania Street and Kapiolani Boulevard Extension as well as setbacks because that is the entry to the Civic Center. Their request is to have the Commission adopt the Civic Center boundary as suggested and also the standards and controls to be applied to the area. For the perimeter of the proposed Civic Center boundary, the recommendation is also for height limitation in some of the areas. A chart prepared shows the height variation around the Capitol and in the outer areas.

When asked for his comment, the Director stated that the CZC provides for the establishment of the special district but this is to be shown on an overlay and not as a special land use or zoning designation. With the report justifying the establishment of the special district, the standards and guidelines relating to architectual compatibility with abutting uses, height controls and so forth would be recommended. For that reason, the suggested boundary of the Central Business District extends across streets rather than fall at the street lines. The question of density was not mentioned so much more than the factor of height limitation to preserve the view of the Civic Center area from Punchbowl extending to the harbor. This is the mauka-makai vista proposal under the Warnecke plan.

Discussing further the mass transit system, Mr. Levine stated that the proposal made by DMJM starts from Pearl City, continuing around Pearl Harbor, then through the Palama district generally along King Street into the downtown area, then following the Hotel Street alignment as shown, then to Ward Street at the Honolulu International Center area where it splits, one line continuing on towards the Waialae Shopping Center and may extend beyond that, and one line going around the HIC continuing on Kapiolani Boulevard to the Kapahulu area. The consulting engineers have indicated that the line should be subsurface in the downtown area. For the downtown alignment, there is a debate whether to use Beretania Street or Hotel Street. The suggested alignment recommended by the DMJM firm also shows the location of the stations.

The Director corrected a statement made by Mr. Levine. He stated that the DMJM report recommended that the alignment go on Beretania Street rather than on Hotel Street. DMJM further indicated that they had no objection to showing a Hotel Street alignment but they mentioned the additional cost involved.

Mr. Levine commented that there have been several modifications to the original study made. For instance, as a result of discussion and debate, a line originally shown through Punahou Street and Ala Wai Boulevard was changed to follow King and Beretania Streets into the Moiliili area.

When asked whether the Commission has the authority to designate the Civic Center boundary on the DLUM and establishing the special district under the CZC, the Director noted that the CZC does not go into effect until January 2, 1969. He believed that the CZC has no bearing at this time on a proposal involving the adoption of a map showing the land use plan for the area. The special district mentioned would be shown on an overlay on the zoning map and processed as a separate item with a separate report. He did not believe that it was legally possible to mix zoning and land uses on the same map.

Mr. Levine reported that their request to the Civic Center Advisory Committee is not to establish this special district at this moment but to begin the necessary preparatory work now because the CZC will go into effect on January 2nd.

Mr. Yamabe recognized the need to preserve the view of Punchbowl not only from the Civic Center and harbor areas but from all sides, and asked Mr. Levine whether they are also recommending height and density controls in the areas around Punchbowl.

Mr. Levine stated his understanding that the Planning Department staff is working on a height-plane ordinance to prevent further abuse of Punchbowl as it is presently being done by the construction of high-rise buildings. He hoped that the height-plane ordinance could be developed and found workable to limit the type of development within the area facing the Civic Center with Punchbowl as the background for the Capitol and other public buildings. The height-plane ordinance should also be made applicable to the other areas around Punchbowl and perhaps made less or more stricter on the other sides.

Mr. Yamabe requested Mr. Levine to continue exploring that possibility because he personally did want to see a nice backdrop for the Capitol.

Mr. Richard Neill, Executive Secretary of the Hawaii Council for Housing Action the redeveloper of the Kauluwela Redevelopment Project area, testified in favor of the proposed Detailed Land Use Plan. He commended the Planning Director and his staff for coming out to the district to explain the proposed

plan which reflects the redevelopment plan of the developer for the Kauluwela area. One of their concern is the safety of pedestrians, and he requested that consideration be given to the construction of a pedestrian overpass across the Freeway between the Kauluwela and the Kukui Project areas.

Mrs. Margaret Schleif, speaking on behalf of Miss Nancy Bannick, Chairman of the Historic Buildings Task Force, read a copy of a letter sent to Mrs. Walter C. Lindley, Chairman of the Action for Beautification Council, seeking their help in gaining a postponement of any action that would affect the old downtown area, specifically, the area along Merchant Street from Fort Street to Nuuanu Avenue. Within this area there are several buildings of historic value, such as the old Police Station building, the Bishop Estate building, and others, and the proposal for a huge parking structure will destroy these buildings. Plans for restoration of these buildings are in progress and they believe that a moratorium of three to six months would not seem unreasonable. She reported that the ABC has gone on record favoring the retention of these historical buildings.

In reply to questions from the Commission, the Director pointed out on the map, the area mentioned by Mrs. Schleif. Under the proposal for a public parking garage, Bethel Street between Merchant Street and Nimitz Highway is to be eliminated and the existing parking structure extended to the area of the old Police Station building. He doubted that any demolishing will take place within the next six months although this parking structure has a high priority.

Mrs. Schleif asked whether the CZC will protect any of the buildings listed as a historic building.

The Director stated that this is possible depending on the establishment of such a district within the area. First of all, boundaries would have to be established and a report prepared justifying the district and the standards and guidelines that would be applicable to the area. The proposal is then submitted to the Planning Commission for its recommendation and to the City Council for adoption.

Mr. Bill Lahman, private citizen and also a businessman, agreed with the proposal mentioned by Mrs. Schleif to preserve our historical buildings. He stated that the buildings located in the Merchant Street area are part of our heritage and they are definitely worth saving. He realized that the

requirement for parking is very necessary but the bulldozer approach should not be taken on everything to satisfy that need. He requested that the Plan be altered to remove the parking facility designation for the subject area.

No one else testified. After a brief discussion, the Commission decided to keep the public hearing open to permit others to testify and to have the staff prepare a resume listing the items in controversy and the arguments given by both sides for evaluation by the Commission.

ACTION: Mr. Yamabe moved to keep the public hearing open for two weeks and to have the staff prepare the report requested by the Commission. Mr. Lemmon seconded the motion which was carried.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
KALAUAO
MAKAI OF KAMEHA-
MEHA HIGHWAY,
EWA OF KALAUAO
STREAM
COMMERCIAL, MEDIUM
DENSITY AND LOW
DENSITY APT. USES

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa to Halawa by changing the land use designation from Industrial use to Commercial, Medium Density Apartment and Low Density Apartment uses, for an area of land on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway, situated between Kalauao Stream and the City and County Kalauao Sewage Treatment Plant in Kalauao, Ewa, Oahu, and identified by Tax Map Key 9-8-14.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 6, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community and civic organizations in the Halawa to Pearl City areas, and to affected property owners within the subject area.

The Director explained the proposals by pointing out the subject area situated on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway between Kalauao Stream and the Sewage Treatment Plant, across the street from the watercress farm. The area fronting Kamehameha Highway is presently developed with commercial uses, such as a service station, repair shop, and restaurants while the interior area is predominantly developed with apartments except for a parcel used as a fish hatchery, a parcel used as a plumbing contractor's yard, a vacant parcel, and a vacant parcel proposed to be developed with apartments as indicated on the Development Plan submitted and displayed on the Board.

The proposed amendments will change the tier of lots fronting on Kamehameha Highway as commercial use, the interior area as medium density apartment use, and the large vacant area next to Kalauao Stream containing approximately 9.7 acres as low density apartment use with the extension of Lipoa Place through the area and meeting Kamehameha Highway.

The Director then pointed out the uses in the adjacent areas as being residential across Kalauao Stream in the kokohead direction, low density apartment and residential use designations in the mauka area across Kamehameha Highway, Pearl Harbor Park on the ewa side and Pearl Harbor on the makai side so that the proposed amendments would be compatible with adjacent uses.

He read the following letters received:

(1) Urban Equipment Inc., signed by its Secretary-Treasurer Masami Matsuura, indicated that it has a 55-year lease from the McCandless Heirs for an 89,161 square foot parcel of land situated between Kalauao Springs Ditch and the proposed extension of Lipoa Place. This lease was entered into with the intention of using the land for industrial purpose and the Corporation still intends to develop the property for this purpose. Therefore, it objected to the proposal to change the designation of this parcel from industrial use to low density apartment use.

(2) The Trustees of the Bishop Estate reported their concurrence with the proposed changes except as follows:

a. Lots 9 and 10 which are occupied by the plumbing contractor's shop and the fish hatchery should be designated for commercial use in view of the current utilization of these parcels.

b. The 9.7-acre parcel of land situated between Kalauao Springs Ditch and Kalauao Stream should be retained in industrial use. Moreover, the proposed road layout for this lot does not conform to the ownership boundaries.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. William Van Allen, representing the Bishop Estate, elaborated on the two objections made by the Trustees of the Bishop Estate. He indicated that their developer has been working for sometime on a proposal to develop the land for industrial purpose and as a result fill material has been placed on the lot. This is a flood plain area so that industrial uses seem more favorable than houses. A parking area for a trucking firm would probably be more suitable.

Regarding the proposal to extend Lipoa Place with the requirement for a bridge over the Kalauao Springs Ditch, he believed that the economics of the area does not provide for the construction of a bridge at the location indicated. Furthermore, the proposed developer might object to paying for the bridge construction. He indicated that dead ending Lipoa Place at the Ditch makes the area self-sufficient. For their land, there is adequate

access as indicated on the preliminary subdivision plan submitted and granted tentative approval by the Planning Director in preparation for development of the area for industrial purpose.

Mr. James Oshiro, attorney for Urban Equipment Inc., stated that the corporation entered into a lease agreement with the McCandless Estate in 1962 and at that time the property was odd-shaped. Only last year, a negotiation with Bishop Estate was concluded for exchange of properties to make the parcel more rectangular shaped and better suited for development. The corporation would like to proceed with its plans to develop the parcel as a storage area for equipment, a repair shop, and perhaps a small retail store for paint supplies.

Mr. Melvin Hardy, representing Island Construction Company, stated that they are the petitioners requesting this amendment to the General Plan followed later by zoning in order that they may proceed with the development of apartments on a vacant parcel of land situated at the dead-end of Lipoa Place. He noted that the proposed development plan is displayed on the Board.

There was no further testimony. The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

In later consideration, the Commission discussed the request made by the Bishop Estate and the Urban Equipment Inc., to retain the industrial use designation for the land lying between Kalauao Stream and the Ditch. The Commission noted that there are residential uses across the Stream on the kokohead side, and apartment and commercial uses on the ewa side; therefore, industrial uses for the subject land would be incompatible with surrounding uses. The logical use is for apartments to be compatible also with the proposed uses across the highway.

Since the land is still vacant, the Commission requested the staff to check the lease document of the Urban Equipment Inc., with the McCandless Heirs to determine whether or not there are any restrictions binding the Corporation to use the land strictly for industrial purposes.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission deferred action pending staff check of the lease document.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
WAIKIKI
ROYAL HAWAIIAN
AVENUE, KUHIO
AVENUE, SEASIDE
AVENUE AND
WAIKOLU WAY
JAIMIEE RICH, ET AL

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to change the zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business for parcels of land situated within the block bounded by Royal Hawaiian Avenue, Kuhio Avenue, Seaside Avenue and Waikolu Way in Waikiki, and identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-19: Parcels 1, 5, 6, 7, 51 and 53, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for Waikiki.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 6, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the property owners within this block, and to the Waikiki Improvement Association. No written protests have been received to date.

The Director oriented the Commission on the location of the properties and noted that this rezoning was initiated as a result of expressions made at the time of the public hearing to consider the rezoning to business of Mr. Benjamin Ayson's property at the corner of Kuhio and Royal Hawaiian Avenues. At the hearing, adjacent property owners indicated their desire to have the business zoning extended to include their properties. Property owners within this block and adjacent blocks were polled and because some of the owners expressed no interest in the rezoning action at this time, this rezoning proposal is confined to this one block area. Water and sewer facilities are available and adequate to serve the area. Out of the six parcels under consideration, the largest parcel is improved with a hotel structure known as the Marine Surf Hotel. The other parcels are developed with individual structures.

With reference to the business zoning proposal for the Ayson's property, the Director reported that the enabling ordinance is pending before the Public Works Committee of the City Council. The Councilmen had expressed concern about the serious parking problem in Waikiki and felt that rezoning should not be effected until the individual property owners can solve that problem. They were also concerned that without a rebuilding program, the City would be encouraging the continuance of non-conforming uses and structures.

The Director reported that within a business zone, 40% of the lot area must be devoted to parking and this would not be possible for all the properties within this block except for the Marine Surf Hotel property which has two decks of parking so that it

might meet the 40% requirement in addition to the requirement of one to four ratio for a hotel operation. The rebuilding of the rest of the properties will depend on whether or not the property owners can form a corporation and consolidate their parcels for one major development. He felt that the rezoning could be processed and later when any changes are to be made to the building, the owners could be made to comply with Code requirements; however, the Public Works Committee felt that the question of parking should be resolved before actual zoning is conveyed on the property. This expression of the Council was made just last Friday so that it was too late to withdraw the public hearing notice for this proposal now under consideration.

In reply to questions from the Commission, the Director stated that the present use can be continued as a non-conforming use even though the area is zoned to business. It is at the time that the property owners apply for a building permit for alteration or renovation work that the requirement for parking can be applied, but it is quite possible that the owner can convert the use of his structure to business without any alteration so that the requirement for parking cannot be imposed. Without an application for a building permit, he did not know of any other process of law which would require compliance with the off-street parking ordinance upon conversion to a business use. He noted, however, that the owner must obtain a business license and a gross income tax license to operate his business.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. Howard Moore, representing Mr. Benjamin Ayson, spoke neither for or against the rezoning proposal. As reported by the Director, he stated that the Public Works Committee last Friday considered the proposed business zoning of Mr. Ayson's property but because of the parking problem mentioned, referred it back to the Planning Director. Mr. Ayson is in favor of the rezoning proposal for the entire block but because the notice of public hearing excluded Mr. Ayson's property, he felt that the hearing notice should be republished to include Mr. Ayson's property.

The Director advised him that a rehearing was not necessary because a separate hearing was already held on Mr. Ayson's property and the Commission's recommendation had been submitted to the City Council. The Public Works Committee's referral was back to the Planning Department to see whether or not some solution can be found on the parking problem. The staff will study the matter further

and report back to the Council which will make the final decision either to approve or disapprove the business zoning.

Miss Jaimiee Rich, one of the property owners affected by the rezoning proposal, felt that parking should not be of major concern because the City has a proposal to construct a large parking complex at the corner of Seaside and Kuhio Avenues. Also, on Lewers Road, there is a large parking area that people can use. Since this section of Waikiki is the tourist area, she doubted that the major portion of the business would come from people with cars. Her property is being used as an apartment and she has no intention of changing this use at this time.

Commander Douglas Stahl of the Navy, President of the Marine Surf Owners Association, stated that the Marine Surf Hotel structure was originally built and sold as a condominium project of 232 apartment units. Out of that number, 215 units are now being administered by a common manager as a hotel operation and the majority of those units are under contract to the United Air Lines. The original design of the building provided for one parking stall for each apartment unit but they had reduced the number when considering the size of present day automobiles, but there are still over 180 parking stalls on three decks. This operation has alleviated the parking situation in the area because they are renting out the parking stalls of the units put into the hotel operation. They have rented out the stalls privately to businessmen in the area and also to restaurants. Speaking for the 186 owners that he represents in the Marine Surf, he favored and supported the rezoning of the parcels under consideration.

When questioned by the Commission, Commander Stahl stated that the length of the contract with United Air Lines is 2-1/2 years with an option for another 2-1/2 years. They support the business zoning because in essence they are conducting a business because of the hotel operation with a restaurant and bar in the building. The present zoning of the area is Hotel and Apartment.

Admiral Howard Corey represented Mr. Henry W. Grant, owner of the property at the corner of Royal Hawaiian Avenue and Waikolu Way. He did not know whether he should speak in favor of or in opposition to this rezoning proposal. He became involved in this proposal because during the hearing on the Ayson's property, he had made a statement that if this one parcel is to be zoned to business, the

same consideration should be given to the rest of the properties in the adjacent areas. As a result of that statement, he finds that he is one of the applicants in this rezoning proposal and was asked to remit the necessary fee for publication of the hearing notice. He thought that he had the privilege of expressing an opinion without being an applicant but finds that this is not so; and therefore, he did submit his share of the publication fee.

He reiterated his belief that zoning should be done for an entire area rather than on a lot by lot basis. He also believed that some definite plan should be prepared for the area so that property owners would be apprised of that plan and act accordingly instead of being placed in a constant state of flux.

There was no further testimony from the public. The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun.

In later consideration, the Commission discussed the concern expressed by the Public Works Committee of the City Council about the parking problem in Waikiki and the need for some assurance, either through the filing of a performance bond or the complete tearing down of existing buildings, that 40% of the lot area would be set aside for parking before business zoning would be approved for properties in the Waikiki area.

The Director reported that the rezoning proposal of the Ayson's property was referred back to the staff to see whether or not the owner somehow could be made to meet the 40% parking requirement; but, he noted that the owner does not propose to demolish the building but plans to operate his real estate office and a curio shop from the existing building. The legal counsel has also advised that no condition can be attached to zoning. Except for the Marine Surf Hotel property, the same situation exists for the rest of the properties which are improved with apartment buildings and with inadequate parking facilities. The Marine Surf Hotel met the parking requirement, but the statement made that the parking stalls were being rented will be checked since it is illegal to rent the parking stalls to other than occupants of the apartments.

The Director felt that the 40% parking requirement can be enforced when the owner applies for a building permit to make alterations or repairs for conversion to a business use. He believed it most unusual to convert an existing apartment use to commercial use without some type of alteration.

He noted that the problem of parking is not confined to the Waikiki area but can be found all over town. He felt that the present situation is no different from a situation where business zoning is conveyed on a residential or apartment zoned parcel improved with a non-conforming business use. In that type of situation, he has never known of a case where the Council refused the business zoning even though the 40% parking could not be met.

The Commission believed that the change in zoning would have a greater tendency to encourage the construction of new buildings because any alteration or repairs to an existing building will still require the setting aside of 40% of the lot area for parking. Since the proposed change is in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Plan for Waikiki and the necessary public facilities and utilities are available, the Commission was inclined to favor the zoning.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission recommended approval of the change in zoning from Hotel and Apartment to Business for the six parcels of land situated within the block bounded by Royal Hawaiian Avenue, Kuhio Avenue, Seaside Avenue and Waikolu Way in Waikiki.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING APARTMENT
DISTRICT B
PALOLO
1216 PALOLO AVE.
HOWARD CHUN

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District B for a 10,798 square foot parcel of land at 1216 Palolo Avenue, situated on the ewa side of Palolo Avenue and approximately 120 feet mauka of Waialae Avenue in Palolo, identified by Tax Map Key 3-3-02: Parcel 23, in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of St. Louis Heights-Palolo.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 6, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the Palolo Community Council and to the Palolo Civic Organization. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

The Director explained the proposal by noting that the subject parcel is situated within an area designated for low density apartment use. Water and sewer facilities are available and adequate to serve

the proposed development of a two-story, six-unit apartment building. Palolo Avenue which fronts this property has standard curbs, gutters and sidewalks with a pavement width of 36 feet in good condition. The development plan submitted shows that the proposed apartment building complies with the minimum parking and setback requirements of the Apartment District B ordinance.

There was no one to speak either in favor of or in opposition to the proposed zoning.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Muller, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District B for the parcel of land at 1216 Palolo Avenue in Palolo.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING RESORT-HOTEL DISTRICT NO. 1
MAKAHA
84-325 MAKAU STREET
MRS. MAHEALANI J. FERNANDEZ

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Class AA Residential to Resort-Hotel District No. 1 for three parcels of land comprising a total area of 39,057 square feet at 84-325 Makau Street, situated approximately 210 feet makai of Farrington Highway in Makaha, and identified by Tax Map Key 8-4-09: Parcels 4, 5, and 6, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map of the Waianae area.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 6, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, the Waianae Model Cities Agency, and to other community and civic organizations in the Makaha and Waianae areas. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

The Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the subject area and explained the proposal as follows:

1. The three subject parcels containing a total area of 39,057 square feet are located within an area designated for resort use on the adopted General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Waianae.

2. The Board of Water Supply has reported that its facilities in this area are adequate to serve the proposed use. However, the Department of Public Works has reported that public sewerage facilities are presently not available to serve the proposed use, and as a result, the developer will use the Cavittete system in accordance with standards established by the Board of Health.

3. Makau Street fronting this property has a right-of-way width of 40 feet with a pavement width of 20 feet in fair condition and it has no curbs, gutters, or sidewalks. Ordinance No. 2412 which requires street frontage improvement cannot be applied since no curb grade has been established for Makau Street.

4. The proposal is to develop a six-story structure not to exceed the height limitation of 70 feet in a Resort-Hotel District No. 1 area. The structure will contain 58 condominium units and the total floor area ratio is little less than 100%. The number of parking spaces provided meets the ordinance requirement. The proposed structure meets the 10-foot building setback line established on Makau Street and also the side and rear yard setback requirements which include the setback from the zone of wave action in accordance with the applicable ordinance.

5. The possibility of improving the existing road from Farrington Highway to the subject property was discussed with the owner, but the Department of Public Works recommended against such an improvement at this time and instead recommended leaving the present pavement width in its present condition and to use the shoulder area for walking.

6. The staff also met with the Planning Committee of the Model Cities Agency regarding this proposal and the Committee's concern was also with respect to the road pavement condition.

7. The owner is ready to proceed with the proposed condominium project.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. David Klausmeyer, representing the Makaha Civic Association, pointed out that the beach area of Makaha is composed of four looped districts and each of these districts is zoned Class AA Residential and registered under Land Court title. All of the parcels have written in their deed, the restriction to use their parcels for residential use or one residential building per 10,000 square foot of land area. The people bought their properties with this understanding and developed in accordance with the deed restriction; therefore, there seems to be a legal obligation to retain the area for residential use.

He stated that members of the Civic Association are very concerned that approving this request will result in a spread of high-rise developments through this residential area. They are also concerned that

an apartment development will result in increased property taxes of the surrounding properties. If the people are unable to pay those increased taxes, the only alternative would be for them to go into a high-rise development, and this is the end result that the Association is strenuously opposed to.

He also mentioned the very narrow road serving the area. At the time the subdivision was laid out, the road met the requirements of the then existing Subdivision Rules and Regulations, but actually it can be stated that the road is a double driveway because it has no curbs, sidewalks or drainage facilities. This type of road will cause a serious traffic hazard if hotel-resort type of use is permitted in the area. Children in the area play on the streets by riding their bicycles and roller skates. Those people purchasing the apartment units might not be careful and injure the children.

He contended that this subdivision was never planned and is not ready for high-rise apartment development. There seems to be no acceptable reason for breaking the legal restrictions contained in the deed. He mentioned that the Waianae District Council and also the Model Cities Task Force have gone on record as disapproving high-rise buildings along the Waianae shoreline and recommending that it be reserved for residential, open space and park uses.

Mr. John Knaus, residing on Makau Street, opposed the proposed rezoning for the following reasons:

1. He has lived in the area and raised his family there for the past 12 years. He purchased in the area because of the deed which restricts the use of the property for residential use. He believed that many of the other residents purchased and are living there for this same reason.

2. He understands that the Planning Director sent out inquiries to the property owners in the area and the result was 1/3 in favor of the rezoning, 1/3 against it and 1/3 had no opinion. Out of the 1/3 voting for the rezoning, he wondered what percentage represented resident-owner and what percentage nonresident-owner.

3. There is inadequate water. During the peak water usage hours, there is hardly any water. It was his understanding that the area now obtains its water from the Capital Investment System, pump No. 9.

4. Makau Street is not wide enough for the proposed hotel development.

5. In the future, hotel development in the area might be inevitable. At that time, he proposed that Makau Street be moved closer toward the ocean and the beach area kept open and developed as a park and recreational area for the people and those who would patronize the hotels and apartments in the area. As people drive down the highway and go on Makau Street, they should be able to see the ocean rather than have the view blocked by high-rise structures. He noted that the ocean cannot be seen from the nearby Holt property which is improved with a high-rise condominium building.

Mrs. John Knaus also stated her opposition to the proposed rezoning. Sometime ago a petition was circulated and she indicated that 60% of the people did not want apartments in the area but somehow this use designation was made for the area. She, like most of the other residents, moved out to Makaha to raise her children in a nice, quiet neighborhood. She was quite upset because the present proposal might force her to move from the area just for the benefit of speculators. Honolulu is already crowded and she felt that the bounties of tourism should be shared with the outside islands. She has lived in the area for the past 12 years and noted many improvements coming into the area, such as better schools. She was strenuously opposed to permitting this apartment use because others would follow. She pleaded with the Commission not to jeopardize the people in the area by granting this use.

Mr. Robert Fukuda, attorney, represented the owner and developers of the apartment project. He explained that the proposal is not to develop a hotel but a residential condominium designed for permanent resident-owner and not for transients. He stated that the deed restriction for properties in this area is not uniform; that is, not all of the lots in the area have the restriction on residential use mentioned in the deed. Out of the three lots involved in this proposed rezoning, one lot does not have this deed restriction.

He stated that the developers are willing to and have offered to enter into an agreement with the City to pave the existing right-of-way all the way to Farrington Highway which is a distance of approximately 200 feet. The proposed project will conform to the density and height restriction imposed by the zoning ordinance. As noted on the development plan submitted, the project is designed with a great amount of landscaping around it to blend with the local topography and scenery. He

believed that this project will actually enhance the area because of the new very attractive structure which will replace an existing old single frame building.

Because the distance from this property to Farrington Highway is just about 200 feet, he believed that traffic problem will be at a minimum. There is also a 10-foot setback on both sides of the existing right-of-way resulting eventually in a 60-foot road to serve the area. They had approached the City and County Engineer about the road improvement and were informed that because of the use of a portion of the existing right-of-way for pedestrian walkway purpose, the City is not in favor of widening the existing pavement at this time. For that reason, the developers have indicated their willingness to repave only the existing pavement width from the property to Farrington Highway.

In reply to questions asked about the deed restriction, Mr. Fukuda stated that the restriction is to the use of the property for single-family residential purpose. This is a covenant solely with the original grantor and not in favor of others. They have communicated with the original grantor of the area to have this restriction removed. He stated that there are no restrictions on purchase and they will sell the units to people with children.

Since there was no other testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Muller.

In discussing this matter later, the Director showed the Commission photographs taken of the road condition in the area. He noted that the road is very narrow and inadequate to serve the heavy flow of traffic anticipated by the apartment development. He had attempted to have the Public Works Department establish the curb line at least for that portion of the road up to Farrington Highway, but the Department was against it and stated that the existing pavement width should not be widened at this time. The width is to be left at 20 feet and the pedestrians are to walk on the grassed area on both sides of the street. He noted that there are many streets in a similar condition all over the island. His concern was that development is being permitted on such substandard streets. The Public Works Department makes a preliminary survey to establish a grade line only when an area is ready to go into an improvement district.

The Commission agreed that the road should be widened for the type of development proposed. Since the subdivision was obviously laid out as a single-family residential community, it asked the basis for designating the area for resort use. It also asked whether the deed restriction was mentioned at the time the area was designated for resort use.

The Director was not aware of the deed restriction until it was mentioned during the meeting with the Model Cities Planning Committee. He believed that this restriction was placed on the lots by the Holt Estate, and apparently when the subdivision lots were laid out, different attorneys prepared the deeds and as a result, the conditions are not the same and some of the lots do not have the residential use restriction mentioned.

Mr. Yamabe recalled that the Commission had recommended against resort use and retention of residential use for area, but it was through City Council action that the area was designated for resort use.

In view of the inadequate road condition, the Commission felt it premature at this time to zone the area for apartment use. However, it stated that it should receive more information about the deed restriction mentioned and to receive a reply from the developers whether or not they were able to obtain the release of the deed restriction.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission deferred action until receipt of more information on the deed restriction.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
WAIMANALO
KALANIANAOLE HWY,
EAST OF KAHAWAI
STREAM
SEWAGE PUMP
STATION SITE

A public hearing, continued from October 3, 1968, was held to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map for Kailua, Lanikai, Maunawili, and Waimanalo, by changing the land use designation from Military use to Public Facility use (Sewage Pump Station site) for a 12,523 square foot parcel of land situated on the north side of Kalanianaole Highway and approximately 150 feet easterly of Kahawai Stream in Waimanalo. The Commission kept the hearing open and had requested further clarification from a representative from the State Department of Land and Natural Resources.

Mr. Bob Chuck, Manager and Chief Engineer of one of the divisions of the State Department of Land and Natural Resources, explained the State's

reason for the need of a sewage pump station on the subject site. He indicated that the State owns a large area of land in Waimanalo and over the years it has been developing these lands. The new pump station will replace a temporary sewage treatment plant and pump station located adjacent to this site. A new sewage treatment plant has been completed at the east end of the Waimanalo Core development, an area near the row of ironwood trees, and the next phase is to install the interceptor sewer lines to take the sewage from the Waimanalo Core area, the old Waimanalo Camp Site and other residential subdivision to the treatment plant. Because of the terrain of the land, a pump station is needed at this location. The land is still under Federal ownership and the State is in the process of having the land turned over to the State for use as a sewage pump station site. A map of the Waimanalo area showing the proposed pump station site and the treatment plant site was displayed.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Chuck stated that the pump station will measure about 20' x 40', one-story structure, setbacked about 100 to 150 feet from the highway. The structure will be completely surrounded by landscaping. He noted that a good example is the pump station near the Niu Valley Shopping Center. The same type of building is to be constructed and the area completely surrounded by landscaping. The operation will not be noisy. He reported that Kalanianaole Highway will not be the main road through Waimanalo. The General Plan shows the major highway as running farther in the mauka direction. He stated that the land surrounding the proposed pump station site is in military use. It was his belief that should Bellow's Field be turned over to the State, the land will be developed for recreational use.

There was no further testimony from the public.

<u>ACTION</u>: Upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map for Kailua to Waimanalo by changing the land use designation from Military use to Public Facility use (Sewage Pump Station site) for a 12,523 square foot parcel of land situated on the north side of Kalanianaole Highway and approximately 150 feet east of Kahawai Stream in Waimanalo.

(Commissioner Lemmon was excused from the meeting at about 4:15 p.m., and was not present during consideration of the following matters.)

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
MAUNALUA
HAWAII-KAI MARINA, UNIT 1-F
HAWAII-KAI DRIVE
(PRIVATE RECREATIONAL CENTER)
KAISER HAWAII-KAI DEVELOPMENT CO.

The Commission again reviewed an application for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction and operation of a private recreational center covering an area of approximately 13,204 square feet, within the proposed condominium development designated as "The Moorings" situated within Hawaii-Kai Marina, Unit 1-F, on the southwesterly side of Hawaii-Kai Drive directly across Pohoki Place in Hawaii-Kai and identified by Tax Map Key 3-9-29: Parcel 76, within an Apartment District B zone.

A public hearing was held and closed on October 3, 1968. The Commission had discussed the six conditions to be imposed with the Conditional Use Permit and had expressed concern with respect to the provisions requiring perpetual maintenance of the recreational center, authorizing the City to do maintenance work if there is failure by the owners, and the placing of a lien upon the various units until the cost of the maintenance work done by the City has been paid. The Commission had deferred action for check of the condominium document and the By Laws of the Association of Apartment Owners by the Corporation Counsel with respect to adequacy of protection to the apartment owners regarding future maintenance, and had also established the time limit of the permit to be the length of the lease term or as long as the use is continued.

Deputy Corporation Counsel Denis Leong stated that he did check the condominium document called the "Declaration of Horizontal Property Regime of the Moorings" entered into by the Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company with the Trustees of the B. P. Bishop Estate, fee simple owner, and the By Laws of the Association of Apartment Owners of the Moorings. He reported that the Declaration and the By Laws provide for sufficient protection of the unit owners to each other. Through the Declaration, a portion of the condominium project constitute the "common elements" and this particular recreational center is going to be a part of that common elements. Appropriation for maintenance of the common elements will be made by the Board of Directors of the Association and if a person fails to pay his proportionate share, the Board of Directors may place a lien on that owner's unit and after a length of time if there is still no payment, the particular unit may be sold.

He stated further that this Declaration, like any other type of declaration, can be amended by 75% of the property owners, so that sometime in the future, the maintenance of the common elements can be lapsed. As of the present, however, there is adequate provision written into the document to assure maintenance of the common elements which include this recreational center.

The Commission recalled that its specific concern was with respect to Condition 4 which reads as follows:

> "4. There is adequate assurance for perpetual maintenance of the recreational center by recorded covenants running with the land which:
>
> a. Obligate the purchasers and occupants of the apartment units to maintain the recreational center in perpetuity,
>
> b. Empower the City, as well as other purchasers and occupants in the apartment units to enforce the covenants to maintain,
>
> c. Authorize the performance of maintenance work by the City in the event of failure by the purchasers and occupants to perform such work and permit the subjecting of various units in the apartment to a lien until the cost of the work performed by the City has been paid."

The Commission had agreed that the provision for maintenance should not be in perpetuity and had established the time limit of the Permit to be the length of the lease term of the condominium project or as long as the use is continued.

The Commission further discussed the provision empowering the City to perform maintenance work when there is failure to do so by the owners and the subjecting of various units in the apartment to a lien until the cost of the work performed by the City has been paid. The Commission felt that Condition 3 which reads:

> "The recreational center including the building, play area, patio, wall, parking area, swimming pool and other facilities shall be maintained in good order and neat and attractive condition, harmonious and compatible with the surrounding residential character.";

adequately provides for the requirement for maintenance and Conditions 5 and 6 which read as follows provide for additional protection to assure that the recreational center will be maintained in an acceptable condition and that if there is failure, the City can revoke the Permit or suspend the operation until there is compliance with the conditions of the Permit:

> "5. The Planning Director or the Planning Commission may impose additional conditions necessary for the protection of persons using the facilities of the center and/or the occupants of adjacent residential properties; and
>
> 6. The City Council may, at any time, upon finding that any of the conditions imposed are not being complied with, authorize the Planning Director or the Planning Commission to revoke the permit or to suspend such operation until compliance with said conditions is obtained."

The Commission noted that the standards to be applied in this type of operation usually relate to safety, health and welfare of the people. It stated that there are applicable ordinances and statutes of the Building Department and the Health Department as well as other zoning ordinances which provide for this type of compliance and protection. The unit owners will have further protection through the condominium document and by laws so that the City should not enter into a situation where the condominium owners can use the City as a crutch to have certain maintenance problems resolved when the unit owners themselves should resolve those problems.

Referring to the condition for placing of a lien on a unit by the City, Mr. Leong indicated that a Conditional Use Permit is granted through a Resolution and as such, he did not believe that the City Council can implement a possible future application of a lien on a parcel of land. This might be possible through an ordinance but not through a resolution which is not a legislative act. Regarding the covenant that runs with the land, he doubted that the City can legally enforce that covenant because the City does not have an interest in that land.

The Commission then determined that the conditional use requested is necessary and desirable for the public convenience or welfare and is in conformity with the elements and objectives of the General Plan

and the appropriate and orderly development of the district in which such use is proposed.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission voted to recommend to the City Council that it grant to the applicant, a Conditional Use Permit to construct and operate a private recreational center within the condominium development known as The Moorings, situated within Hawaii-Kai Marina, Unit 1-F, with the imposition of the conditions recommended by the Planning Director except for Condition 4 and its subsections which are to be eliminated in their entirety.

ZONING CLASS A-1
RESIDENTIAL
MAKIKI
2028 MAKIKI ST.
L. D. HAXTON,
ET AL

The Commission again reviewed a proposal to change the zoning from Class AA Residential to Class A-1 Residential for an area of land situated at the mauka northerly end of Makiki Street and bounded by Makiki Street and Round Top Drive in Makiki, identified by Tax Map Key 2-5-07: Parcels 1-12, 14-23, 25-35, 37-48, in conformity with the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu.

The public hearing held on August 22, 1968, was continued to September 19, 1968, and closed. The Commission had deferred action pending further staff consultation with Mr. Haxton to determine whether or not he is willing to widen the existing 16-foot right-of-way to 24 feet in order that he may proceed with the proposed subdivision of his parcel into two, one lot to contain an area of 35,464 square feet with four existing houses and one lot to contain 9,666 square feet for the construction of a new house.

The Director reported that a consultation was held with Mr. Haxton who indicated his reluctance to widen the 16-foot roadway because this would affect two existing dwellings. The Director explained that the present 16-foot roadway serves five parcels and the proposed subdivision will make it six. The larger parcel can be further subdivided off this roadway. The Subdivision Rules and Regulations require a 24-foot roadway to serve the six parcels. Under the existing zoning classification, Mr. Haxton cannot construct the fifth dwelling that he wishes but he may under the Class A-1 zoning provided that there is no subdivision.

Mr. Haxton displayed a proposed subdivision map showing the two lots and the existing four houses.

He stated that an engineer measured that roadway and found it to be 16 feet wide at the entrance but slightly wider toward the interior so that it is 23.5 feet wide at the end. He merely wants to subdivide his parcel into two so that he could sell the larger portion containing the four houses and retain the back lot for construction of his new home. He does not intend to further subdivide the large lot. If he cannot do this, he may have to sell the entire parcel and move from the area. He indicated that a concrete driveway running through the parcel gives access to the two back houses so that the 16-foot roadway is not used. The houses are well maintained and in good condition; therefore, he did not believe it feasible to move the houses to permit the widening of the roadway. He mentioned that he formerly owned the road easement in the back but because he had no use for it, he granted the people in the back to use that easement.

The Commission then discussed the proposed zoning as it relates to the entire area and not confined to Mr. Haxton's property. It recalled that other owners in the area with large sized parcels supported the rezoning in order that they may also subdivide their parcels or to construct additional dwellings. The Director had given information that only seven lots in the whole triangular area could be further resubdivided and approximately 13 to 14 more homes can be added in this area which has about 38 homes. The Director had also recommended that the rezoning should either cover the entire triangular area or none at all.

The Commission observed that majority of the lots in this triangular block have areas of 10,000 square feet or less, some as small as 4,000 square feet. An adjoining area on the lower side is zoned Class A Residential while the upper side is State owned land and undeveloped.

ACTION: On the basis that Class A-1 zoning would not be incompatible with surrounding uses, the Commission voted to recommend approval of the change in zoning from Class AA Residential to Class A-1 Residential for the triangular area bounded by Makiki Street and Round Top Drive in Makiki as initiated by the Planning Director, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Muller.

GENERAL PLAN
DLUM AND DP
(AMENDMENT)
ST. LOUIS HEIGHTS-
PALOLO
DELETION OF
POOLEKA STREET
EXTENSION AND
WIDENING OF
AHE PLACE

The Commission again considered a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan of the St. Louis Heights-Palolo area by deleting the extension of Pooleka Street and widening of Ahe Place by 15 feet on the ewa side and 9 feet on the kokohead side for a 44-foot right-of-way. A public hearing was held and closed on August 22, 1968, and the Commission had deferred action pending further study by the staff on the proposal to widen Ahe Place in view of the objections by affected property owners.

The Director explained the proposal and reported that a meeting was held with the protestants, Mr. and Mrs. Alvin Brown, who had objected to the proposal to take 9 feet from their property and being assessed again for another improvement district project when they had just completed paying for the improvement district project completed for the area. A revised proposal to widen Ahe Place to a 40-foot roadway by taking the widening from the ewa side of the street involving the State owned public housing project land was presented to the Browns who expressed no objection to the revised scheme. Although another improvement district project is not presently scheduled for this area, the Browns were advised that no guarantee can be given that they would not be assessed again for an improvement district project initiated sometime in the future. He stated that a large parcel of land in the interior was subdivided with access off Tenth Avenue so that the extension of Pooleka Street has become unnecessary and as a result, the proposal is to delete it from the General Plan.

Mrs. Brown confirmed that they were concerned about the additional assessment and the taking of additional land from their property because the original proposal was to take 9 feet from their property. She had no objection to the new proposal to take the widening entirely from the other side of the street.

Mr. Thomas Mui, representing property owner Mr. Buzzy Okazaki, reported that a measurement made on the site showed that Ahe Place is actually a 32-foot right-of-way with a pavement width of 20 feet and not 16 feet as originally reported. For the present, he felt that maintaining the status quo would be best for the area because the roadway is sufficiently wide to serve the area. He also stressed that this is a dead-end road.

The Director reported that only the entrance portion was improved to a 32-foot right-of-way but the rest of the road narrows down to a 20-foot right-of-way.

Mr. Mui confirmed that information but noted that the right-of-way for a 32-foot road is there. The sidewalk is in on only one side of the road which is the side of the Brown's property but on the housing side, a 6-foot sidewalk area is set aside.

Mr. Okazaki noted that the tax map shows the width of Ahe Place as 16 feet but in going to the site and measuring the road, it is actually 20 feet wide from curbstone to curbstone. The road was widened but the tax map does not reflect this. He stated that a roadway with a pavement width of 20 feet is in effect a 32-foot roadway under the ordinance.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission recommended approval to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan of the St. Louis Heights-Palolo area by deleting the extension of Pooleka Street and to maintain the status quo on the proposal made by the Director to widen Ahe Place.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Muller, authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director and authorized the Director to set the dates of the public hearings:

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT EWA LAUPAPA AND HANAKAHI STREETS LEWERS AND COOKE, INC.	(1) An application for a Conditional Use Permit to construct and operate a private community center within the Ewa Estates Subdivision, Unit II, on a 30,500 square foot parcel of land situated at the southwest corner of Laupapa and Hanakahi Streets in Ewa, within a Rural Protective zone.
ZONING BUSINESS KANEOHE-HEEIA KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY AND LILIPUNA ROAD BISHOP ESTATE, ET AL AND DEV: T. F. McCORMACK	(2) A proposal to change the zoning from Class AA Residential to Business for 11.158 acres of land situated at the southwest corner of Kamehameha Highway and Lilipuna Road in Kaneohe-Heeia, in conformity with the General Plan.
ZONING BUSINESS KALAUAO 99-298 KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY MIYASATO PROPERTIES	(3) Change in zoning from Class A Residential to Business for a 9,693 square foot parcel of land situated at 99-298 Kamehameha Highway in Kalauao, in conformity with the General Plan.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND
USE MAP AND
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
CENTRAL HONOLULU
DISTRICT
(MAKIKI, PAWAA,
ALA MOANA)
PLANNING AREA
NO. 13

(4) A proposal to adopt the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan for the Central Honolulu District, Planning Area No. 13 (Makiki, Pawaa, Ala Moana) and amendment to that portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu for land bounded by Kewalo Basin, Ward Avenue, Prospect Street, Nehoa Street, Punahou Street, Beretania Street, Kalakaua Avenue, Ala Wai Canal and the shoreline and including Magic Island.

GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
KANEOHE TO KUALOA
KANEOHE-HEEIA
VARIOUS CHANGES

(5) Amendment to the Kaneohe-Heeia portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe to Kualoa area by changing certain land use designations within the area covered by the ahupuaa of Heeia, and modifying the right-of-way width of Kamehameha Highway between Waikalua Road and Lilipuna Road from 100 feet to 84 feet.

Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission recommended approval of the following street names:

STREET NAMES
HALEIWA, WAIALUA
"KAIKA PLACE"

(1) Roadway off Walikanahele Road at Haleiwa, Waialua:

KAIKA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Walikanahele Road.
Meaning: Cultivated patch or area

STREET NAMES
MAUNALUA, HAWAII-KAI
KOKO ISLE
CONDOMINIUM

(2) Roadway within Koko Isle, a private condominium development at Hawaii-Kai, Maunalua:

KOKO ISLE CIRCLE - Circular roadway on Koko Isle at the end of Anapalau Street.
Meaning: Koko Head Island Circle

ANAPALAU STREET - Extension of an existing roadway into Koko Isle and terminating at Koko Isle Circle, being on the Honolulu side of the bridge.

Note: The applicant has complied with the minimum requirements for naming of private roadways.

STREET NAMES
MOANALUA
MOANALUA HILLSIDE
APARTMENTS

(3) Roadways within the Moanalua Hillside Apartments, Moanalua:

ALA KAPUNA - Roadway extending from Moanalua Road in a mauka direction and terminating past Ala Kipa.

Meaning: Roadway to a spring

ALA KULA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Ala Kapuna between Moanalua Road and Ala Kipa.

Meaning: Roadway to the open field

ALA KIPA - Roadway extending from Ala Kapuna and running in a Honolulu direction.

Meaning: Roadway to turn in and lodge

Note: The applicant has complied with the minimum requirements for naming of private roadways.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima

Carole A. Kamishima
Secretary-Reporter II

Special Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
October 24, 1968

The Planning Commission held a special meeting on Thursday, October 24, 1968, at 9:05 a.m., in the Assembly Room of City Hall, Honolulu Hale, with Chairman Richard K. Sharpless presiding:

PRESENT: Richard K. Sharpless, Chairman
Philip Chun
Robert L. Muller
Arthur A. Rutledge
Thomas N. Yamabe II

Robert F. Ellis, ex-officio (present at 9:35 a.m.)

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director

ABSENT: Cyril W. Lemmon
Moses Lum Hoy, ex-officio

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP OF WAIANAE
(AMENDMENT)
WAIANAE-KAI
MAKAI OF FARRINGTON
HIGHWAY IN PROXIMITY
TO MAUNA LAHILAHI
BEACH PARK
(RESORT-HOTEL USE)
MANOA INVESTMENT
CO., ET AL
BY: JAMES SHIGEMURA,
ATTORNEY

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waianae by changing the land use designation from Low Density Apartment use to Resort-Hotel use for parcels of land totalling 5.56 acres on the makai side of Farrington Highway, situated on the Kaena Point side of Waianae High School premises in Waianae-Kai, and covered by Tax Map Key 8-5-17: Parcels 8 to 16 inclusive.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 13, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, and to interested groups and organizations. No letters of protest or comment have been received.

The Director reported that the City Council had referred to the Planning Department, through Committee Report No. 986, a request to amend the Detailed Land Use Map for Waianae-Makaha to designate an area of 5.56 acres from Low Density Apartment to Resort-Hotel use. The area is located on the makai side of Farrington Highway, situated on the Kaena Point side of Waianae High School premises in Waianae-Kai. Committee Report No. 986 also authorizes the acquisition of adjoining areas required for beach park expansion. The City's Capital Improvement Program provides $240,000 for this purpose in Fiscal Year 1970-1971.

The Director reported that the land is presently vacant and is situated makai of Farrington Highway and about 200 feet inland from the shore. A strip of approximately 20 feet wide is indicated for widening Farrington Highway. A portion of the shoreline is rocky near the school but the area farther up is sandy. A strip park is indicated

on the existing Detailed Land Use Map along the shore line.

The Director reported that a meeting was held with the Model Cities Agency in Waianae because it was agreed that they be informed of all proposed zoning changes or Detailed Land Use amendments before a public hearing is held.

The Director presented the following information as his basis for recommending denial of this application:

1) The Waianae Coast has several areas designated for resort development and most of these are larger areas than indicated in this particular application. He believed that adequate areas have been designated for resort use on the Waianae side until such time as there is sufficient indication for more resort development in this area.

2) He questioned the designation of resort uses next to a public facility use such as a high school. The Detailed Land Use Map indicates that the area adjoining the high school would be more appropriate for residential and low density apartment uses, and resort use is not a compatible land use. The land is presently designated for low density apartment use.

3) The resort and hotel developments in this area are the Beach Cabanas, the Makaha Shores which was recently completed which is an 88-unit apartment unit located at Kepuhi Point, and the Capital Investment Company's project under construction.

The Director pointed out the subject property as outlined in orange on the Detailed Land Use Map overlay. He pointed out another area designated for Low Density Apartment use which is located in the Kaena Point direction. The area in between along the beach frontage is recommended for park development. He also pointed out the location of the existing high school and the elementary-intermediate school complex and the branch library. The State has acquired additional land which was returned by the Federal Government for expansion of the high school.

The Director indicated that Parcel 19 was not included in the application. Upon an inquiry by the applicant's attorney, a check was made into the files which revealed the exclusion of Parcel 19. He would still recommend denial of this application even if Parcel 19 was included in the application.

Regarding the lot area which the City Council had authorized acquisition of for a park development, the Director replied that it is listed by lot numbers and noted that those are private parcels. Two or three lots are owned by the Federal Government. There is a 20-foot strip which the Director

believed is the railroad right-of-way and the park is intended to go through there and to the private parcels.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. David O. Klausmeyer, representing the Makaha Civic Association, spoke in opposition to the proposal. He presented the following information which he believed would justify the area for park use:

1) Around 1960, the Makaha Civic Association advocated the use of the whole beach area up to the highway, including the applicant's property, for park purposes. At that time any proposals for low density apartment use were being opposed by the association. The Association still advocates the whole area for park purposes with the exception of one or two private residences which have been there for many years, namely, the Badoyos and another family, whose name he could not recall.

2) The City and County presently has only a very small stretch of land for a public park which is located opposite the Cornet Store. This park is one of the most popular parks in the City and County of Honolulu. He assumed that this is because the water is shallow and affords swimming for the children, and it is a low lying areas with easy access to the water. There is good surfing at times. Up the coast further, the sand shifts and sometimes rocks are exposed.

3) It is estimated that Makaha will support a future population growth of approximately 20,000 people. The existing park fronting Cornet Store comprising a few acres, plus seven acres down at the surfing area, plus another four or five acres near the elementary school, will not be sufficient to serve 20,000 people, let alone the hundreds of people who come to this area on weekends.

4) The Association agrees with the Director that a high rise resort area next to a public facility is not a compatible use. They feel that this is an excellent opportunity for the City to purchase a park at low cost. This area is a hodgepodge of State and Federal lands. He believed that the State and the Federal lands could be acquired by the City and with the private lands, this would be a very reasonable way to get a park for the City and County.

Also speaking in opposition to the proposal was Mr. George Teramoto, President of the Makaha Civic Association, who presented some background information about the Mauna Lahilahi Beach park fronting Cornet Shopping Center. He stated that this land was originally purchased on a Condition of Sale by Mr. William Vannatta for the purpose of constructing a condominium. When the zoning was not approved,

Mr. Vannatta proposed to sell this property to the City for park purposes.

Regarding the swimming area, Mr. Teramoto pointed out that there is a sort of natural pool located on the reef and the Association plans to convert that area into a larger swimming area for the children.

He stated that the Association was informed of the applicants' plans, and the Association, in turn, informed the applicants of its opposition to the proposal. The Director had also denied the request, but the applicants submitted their request to the City Council. Mr. Ben Kaito, Chairman of the Public Works Committee of the City Council, indicated that he would recommend to the Chairman of the Finance Committee of the City Council to negotiate with the applicants to purchase a portion of the area for park purposes. Mr. Douglas Sakamoto, Director, Department of Parks and Recreation, felt that the entire area should become a park, but because of the lack of funds, a compromise was made to acquire approximately four acres.

Mr. Teramoto noted that the map does not show the contour of the area. He felt that to be fully apprised of the situation, the Commission should visit the site.

He pointed out the existing park which is a narrow stretch of land with no parking facilities. The vehicles park on the shoulder of the road which is a violation of the City or State ordinance which states that vehicles may park on the shoulder of the road only in cases of emergency.

He stated that the Director, as an appointed official, presented his recommendation to the Commission, and the Commission should accept his recommendation. In this way the residents will not have to take time off from their place of employment to attend the meetings. He noted that although the Commission may act favorably for the residents, it is possible that the authorities at a higher level may not act accordingly. He noted that the applicants' attorney is an elected official; namely, a member of the House of Representatives. He requested that consideration be given to the residents.

Mr. James Shigemura, attorney representing the applicants, stated that although he is a member of the House of Representatives, he did not feel that there is a conflict of interest as he is not involved in the appointment of members to the Planning Commission, nor the members of the City Council.

A photograph of the Waianae area was shown in which he pointed out the white sandy area which is from Mauna Lahilahi Point to Waianae High School and which is the general area under consideration and the surrounding areas. He stated that the

approximate distance from the beginning of the white sandy stretch to the end of the stretch is approximately 1.1 miles by automobile.

A map was shown of Waianae High School, the football field, administrative classroom buildings and the gymnasium. He stated that the gymnasium is the only part of the school which borders the subject property.

He explained that inadvertently Parcel 19 was not included in the application and requested that Parcel 19 be included in the application as it is part of the contiguous total area.

He stated that the applicants have been very cooperative in working with the City, and he is sure that the Director is aware of this. The applicants' original request was for 20 parcels but at the hearing of the Public Works Committee, the applicants were asked to concede to the City's desire to purchase 10 parcels for park purposes. The applicants are now in the process of negotiating the sale of these parcels and, therefore, have not asked for a change in land use of the other parcels. The 10 parcels are located along the seashore so the applicants are not requesting a change in land use for lands abutting the ocean but for lands which are interior and adjacent to Farrington Highway. The entire boundary of Waianae High School has a hurricane fence of 10 to 12 feet high.

(Mr. Ellis was present at about this time).

Mr. Shigemura felt that the Commission should realize that the applicants have taken a very reasonable attitude in this matter and the application now relates to the remainder of the land which is approximately 50% of the original request. He stated that none of the lands will border the park and the park will occupy the entire beach frontage.

Regarding Mr. Klausmeyer's statement that the length of the park was just a small stretch, Mr. Shigemura felt that 1.1 miles cannot be described as a small area.

The extensive total park development on the entire Waianae Coast line was pointed out, such as at Mauna Lahilahi Point, Pokai Bay, and two other parks near the Kaena side of Makaha Beach. He, therefore, felt that the park and recreational areas are adequately taken care of as compared to the limited park areas on the Windward side.

Regarding accessibility, he noted that the subject property abuts on Farrington Highway. When the newly aligned Interstate Highway is completed, it will go through Mr. Chinn Ho's property and mauka of Farrington Highway and will relieve all of the present traffic in this location and will serve local traffic which will be adequate for this resort use.

He stated that water facilities are adequate to serve a resort-hotel development. Sewer facilities will be adequate when the Makaha Sewer Interceptor is completed which is scheduled for completion in Fiscal Year 1968-1969. This development is estimated to generate real property taxes of $20,000 annually and these become the profit of the City and County of Honolulu.

Waianae has the highest unemployment rate of approximately 11%. It is estimated that each room will create one job not from the service of the room, but from the shops and the restaurant. A total of approximately 1,000 new jobs is expected to be created.

Regarding the Director's statement that perhaps this was not a proper area for the development of a hotel, Mr. Shigemura stated that he does not know whether this is the case, but he quoted a statement made by the Director published in the Honolulu Advertiser on August 3, 1967, when Mr. Chinn Ho's Makaha zoning request was being considered when Councilman Frank Fasi stated that favoritism was given to Mr. Ho: "Mr. Skrivanek, asked to comment on Fasi's charges, said that he favored the Makaha development because it would relieve the pressure in Waikiki. He said that Waikiki was strangling on its own traffic and that development should be encouraged away from that area....

"Mr. Skrivanek suggested that new developments for tourism probably should be encouraged away from the area in Waikiki."

Mr. Shigemura stated that he saw no reason why those arguments should not now be made applicable to the request under consideration.

When interrogated by the Commission, Mr. Shigemura stated that the development plans of his clients are for the development of 500 duplex suites which will be convertible to two rooms or a total of 1,000 rooms. The cost is estimated at $25 million and will be developed as a hotel condominium. His clients have also developed the resort hotel known as the Makaha Cabanas in Waianae. Presently his clients are in the process of developing another condominium in Waikiki located between Aloha Avenue and Royal Hawaiian Avenue.

The proposed development is not a high-rise development in the sense of constructing a 30 or 40 story structure. One of the witnesses had testified that this was to be a high-rise development which caused some alarm.

When asked for the height limitation for the Resort-Hotel district, the Director stated that the height limitation is 70 feet, so the maximum number of stories would be approximately seven stories.

Regarding the sale of the parcels to the City and County, Mr. Shigemura stated that his clients agreed

to sell the parcels for a reasonable sum, and he assumed that the purchase price would not be based on the current market value. It was his understanding that the testimony presented earlier indicated that the City and County has scheduled this project for Fiscal Year 1969 and, in the meantime, his clients will realize no income and although there are obligations which must be met, they are still willing to be cooperative.

As a matter of information, Mr. Teramoto stated that there are classrooms abutting the boundary line and not only the gymnasium as mentioned by Mr. Shigemura. He also stated that the high school is expanding. Mr. Shigemura also mentioned that the length of the sandy area is 1.1 miles, but Mr. Teramoto stated that the park area is not that long and noted that private properties are included. The ultimate goal will be 1.1 miles long.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Chun, closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

In discussing this matter later, the Commission inquired about the possibility of acquiring the 5.5 acres for a park site. Mr. Rutledge wanted to know whether the City is going to purchase the parcels for a park site and if so, when will it be developed.

The Director mentioned that the instructions from the Public Works Committee were to start negotiating for the acquisition of the parcels. Because of the lack of sufficient funds to purchase the parcels for a park site, the Capital Improvements Program will have to be supplemented. An amount of $240,000 was allotted for Fiscal Year 1970-1971, but he felt that this amount was not sufficient to purchase even half of the parcels.

In response to questions from the Commission, the Director stated that the applicants were aware of the low density apartment use, but submitted an application to the Planning Department last year requesting an amendment. The Planning Department denied the request and the applicants then submitted their request to the City Council. The City Council referred the request back to the Planning Department since this is an amendment to the General Plan. If the Commission denies this application, the City Council would require a 3/4 majority vote to override the recommendation of the Commission.

<u>ACTION</u>: Mr. Muller moved that the proposed amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map by changing the land use designation from Low Density Apartment use to Resort-Hotel use for parcels of land totalling 5.56 acres situated on the Kaena Point side of Waianae High School premises in Waianae-Kai be denied based on the recommendations of the Planning Director. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN AND
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP OF ALIAMANU-
SALT LAKE (AMENDMENT)
MOANALUA
OFF SALT LAKE
BOULEVARD
(MEDIUM DENSITY
APARTMENT USE AND
ESTABLISHMENT OF A
FIRE STATION SITE)

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Aliamanu-Salt Lake by changing the land use designation from Public Facility (Fire Station site) to Medium Density Apartment use and the establishment of a new Fire Station site on a 15,000 square foot parcel of land situated on the mauka-Waikiki corner of Salt Lake Boulevard and Ala Napunani Street in the Moanalua-Salt Lake area and covered by Tax Map Key 1-1-63: Parcel 11.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 13, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, International Development Company, Aliamanu Community Association, Moanalua Lions Club, and to the Moanalua Gardens Community Association. No letters of protests have been received.

The Director reported on the proposal to change the land use designation from Public Facility (Fire Station site) to Medium Density Apartment use for an area originally designated for the fire station site at the time the Detailed Land Use Map was adopted. Originally the fire station was to front on the access road leading into Salt Lake Boulevard. The proposed fire station area consists of 15,000 square feet and a portion of this land was purchased by the State for the proposed high school site adjoining, and in negotiations between the City and County and the State, the City was able to acquire this site from the Department of Education. The land is presently vacant. Water facilities are adequate and there is a 16-foot water main existing along Salt Lake Boulevard. The access to the site is by a 56-foot right-of-way. Salt Lake Boulevard has a right-of-way width of 100 feet although it is not improved to that particular cross section. Puuloa Road has a right-of-way width of 120 feet.

Since this area does not have a fire station and with the developments occurring in this area, the Fire Department felt the need for a fire station to service this area. Other sites which were considered for a fire station site included some Federal lands and lands across Puuloa Road but because of topographic problems, it was felt that the proposed site would be adequate.

Upon the call by the Chairman, no one spoke in favor of or in opposition to the proposed amendment.

<u>ACTION</u>: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposed amendment to the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Aliamanu-Salt Lake by changing the land use designation from Public Facility

(Fire Station site) to Medium Density Apartment use and the establishment of a new Fire Station site on a 15,000 square foot parcel of land situated on the mauka-Waikiki corner of Salt Lake Boulevard and Ala Napunani Street in the Moanalua-Salt Lake area.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
KAPAHULU
2848 KIHEI PLACE
DAVENROY DRYCLEANERS
BY: RICHARD H. F. YEE, GENERAL MANAGER

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing Hotel-Apartment District to Business for a 5,407 square foot parcel of land at 2848 Kihei Place, situated on the mauka side of Kihei Place, between Davenroy Drycleaners and road leading to Board of Water Supply Pump Station in Kapahulu and covered by Tax Map Key 2-7-30: Parcel 56, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for Kaimuki-Kapahulu.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 13, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, Kaimuki Business and Professional Association, Kapahulu Businessmen's Association, and to the Kapahulu Community Association. No letters of protest have been received.

The Director presented the request to change the zoning from existing Hotel-Apartment District to Business for the subject property containing an area of 5,407 square feet, of which approximately 2,753 square feet is zoned for Hotel-Apartment and the remainder is zoned for Business use. The parcel is situated mauka of the Harding Avenue Extension adjoining the Pahoa Pumping Station in Kapahulu.

At the time of the public hearing to consider the adoption of the Detailed Land Use Plan for the Kaimuki-Kapahulu area, a question was raised whether it was appropriate to have such a small area zoned for Hotel-Apartment and, therefore, the Commission designated the area for Business use on the Detailed Land Use Map.

The Director explained that this is an expansion of the Davenroy Drycleaning Laundry Plant, which is located at the corner of Kapahulu Avenue and Kihei Place. The existing plant covers three lots within the Business District which was established 150 feet parallel fronting on Kapahulu Avenue.

The Board of Water Supply reported that its facilities are adequate to serve the proposed use. The Department of Public Works has indicated that sewers are adequate for the proposed development, provided the business does not involve high water usage. The applicant has indicated that the property will be used for the relocation of the underground fuel and chemical tanks necessary for the operation of the laundry, and also to handle parking and truck loading and unloading.

The Kaimuki-Kapahulu Development Plan indicates road widening of Kihei Place from 40 feet to 44 feet. There is a two-foot setback on Kihei Place; however, the Department of Public Works do not have any plans to widen it at this time. Since this application is in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for this area, the Director recommended approval of this rezoning request.

In reply to questions from the Commission, the Director stated that the two-foot setback will be applied when the application for a building permit is made.

Mr. Yamabe inquired whether it was possible to apply the zoning change to other properties with the same problem.

The Director replied that during the calendar year, a review of the district boundaries will be made and adjustments will be made at that time.

No one spoke in favor of or in opposition to the rezoning request.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Muller, closed the public hearing and recommended approval to the change in zoning from Hotel Apartment District to Business for the subject property situated on the mauka side of Kihei Place, between Davenroy Drycleaners and the road leading to the Board of Water Supply Pump Station in Kapahulu.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
WAIKIKI
PRINCE EDWARD
STREET AND KOA
AVENUE
KAHILI HOTEL,
ET AL

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing Hotel-Apartment to Business for five parcels of land totalling 20,625 square feet fronting on Prince Edward Street and Koa Avenue, situated on the Diamond Head side of Kaiulani Avenue in Waikiki, and covered by Tax Map Key 2-6-23: Parcel 33, 34, 35, 36 and 76, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for Waikiki.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 13, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicants, applicable governmental agencies, Waikiki Improvement Association, and to the Waikiki Jaycees. No letters of protest have been received.

From the Detailed Land Use Map displayed on the wall, the Director pointed out the subject location fronting on Prince Edward Street and Koa Avenue, situated on the Diamond Head side of Kaiulani Avenue, and directly opposite the new wing of the Kaiulani Hotel which is presently occupied by single family dwelling and one and two story structures.

The Director presented the request to construct a 19-story commercial-apartment type structure. One-to-one parking will be provided for each apartment unit, and parking will also be provided for the proposed retail shops and the restaurant. The proposed structure will not exceed the density ratio under the Comprehensive Zoning Code.

The General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Waikiki designates the area under consideration for Resort Commercial uses. The area is within the designated boundary for the urban renewal project in Waikiki and the Honolulu Redevelopment Agency reported that it has no objections to the proposal, but suggested that Parcel 35, comprising an area of 4,125 square feet, which was not included in the original application, be acquired in order that the applicant may meet the lot size requirement. The Director reported that a land exchange has been worked out to include Parcel 35.

The Board of Water Supply reports that its facilities are adequate. The Department of Public Works reports that sewers are adequate for the proposed development, provided a connection is made to the Kaiulani Avenue Sewer. Since Kaiulani Avenue is located on the ewa side of the property, the Director reported that the applicant will be able to make the connection. The Department of Public Works further reported that there is a drainage problem in this area extending from Kaiulani Avenue to Kapahulu Avenue but it is expected that this problem will be solved when the urban renewal project is undertaken. The Director recommended approval of this rezoning request since the application is in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for this area.

In response to an inquiry of whether the parcels are under one ownership, the Director replied that it was originally under separate ownership, but the parcels have been consolidated and are now under one development.

In answer to further inquiries from the Commission, the Director stated that a letter has been sent to the Department of Traffic for its comments, but no reply has been received. He indicated that the Department of Traffic normally does not submit comments on individual requests.

Mr. Sharpless inquired on the right-of-way widths for both Koa Avenue and Prince Edward Street and the parking regulations for these streets.

The Director stated that Koa Avenue has a right-of-way width of 50 feet and a pavement width of 34 feet, allowing for four moving lanes, but parking is permitted on both sides of the street. Prince Edward Street has a right-of-way width of 40 feet and a pavement width of 20 feet, allowing for two moving lanes, but parking is permitted on one side of the street. Prince Edward Street is a one-way street in the Diamond Head direction. There are curbs and sidewalks, but no gutters because drainage

problems would be created.

No one responded to the Chairman's call to present testimony in favor of or in opposition to the rezoning request.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

Noting that the applicants were present, Mr. Yamabe inquired whether they would be available to answer any questions that the Commission may have in its discussion. The applicants gave an affirmative reply.

In the discussion that followed, Mr. Yamabe stated that his primary concern was the traffic problems which may be created from this development because of the narrow width of Koa Avenue and Prince Edward Street, and asked whether the problems could be solved in the process of rezoning.

The Director did not think that the traffic problems in Waikiki could be related to a single development, but rather to the whole area of Waikiki. The Department submitted some proposals to the City Council at the time the Detailed Land Use Map was being considered, such as the Kuhio Avenue widening, the reconstruction of Ala Wai to its proposed standards, and the mauka arterial, but some of the proposals were rejected. The Public Works Committee of the City Council has under consideration some proposals from the Department of Traffic, and the proposal of instituting a one-way street system submitted by the Oahu Development Conference. He felt that there will be no significant relief in the traffic situation until the Kuhio Avenue widening and the mauka arterial becomes effective.

Mr. Yamabe inquired whether there was any way in which the Commission could help minimize the traffic problems.

The Director replied that the recommendations proposed by the Department of Traffic requiring immediate action, such as banning left turns in certain intersections, no parking in certain areas, restriction on hours of loading and unloading of delivery trucks, and so forth, pertained primarily to Lewers Avenue where there is a serious problem of tour buses and trucks blocking one lane of traffic for unloading. The Public Works Committee of the City Council has these recommendations under study working together with the Waikiki Improvement Association and the Hotel Association.

In an inquiry of whether the developer will be subject to the amendments under the Comprehensive Zoning Code, the Director did not think that the applicants will be submitting their building permit application during this year and, as a result, will be subject to the new requirements. Their construction plans have not yet been drawn.

Mr. Yamabe inquired of the applicants that if an application for a building permit is made in this current year, whether they would adhere if a request is made by the Planning Director to conform to the new ordinance as far as loading and unloading and any other amendments of the zoning ordinance are concerned that would alleviate the traffic problems.

Mr. Leslie Fullard-Leo, representing the owners of the property, stated that they have been very adamant that the structure must conform to the Comprehensive Zoning Code. He indicated that the building permit application will not be submitted for another five to six months. The proposed structure consists of one tower and the remainder will be a low rise structure with the concept of a garden mall-type of development.

Regarding the subject property, he stated that Kaiulani Avenue, which is quite a wide street, is one of the boundary lines. Regarding the availability of parking spaces along Prince Edward Street and Koa Avenue, he stated that, to his knowledge, there are four parking spaces available on Prince Edward Street because of driveways and residences; and there are two parking spaces available on Koa Avenue because of a considerable number of businesses on this street.

Mr. Fullard-Leo indicated that the developer is the lessee. The developer was present earlier, but left for another appointment. He apologized for not presenting any testimony earlier during the hearing, but thought it was not necessary since there were no objections.

In response to whether there is any agreement or legal document whereby the applicant, as the lessor, might require the lessee to conform to the Comprehensive Zoning Code, Mr. Fullard-Leo gave an affirmative reply and stated that the lessee was made aware of it. He stated that if the lessee did not want to conform to the Comprehensive Zoning Code, the building permit application would already have been filed.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, recommended approval of the change in zoning from existing Hotel-Apartment to Business for five parcels of land fronting on Prince Edward Street and Koa Avenue, situated on the Diamond Head side of Kaiulani Avenue in Waikiki.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING APARTMENT
DISTRICT C
PALOLO
3324 SIERRA DRIVE
EDWARD R. AOTANI

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing Class A Residential to Apartment District C (medium density) for a 14,618 square foot parcel of land at 3324 Sierra Drive, situated on the ewa side of Sierra Drive and approximately 250 feet mauka of Waialae Avenue in Palolo, and covered Tax Map Key 3-3-05: Parcel 13, in conformity

with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for St. Louis Heights-Palolo.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 13, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, Kaimuki Business and Professional Association, Palolo Community Council, and to the Palolo Civic Organization. No letters of protest have been received to date.

The Director indicated that the Detailed Land Use Map, adopted by the City Council in early spring of this year, designated this area for medium density apartment use. The area farther up on Sierra Drive is zoned for high density apartment use. The applicant is proposing to construct an apartment building and will conform to the zoning requirements. The Board of Water Supply and the Department of Public Works reported that their facilities are adequate to serve the proposed development. Sierra Drive has a right-of-way width of 50 feet and a pavement width of 28 feet. There are concrete curbs, gutters and sidewalks. Since the proposed rezoning conforms to the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for this area, he recommended approval of the zoning change to Apartment District C.

No one responded to the Chairman's call to present testimony in opposition to or in support of the request.

<u>ACTION</u>: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Muller, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District C (medium density) for the subject property situated on the ewa side of Sierra Drive and approximately 250 feet mauka of Waialae Avenue in Palolo.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Muller, authorized the calling of public hearings on November 14, 1968, to consider the following proposals initiated by the Planning Director:

ZONING APARTMENT DISTRICT C PAUOA PUOWAINA DRIVE AND AUWAIOLIMU STREET MR. AND MRS. RICHARD E. HOLLINGER	(1)	Change in zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District C for a 24,312 square foot parcel of land situated at Puowaina Drive and Auwaiolimu Street in Pauoa. Water and sewer facilities are available.

ZONING BUSINESS WAIKIKI 337 ROYAL HAWAIIAN AVENUE DONALD W. HEWITT AND BUDGET RENT-A-CAR OF HAWAII BY: MORIO OMORI, ATTORNEY	(2)	Change in zoning from Hotel-Apartment to Business for a 7,200 square foot parcel of land at 337 Royal Hawaiian Avenue in Waikiki. Water and sewer facilities are available and adequate to serve the proposed use.
ZONING CLASS A-2 RESIDENTIAL WAIPAHU MAKAI OF THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY OAHU SUGAR COMPANY, LTD. BY: COMMUNITY PLANNING, INC.	(3)	Change in zoning from Class A-1 and Rural Protective to Class A-2 Residential for 58.8 acres situated makai of the Interstate Highway in Waipahu, in conformity with the Detailed Land Use Plan of Waipahu.
ZONING RESORT HOTEL DISTRICT NO. 1 LAIE 55-289 KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY MRS. THERESA K. MALANI AND MR. WOODROW W. MIGGS BY: ROBERT K. FUKUDA, ATTORNEY	(4)	Change in zoning from Highway and Rural Protective to Resort Hotel District No. 1 for a 117,676 square foot parcel of land at 55-289 Kamehameha Highway in Laie.
SUBDIVISION RULES AND REGULATIONS	(5)	Amendments to Section 10 of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations relating to: (a) compliance of Comprehensive Zoning Code on lot area and lot width; and (b) lot area and lot width in town house development.
MISC. MEETING DATE		The Commission decided to hold its meeting on Wednesday, November 27, since Thursday, November 28, is a holiday.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 10:47 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie M. Abbott
Hearings Reporter

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
October 31, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, October 31, 1968, at 1:45 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Richard K. Sharpless presiding:

PRESENT:
Richard K. Sharpless, Chairman
Philip T. Chun
Cyril W. Lemmon
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Robert F. Ellis, ex-officio
Moses Lum Hoy, ex-officio

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director
Denis Leong, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:
Robert L. Muller
Arthur A. Rutledge

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT
EWA
LAUPAPA AND
HANAKAHI STREETS
LEWERS AND COOKE,
INC.

Pursuant to the provisions of Ordinance Nos. 2423 and 2448, a public hearing was held to consider an application made by Lewers and Cooke, Inc., for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction and operation of a private recreational center within the Ewa Estates Subdivision, on a 30,500 sq. ft. parcel of land situated on the southwest corner of Laupapa and Hanakahi Streets in Ewa, identified by Tax Map Key 9-1-01: Portion of Parcel 1, within a Rural Protective zone.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 20, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the Leeward Economic Planning Board and to the Ewa Beach Community Association. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

The Director explained the applicant's proposal to construct and operate a private recreational center to consist of a one-story bathhouse with locker facilities, a swimming pool, a wading pool, a pavilion, and outdoor cooking and picnic areas with some play equipment. He noted on the revised plot plan submitted, the location of the various facilities and the fencing around the property including separate fencing around the swimming pool and the wading pool. In compliance with the staff's recommendation, an off-street loading and unloading area is indicated on the plan and approximately eight cars can be accommodated in the area. Since this recreational area is for the exclusive use of the residents of the Ewa Estates Subdivision and is within easy walking distance, the developer does not anticipate too many vehicles coming into the area. For those few who may drive, they can park on Laupapa or Hanakahi Streets. When they do have large gatherings, the gate will be opened to allow parking on the lawn. This is a similar procedure followed at the Pacific Palisades and the Momilani Recreational

Centers which have been granted Conditional Use Permits and to date, no complaints have been received about the lack of parking facilities.

The proposed recreational center is desirable and necessary to provide adequate recreational facilities within this subdivision; and therefore, the staff's recommendation is approval with the attachment of the following conditions to insure protection to and compatibility with adjoining land uses:

1. The development of the site shall conform substantially to Plot Plan B as submitted by the applicant and filed under Folder No. 1968/Z-96. Said Plot Plan B shall be made a part of the Conditional Use Permit.

2. Adequate planting and fencing buffer shall be provided along the boundaries of the site in question and particularly adjoining the residential uses in order to protect said residential uses from noise, refuse and unsightliness. Said buffer shall be attractively maintained.

3. The recreational center including the building, landscaping, swimming and wading pools, pavilion, barbecue areas, driveway and other facilities shall be maintained in good order, neat, attractive and harmonious with the residential character of the surrounding area.

4. Adequate fencing shall be provided around the swimming and wading pools for the safety of the infants and children and shall be adequately maintained.

5. The Planning Director or the Planning Commission may impose additional conditions necessary for the protection of persons using the facilities of the center and/or the occupants of adjoining residential properties.

6. The City Council may at any time, upon finding that any of the conditions imposed are not being complied with, authorize the Planning Director or the Planning Commission to revoke the permit or to suspend such operation until full compliance of said conditions is obtained.

The Commission inquired about facilities for sewage disposal, the farthest distance a person must walk to the community center and so forth.

The Director reported that this entire Ewa area does not have public sewerage facilities. A sewage treatment plant site is designated on the Detailed Land Use Map for the area but it is not scheduled for immediate construction. The Board of Health has approved the Cavittete system of sewage disposal for this particular subdivision. He stated that this community center is to serve this entire subdivision

and maintained through a homeowners association. He did not know the distance between the farthest point of the residential subdivision and the community center.

The Commission noted that a representative of the applicant was present earlier but was not present at this time.

There was no one to speak in opposition to or in support of this application.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Chun, closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

In later consideration, the Commission inquired about the provision for maintenance and the adequacy of the off-street parking area.

The Director reported that this center is to be operated in a similar manner as the Pacific Palisades Recreational Center through the incorporation of a homeowners association and regulated under its by-laws. The developer, from its own funds, will build and operate the center until such time as there are enough residents,then the center is turned over to the association. Upon purchase of a lot, every owner becomes a member of the association and is assessed a fee for maintenance and operation of the center. The incorporating document mentions no provision for placing of a lien upon a delinquent member's property and instead states that: "No membership shall be terminated or forfeited, nor shall any member be expelled, except upon sale of any fee simple lot. No member may withdraw, nor shall any member transfer or otherwise dispose of his membership, except upon lawful conveyance, assignment or transfer (or agreement of sale) of his rights and duties as such owner, and upon payment of all his indebtedness to the corporation, on account of unpaid assessments or otherwise, and a transfer charge of $_____." Any problem that arises can be settled by the association.

The Director doubted that everyone would walk to the center as claimed by the developer. Some will drive their cars while others will be dropping off children at the center; therefore, the off-street loading area was recommended. For large meetings which are usually held in the evenings, the grassed play area can be used. This is done at Foster Village and at other community centers with no great inconvenience. He has not received any complaint about the lack of parking facilities.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission recommended to the City Council that the Conditional Use Permit requested be granted with the attachment of the six conditions mentioned by the Director.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING CLASS A,
A-1 & AA RES.
MAUNALUA
HAWAII-KAI
DEVELOPMENT
KAISER HAWAII-KAI
DEVELOPMENT CO.

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Farm District and Unrestricted Residential to Class A Residential for 506.730 acres of land, Class A-1 Residential for 145.509 acres of land, and Class AA Residential for 163.440 acres of land, identified by Tax Map Key 3-9-05, 08, -10, -14, -15, -18, -19, and -20, situated within the Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development at Maunalua, in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Hawaii-Kai.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 20, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies; to the Koko Head Terrace, the Maunalua Triangle, and the Hawaii-Kai Marina Community Associations; to the Koko Head Farm Bureau Center; and to the Kamilonui Farmers Cooperative. No written comments or protests have been received to date.

The Director outlined on the map displayed, the various areas involved in this rezoning proposal. The lands are generally located in the mauka area off Lunalilo Home Road and designated as Marina 8, 9 and 10, Kamilo Ridge, Kamiloiki Valley, Kamehameha Ridge, Kalama Valley, and Lunalilo Park. The areas are presently undergoing development under the present unrestricted residential zoning classification which permits 5,000 sq. ft. lots, but it is more appropriate to rezone to the different residential zoning categories. Water, sewer, street improvements and drainage facilities will be constructed by the developer in accordance with standards of the Department of Public Works as the subdivisions are developed. Since the proposed rezoning conforms to the adopted Detailed Land Use Plan of the area and will eliminate a less desirable type of zoning, the Director recommended approval of the proposals.

The Commission inquired whether the lands are still occupied by farmers and whether or not there would be difficulty in relocating them.

The Director believed that there are still some farmers in the areas. He noted that Mrs. Lillie Wong is present and since she reviewed the map, she may be able to give some information.

Mrs. Wong, speaking on behalf of the Koko Head Farm Bureau Center, did not oppose the proposed rezoning but asked certain questions. It was her understanding that the Ehukai area where several hog farmers are located is involved in this rezoning proposal. She wanted to know Hawaii-Kai's timetable for development of the area so that arrangement can be made for the orderly transition of the farmers to another area. She stated that there are 33 full-time and part-time hog farmers there and they would need at least a year or more of advance notice to locate another site and move.

The Director could not give a reply and noted that a representative of the developer was not present. He felt that this was a private matter to be settled between the farmers and Hawaii-Kai.

The Commission was sure that Hawaii-Kai is aware of the presence of the farmers in the area and advised Mrs. Wong to contact Hawaii-Kai to obtain their time-table of development.

No one spoke in opposition to or in support of the rezoning proposals.

Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Lemmon, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

Later in the meeting, Mr. Donald Iwai, attorney, representing Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company, apologized for not being present during the public hearing. He explained that he had gone to the other meeting room and by the time he came here the hearing had been closed.

The Commission informed Mr. Iwai about the testimony given earlier that there are some hog farmers in one of the areas under consideration for rezoning, and asked for the status of these tenants.

Mr. Iwai recalled the problem they encountered with the farmers at the time the rezoning of the area off Lunalilo Home Road was being considered. Together with the settlement of that problem, they attempted to take care of the farmers in Kalama Valley also. He stated that there are approximately 30 hog raisers there on a month to month lease basis with some having two to three years remaining on their leases. Hawaii-Kai has no plans prepared for the immediate development of the area. Although it has very rough preliminary plans prepared, development is definitely very far-off. They did meet with the farmers and discussed the terms of giving the farmers advance notice as soon as possible, but not less than one year.

In discussing this matter further with Mrs. Wong, she stated to him that the farmers intend to appeal to the Legislature or probably the State Department of Land and Natural Resources to have some farm lands made available to the hog raisers. This would require approximately two to three years of advance planning and preparation. At this time, it is difficult for Hawaii-Kai to make a definite commitment that it would not develop the area within three years because circumstances might arise which would permit Hawaii-Kai to move into the area much earlier, but the farmers will definitely receive advance notice of not less than one year. By discussing this matter further with the project engineer and the manager of Hawaii-Kai, he believed that he could obtain some idea as to about when Hawaii-Kai will begin development in the area.

Mrs. Wong stated that the farmers will need more than a year's notice to start moving from the area, that is why she wanted to know Hawaii-Kai's timetable for development of Kalama Valley. It takes time to locate another suitable site and she cited the hardship placed on these farmers who are constantly being moved from one place to another.

The Commission asked Mr. Iwai whether he could return in two weeks with some firm commitment regarding the provision Hawaii-Kai will make for notification to the farmers.

Mr. Iwai cited the various controlling factors involved, such as availability of money, market, and so forth, when developing a vast tract of land; therefore, it is difficult to give a definite commitment as to when they would develop an area. For instance, if the farmers are told to move out of an area within two years and after they move out the area is still not ready for development, they would be subject to criticism for moving the farmers out too soon. Yet, the developer cannot say that we will not go into an area within three years because in two years they might be able to develop the area. However, he will discuss this matter further with the project engineer of Hawaii-Kai to draft some sort of notice informing the farmers when the developer is expected to start development in the area.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission deferred action for two weeks pending receipt of a reply from Mr. Iwai.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
KALAUAO
99-298 KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY
MIYASATO PROPERTIES

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Class A Residential to Business for a 9,693 sq. ft. parcel of land at 99-298 Kamehameha Highway, situated on the mauka side of Kamehameha Highway between Kihale Street and Honomanu Street in Kalauao, identified by Tax Map Key 9-8-25: portion of Parcel 1, in conformity with the adopted General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa to Halawa.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 20, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, Aiea Community Association, Aiea District Council, and the Enchanted Hill Aiea Community Association. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

The Director reported that the subject property fronts Kamehameha Highway which is a fully improved 120-foot roadway. An adjoining business zoned property is owned by the same person and the proposal is to construct a restaurant building. Later, the owner will be submitting a request for a conditional use permit to allow off-street parking use for an

adjoining area on the mauka side also owned by the same person. A separate public hearing will be required to consider that proposal. The Board of Water Supply has reported that its facilities are adequate to serve the proposed use. Public sewerage facilities are not available but the Cavittete system approved by the Board of Health will be used.

There was no one to speak either in opposition to or in support of this rezoning proposal.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Lemmon, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Class A Residential to Business for a 9,693 sq. ft. parcel of land at 99-298 Kamehameha Highway in Kalauao.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
KANEOHE-HEEIA
KAMEHAMEHA HWY.
& LILIPUNA ROAD
T. F. MCCORMACK,
ET AL

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Class AA Residential to Business, in conformity with the adopted General Plan Detailed Land Use Plan for Kaneohe-Heeia, for parcels of land containing 7.758 acres, situated on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway at the southeast corner of Kamehameha Highway and Lilipuna Road, near Honey's, in Kaneohe, and identified by Tax Map Keys 4-6-02: Parcel 5, portions of Parcels 1, 3, 6, 8, 13 to 15, 18, 24, 27 to 29, 34 to 39; and 4-6-03: Parcels 2 and 4.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 20, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies and to the various community and civic organizations in the Kaneohe and Heeia areas. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

The Director oriented the Commission on the location of the properties situated to the rear of lots fronting on Kamehameha Highway and presently zoned for commercial use. He indicated that the General Plan designates this back portion for commercial use. As shown on the development plan submitted, the owner proposes to develop a shopping center complex composed of a bank, a super market, and several shops with off-street parking facilities in the front. The Board of Water Supply has reported that water facilities will be provided by the developer to serve the shopping center. Public sewerage facilities are presently not available but the developer has stated that sewage will be disposed of either to the existing 27-inch interceptor along Kamehameha Highway or to the existing sewer laterals in the realigned Lilipuna Road. The State Highway Department which has jurisdiction over Kamehameha Highway has reported no objection to the zoning change.

Mr. Robert Sue spoke against the proposed zoning change. He stated that his mother owns a piece of property fronting on Kamehameha Highway and where

this proposed shopping center is to be developed. They have been there for about 60 years and intend to construct a business building later; therefore, they object to the taking over of their property for the shopping center. If the developer wants to develop a shopping center, he felt that there are various processes by which he could do that without forceable acquisition of land. If the developer wants to enter into a long-term lease, it would be all right but they did not want to be forced into selling their property.

When asked by the Commission to clarify his objective, Mr. Sue pointed out on the map, the location of their property. This property was noted as being within the area zoned for business use and marked as "exclusion" on the development plan map submitted by the developer.

Mr. T. F. McCormack, realtor and developer of the land in question, stated that no attempt was made to harm Mr. Sue and his family. He did approach Mr. Sue for either purchase or exchange of lands but Mr. Sue has been reluctant; therefore, the proposed development plan was prepared to go around Mr. Sue's property. However, if Mr. Sue is ready to discuss lease terms, he would be happy to meet with Mr. Sue. He stressed that no attempt was made to take over Mr. Sue's property for the shopping center.

Since there was no further testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Lemmon.

The Commission considered this matter later.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Lemmon, the Commission recommended approval of the change in zoning from Class AA Residential to Business for the various parcels of land in Kaneohe as described in the public hearing notice.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND
USE MAP (AMEND)
KANEOHE-HEEIA
VARIOUS CHANGES

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend the Kaneohe-Heeia portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe to Kualoa by (1) changing certain land use designations within the area covered by the Ahupuaa of Heeia; and (2) modifying the right-of-way width of Kamehameha Highway between Waikalua Road and Lilipuna Road from 100 feet to 84 feet.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 20, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community and civic organizations in the Kaneohe and Heeia areas, and to interested parties.

The Director presented the proposed land use and street changes as follows:

1. Redesignation of the 154 acres of commercial-park-apartment-marina complex situated in the marsh land mauka of Heeia Viaduct to Residential-Golf Course complex;

2. Designation of 22.2 acres of land along the slope mauka of the Residential-Golf Course complex to Medium Density Apartment;

3. Expansion of the existing Light Industrial designation from 22.7 acres to 47.0 acres by including the remainder of the plateau now in Medium Density Apartment situated between the Kaneohe-Heeia district boundary and the gully from Haiku Gardens;

4. Designation of a 20-foot and a 40-foot planting screen buffer strip in the Light Industrial designation along the Kaneohe-Heeia district boundary and along the makai side of Kahekili Highway opposite Heeia Village respectively;

5. Readjustment of the boundaries of the Commercial and the Medium Density Apartment uses situated makai of Kamehameha Highway between the Kaneohe-Heeia district boundary and Lilipuna Road opposite Haiku Road by:

   a. Realigning the proposed Nahiku Street extension to run along the base of the knoll;

   b. Separating the Medium Density Apartment designation along the makai side of Nahiku Street extension into a complex of three parcels of Medium Density Apartment use with an aggregate area of 8.1 acres;

6. Redesignation of the elementary school-playground complex in the Haiku Plantation area to Residential use;

7. Deletion of the intermediate school site and readjustment of the boundaries of the elementary school-playground complex in the Horseshoe Valley mauka of the Residential-Golf Course complex;

8. Retention of S. W. King Intermediate School as an intermediate school;

9. Designation of a 10.0-acre district park on the knoll mauka of the proposed elementary school-playground complex in the Horseshoe Valley;

10. Designation of the existing mangrove mauka of Heeia Viaduct for Park purposes (possibly as a botanical park);

11. Deletion of all land use designations in the Heeia Fish Pond until the State Land Use District of the State Land Use Commission is clarified for the Fish Pond area;

12. Modification of the right-of-way width of Kamehameha Highway between Waikalua Road and Lilipuna Road from 100 feet to 84 feet;

13. Amendment of the street width and alignment of the street plan for Heeia.

The Director explained that the light industrial area was expanded to accommodate the small contractor's who operate on this side of the island since he understands that they have difficulty locating a suitable site from which to operate without having to commute some great distance. The school-playground complex within Haiku Plantation was changed back to residential because the Department of Education indicated that this school was not needed. The Heeia Fish Pond area is presently in litigation and as a result, no designation should be shown until that is settled. Some of the areas which get quite steep will be retained in the Preservation District which is a new district under the Comprehensive Zoning Code.

The Director then read the following letters which were placed on file:

1. The Kaneohe Community Council, signed by its President Dale T. Trenhaile, reported that the next meeting of the Kaneohe Community Council will be held on Wednesday night, November 6th, and as a result, they have not had sufficient time to evaluate and consider the various proposals to amend the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe-Heeia. They asked that no action be taken until they have had a chance to consider the various proposals.

2. Senator John J. Hulten from the Third District expressed his concern on the following matters:

a. The type of notice given is not sufficient for the average citizens to form an opinion either for or against the suggested changes.

b. The inconvenience of the time of the hearing. Hearings should be held in the evenings in the area affected.

c. The proposed rezoning of land fronting Kahekili Highway and Heeia Road will effect the visual grandeur and open vista presently provided along the highway.

d. There appears to be no valid reason for reducing the width of Heeia Road and eliminating the medial strip.

Senator Hulten also urged that no final action be taken on the proposed changes until the residents in the Kaneohe-Heeia area have had an opportunity to study the proposals.

3. The Windward Citizens Planning Conference, signed by its President O. K. Stender, also requested

the Commission not to take any action until the proposals could be reviewed with the citizens of the area by the Planning Department.

The Director stated that the Planning Department usually meets informally in the evenings with the community associations in those areas affected by General Plan changes. To explain these proposed changes, the last meeting with the Kaneohe Community Council was held on August 7th. If the Commission wishes to continue the hearing, he could meet with the community groups again.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mrs. Eve Drolet, reporter for the Pali Press, brought out the following issues.

1. She concurred with the statements made by the Windward Citizens Planning Conference, the Kaneohe Community Council and Senator Hulten that the citizens in the area have not been given adequate notice about the various proposals.

2. The public hearing notice which was published in the Star-Bulletin and Advertiser on October 20th was received at her office the next day which did not give her sufficient time to report the proposals to the people. The story appeared in yesterday's Pali Press, giving the people just one day's notice.

3. Kahekili Highway should be preserved as a scenic route. She did not believe that a buffer zone will guarantee plantings of some sort which would hide the filling stations that would be constructed along the highway. She wanted to see some guarantee made on that.

4. A new school site is not designated in the area opposite King High School. Just this morning she had spoken to someone at the Department of Education and was informed that a school is expected to be built in that area.

She also requested that this hearing be deferred until after the meeting is held with the Kaneohe Community Council.

Mr. Donald Iwai, attorney, represented the Haiku Realty, Ltd., owner of a parcel of land situated on the makai side of Kahekili Highway and adjoining an industrial designated area. He noted that the proposed amendments designate this particular area as Preservation in lieu of Apartment use as presently designated. His client realizes that all of that property cannot be developed for apartments, nor does his client intend to develop it because it is actually a gully, but the proposed amendment will jeopardize a successful land exchange which is presently in negotiation with Bishop Estate.

His client has pending before the Planning Department, a rezoning request to resort use, pursuant to the General Plan, for land in the mauka area.

In order to straighten out the boundaries of the land to provide for a better development, a land exchange had been negotiated with Bishop Estate and the land lying makai of the highway now designated as preservation is involved in that exchange. In order not to adversely affect a successful conclusion of the land exchange, he proposed that the area be designated instead as a Flood Hazard District as provided for under the new Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance. This designation will permit the owner to make whatever use he can of the property as long as he satisfies the Chief Engineer's requirement regarding flood control. Mr. Iwai also requested that this hearing be continued to permit further study of the various proposals by the residents in the area.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Iwai stated that lands on the mauka side of the highway containing about 14 acres is not affected by the proposed amendments. The makai area, involved in the land exchange, contains about 5 acres.

Mr. DeRoode, a resident of Kaneohe for the past 12 years and residing in the area immediately to the left of the area proposed for contractors' yards, strongly protested against the proposal to increase the industrial designated areas. He stated that his property is on top of a knoll overlooking a green meadow. The primary value of his property is the fact that it is a view lot, but if it is to overlook contractors' yards and other noisy and dusty operations, the value of his land will decrease considerably. This will definitely affect the salability of his property but he doubted that it would decrease his assessments.

At the request of the Commission, Mr. DeRoode pointed out on the map the location of his property. He noted that this general area has very few houses but there are about two or three dozen houses in the flat areas. He stated that in the early mornings, noise from the residential development below carries to his area so that he was quite concerned about the noise generating from a contractor's yard.

Mr. Oswald Stender, President of the Windward Citizens Planning Conference, reported that those people who did attend the informal presentation made by the Planning Director in Kaneohe commented that they did not understand too clearly the various proposals under consideration today. He questioned the reasoning and the philosophy behind the proposal to provide a strip of industrial land along a major feeder road to Kahekili Highway. Once the area is used for industrial purpose, he believed that the contractors will be using the streets for parking, loading, and unloading purposes, thereby further restricting traffic along that highway. He agreed with Senator Hulten that the planting strip will tend to become a "no man's land" because contractors are really not good housekeepers.

He questioned the proposal which eliminated a school site within the Haiku Plantation development and noted that there is no replacement within that general area. Although a school site is proposed near King High School, he wondered whether this location is proper since it is not within a densely populated area but next to a proposed golf course. Since they have not had sufficient time to review all the proposals in detail, he requested the Commission to defer further consideration of these proposals until they have had sufficient time to review them with the Planning Department. When questioned by the Commission whether he was opposed to the planting strip or the industrial designation, Mr. Stender replied that it is the proposed industrial designation. The planting strip is incidental. If there is no industrial use to hide, there would be no need for a planting strip.

Mr. Dale Trenhaile, President of the Kaneohe Community Council, reiterated the request made by letter to have the Planning Director explain the proposed changes at the Council meeting to be held on Wednesday, November 6th at 7:30 p.m., in the pavilion of the Kaneohe Playground on Keaahala Road.

He then commented on the proposed amendments, as follows:

1. He noted that the site of the proposed Kaneohe District Park on State land, which is part of the Kaneohe Hospital grounds, is not designated on the map. The land involved contains about 20 acres situated at the Keaahala Road-Kahekili Highway corner on the Kahuku side, and about 14 to 17 acres on the opposite side of Keaahala Road, mauka corner. The park is to be developed by the City and County of Honolulu on land deeded to it by the State. Since this fact is known by the various City administration and the City Council,he indicated that this park use should be incorporated on the map as soon as possible.

2. They are trying to maintain Kahekili Highway as a scenic route; therefore, they oppose the proposal to establish planting strips which are liable to be planted with cars that no one owns.

3. He thanked the Planning Director and his staff for coming out to Kaneohe and explaining the proposals to the people, but he felt that more such informational meetings are needed.

4. He complained that three requests made since October of last year to have proceedings of all meetings which involve changes in Kaneohe be sent to the Kaneohe Community Council have not been complied with. He requested that two copies of the agenda be sent to them only when items concerning their area are to be considered by the Planning Commission.

5. He commented that the type of notice that is published might be understood by land developers, lawyers, and a few others, but to the general public, it is the type of presentation made by the Planning Director and his staff at community association meetings where questions can be asked that the public can understand what is being proposed.

6. Before any final action is taken, he hoped that another presentation can be made in Kaneohe with the presence of those wanting the changes in attendance.

Mr. T. F. McCormack stated that he is one of the developers requesting the revisions to the General Plan. He has lived in the Kaneohe area for 30 years and assured the people that he is also interested in seeing that Kaneohe is developed properly. If there are oppositions, he would like to know what they are so that the differences can be resolved to the satisfaction of all. He was also agreeable to a deferral until another meeting can be held with the people in Kaneohe. He has been given permission by Mr. Hasegawa, who is the developer of the Bishop Estate's lands, to announce Mr. Hasegawa's willingness to a deferral until a meeting can be held with the people.

ACTION: Mr. Lemmon moved to keep the public hearing open and to request the Planning Director to schedule a meeting with the community concerned to discuss the proposals at an evening meeting and to report back to the Commission for continuation of the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yamabe and carried.

PUBLIC HEARING GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN (PLANNING AREA NO. 13) MAKIKI-PAWAA-ALA MOANA (CENTRAL HONOLULU DISTRICT)

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to adopt the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan for street plans, utilities and public facilities, and to amend that portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu, for Central Honolulu District (Makiki, Pawaa, Ala Moana), Planning Area No. 13, for land bounded by Kewalo Basin, Ward Avenue, Prospect Street, Nehoa Street, Punahou Street, Beretania Street, Kalakaua Avenue, Ala Wai Canal and the shoreline and including Magic Island.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 20, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, Pacific Business News, and to the Central Honolulu Community Association.

The Director acknowledged receipt and read the following letters which were placed on file:

1. The Outdoor Circle supported the Planning Director's proposal to designate Magic Island for public park use. Realizing the present and future needs for more parks to serve the increasing population, it also supported the proposals for additional mini-parks and

neighborhood parks in this planning area. However, the Circle expressed concern about the proposal for hotel zoning in the Ala Moana area. It felt that this was spot zoning and does not reflect sound planning principles. It hoped that the Commission will recommend action to deter hotel building in the Central Honolulu District until the Comprehensive Zoning Code goes into effect and to zone for apartment and not hotel use in this area.

2. The Dillingham Development Corporation supported the proposed plan recommended by the Planning Department with one exception. Regarding the proposed school-park site at Queen, Kamakee and Waimanu Streets, it felt that this area will not warrant a school location because of the type of use envisioned for the area. It stated that the proposed resort and commercial uses in the surrounding area will not produce a high density of school children. It also felt that a park was not needed since the nearby Ala Moana Park and Magic Island recreational areas should be adequate to serve the area. In keeping with the surrounding uses, it felt that the area should be designated for high density apartment use.

Referring to the Detailed Land Use Plan map and the Development Plan map displayed, the Director explained the various land use proposals and street pattern for this planning area which covers about 1,047 acres. In 1960, the area had a population of 19,414 persons and the 1985 projection is for 34,500 persons. The major uses in this area are apartment and commercial uses, and many parcels are presently zoned and used for these purposes. Because of the high density uses, an attempt was made to establish additional park locations in the area by expanding existing ones as well as providing new ones which could be called mini-parks. This is a new concept which has not been fully accepted by some of our governmental agencies because of the problems involved in maintenance and upkeep.

The Director pointed out on the map the location of these new park sites as well as some of the other land use proposals as follows:

Park sites:

a. On the waikiki side of Piikoi Street between Elm and Rycroft Streets;

b. On the ewa side of Piikoi Street between Kinau Street and the freeway; and

c. Expansion of Cartwright Field up to the freeway.

School sites:

a. A school and park complex for the area presently used by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association on the waikiki side of Keeaumoku Street between the freeway and Wilder Avenue.

b. An elementary school and playground in the Kakaako area. This is the proposal objected to by the Dillingham Development Corporation, but the Director felt that the area will generate enough school children to support the need for an elementary school at this location.

Apartments:

a. In the Makiki area, a high density apartment use designation is shown because many such zoning commitments have been made and it might not be advisable to change it at this time.

b. In the Sheridan Tract industrial area, a high density apartment use designation is shown. How repidly the present mixed uses of commercial and industrial might be phased out is not known at this time. The rest of the Sheridan Tract area is designated for medium density apartment use because of the narrow streets.

c. In the Kakaako area, a similar situation of mixed uses exists and the proposal is for high density apartment uses. In the same general area, resort use is designated on the mauka side of Ala Moana Boulevard. It is believed that high density hotel use is acceptable because it is opposite open space which is Ala Moana Park and this area might provide some relief to the congestion occurring in Waikiki.

The Director noted that the plan does not show the location of the mass transit line. Until the next phase of the mass transit study is completed, he felt it premature to indicate the alignment at this time. The land use plan itself might undergo some changes when the alignment is designated because it is generally in the vicinity of the station stops where the highest density of development occurs.

The Director also pointed out and explained the major street system for the area as shown on the map displayed. New proposals include a viaduct structure at the intersection of Kalakaua Avenue and Kapiolani Boulevard, a road connection between Punahou Street and Kalakaua Avenue, and the extension of Kinau Street to Punahou Street.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Dr. Chester Terpstra, President of the Central Honolulu Community Association, read his prepared statement which was placed on file. He stated that the Central Honolulu Community Association was organized in October, 1965, with the adoption of certain goals and objectives. Its membership consists of people from all walks of life. Since April, 1966, the Community Association met with representatives from the City Planning Department regarding the planning for this Central Honolulu area. He introduced the following speakers to elaborate on certain phases of the two plans: Mr. Richard Lowe, Mr. Wellington Chu, Mr. Timmy Hirata, and the Reverend Robert Fiske.

Mr. Richard Lowe, Director-at-Large of the CHCA, mentioned the many hours spent with its members, other citizens groups, members of the Planning Department, and other City agencies during the past two years to prepare a plan for the Central Honolulu area. Their goals and objectives are comprehensive and, in general, they cover recreation, schools, housing, tourism, transportation, commercial development,industrial development, health, and social welfare. They also thought about and discussed many issues concerning the area and these relate to: playgrounds in urbanizing Makiki, tot lots for the very young, the question of school children in apartments and where to locate schools, quality in high density apartment districts, the expansion of tourism away from Diamond Head into Central Honolulu and where to draw the line of this expansion, street congestion, and new modes of land use and transportation.

He stated that the Association has also developed its own plan for the area as shown on the map displayed. The Association has succeeded in resolving all but three issues of the plan and these relate to:

1. Lower Makiki

There is a disparity between the two plans for lower Makiki. The Planning Department's plan shows high density apartment use while the Association's plan shows medium density apartment use. They recognize that there is a history of land use and zoning decisions in that area that led to the Planning Department's recommendation of high density use, but the Association feels that recent developments in lower Makiki justify a new look at land uses there.

2. School location

There is a disparity in school site location policy between the two plans. They recognize that the City and the State are unable to know what the school population and its distribution will be and, therefore, are anxious to indicate sites even though accepted projections may indicate a different conclusion from that of the Association. His reference is to the school site in the Kakaako area and he noted that Mr. Hirata will expand on this.

3. Transportation

They realize that the State, not the City, is responsible for freeway and freeway access design and location. However, they believe it important to show the major street and transportation routes on the Detailed Land Use Map as well and not confine them only on the Development Plan map.

Mr. Wellington Chu, Director-at-Large of the Central Honolulu Community Association, read his prepared statement which was placed on file. Commenting on the proposed traffic system,he felt it essential that consideration be given to the following:

1. Provide an exit from the H-1 Freeway for traffic coming from the Koko Head direction onto Keeaumoku Street at the mauka-ewa corner of that intersection, and provide an entrance and exit from the H-1 Freeway at Piikoi Street for traffic going to and coming from the Ewa direction. Also, there should be an entryway for cars going up Keeaumoku Street onto the H-1 Freeway and headed towards Koko Head.

2. Provide a grade separation along Kapiolani Boulevard at Keeaumoku Street to separate the conflicting traffic movement going east and west from the traffic movement going mauka-makai.

3. Indicate at this time the mass transit route serving this area to enable this area to continue to grow in an orderly manner.

Mr. Timmy Hirata, member of the Central Honolulu Community Association and also the District Superintendent of Honolulu Schools, read his prepared statement which was placed on file. He spoke on the designation of possible future school sites in the Ala Moana-Kewalo area. Based on a study conducted by the Association, a copy of which study was submitted, they contend that there is no justification to locate a school in that locality. Children from that area could be accommodated in other schools in the surrounding area; however, in the event future circumstances warrant an elementary school in the area, they would recommend a 4-acre school site and an adjoining 4-acre park site.

The Association supported the designation of the area across Kinau Street between Pensacola and Piikoi Streets as a park site since this would permit Kaahumanu School to build more classrooms on the existing school grounds and use the park as its playground. The Association also supported the proposal to designate the present HSPA Experiment Station site as a future school-park site to accommodate the projected population increase in the Wilder-Makiki district.

Mr. Robert W. Fiske, Pastor, Christ United Methodist Church, also President of the Associated Christian Churches of The Makiki Area, and a resident of Makiki, read his prepared statement which was place on file.

Speaking as a citizen and a resident of Makiki, he supported the medium density apartment designation for the area mauka of Wilder Avenue as recommended by the Central Honolulu Community Association. The area is currently designated for high density apartment use. As a result of increasing population, he mentioned traffic congestion as one of the problems confronting the area. Associated with traffic congestion is the problem of parking. He noted that there is not sufficient off-street parking to accommodate the many apartment residents and visitors in the area. He felt it logical to have a gradual

transition from high density apartment use makai of Wilder Avenue to medium density apartment use from Wilder Avenue to Nehoa Street to give greater protection to the residential area mauka of Nehoa Street.

Mr. Lowe then summarized the points made by the last three speakers. These related to:

1. Transportation. They felt that the freeway plan proposed by the State does not seem to take into account the generating potential of traffic in the area, even with present uses not to mention future uses that seem to be developing and perhaps will develop probably as a result of this plan.

2. Schools. While they take issue with the site of the school, they feel that if the population that develops justified a school, they would be the first to support that proposal.

3. Lower Makiki. They recognize that the General Plan designation and eventual zoning applying to this area will not determine to a satisfactory degree, the livability of the area; that is, whether it would be a good environment for apartments or not. Beyond general planning and zoning, they believe that good environment depends on such considerations as site planning, architecture of buildings and adequate provision for park and open space. If they can be assured that these other considerations will be given, they would prefer that the whole of Makiki be in high density use rather than to have a hodgepodge of low and medium density uses. Their major objective is for quality of environment.

Interrogated by Commissioner Yamabe, Mr. Lowe explained that his reference to architecture of buildings did not mean that the City should adopt an ordinance through which the City could control the actual design of apartments in high density designated areas. They did not wish to take a definite position against high density apartment use without qualifying that position. In other words, they do not absolutely prefer these densities over the high density because presently there are no method by which design can be controlled or that there is assurance that adequate open space would be provided. If these controls can be met, they would be receptive to changing their position about the high density designation.

Regarding the street system for the area, Mr. Lowe stated that the Association did not make a study in depth to make recommendations on the width of streets.

A section of the mass transit route is shown as going between the Honolulu International Center and McKinley High School. This route was shown because there is a need to link a maximum number of points between Waikiki and downtown. Subject to a lot of detailed study in design and engineering, they cannot say positively that this is the ideal and perfect location for the rapid transit line. It could be diverted to some other location.

Mr. Aaron Levine, Executive Vice President of the Oahu Development Conference, stated that they have been concerned about this area of the City for several years because of its critical location between Waikiki and the Downtown-Civic Center area and the fact that this area would have exerted on it tremendous pressures of Waikiki in terms of hotels, and from Downtown in terms of office and commercial utilizations. They also see this area with tremendous possibility for close-in living towards the Downtown area as well as the central location of the City. It could also meet some of the resort needs of the community and, consequently, they have worked with the Central Honolulu Community Association for the past several years in helping them develop the plan that is displayed on the wall.

The ODC concurred with the hotel use recommendation along Ala Moana Boulevard between Piikoi Street and Ward Avenue. Because of its close proximity to Waikiki, to the Honolulu International Center, shopping centers, to the park, and to Downtown, this area becomes a good location for both residents and hotel developments. He questioned the comments made that the mixture of hotels and apartments might not be good because of the mixture of people. If the area is put to apartment use instead of hotel, he felt that the same number of people,if not more, would be using the park. Ala Moana Park is not heavily used 4 or 5 days of the week so that greater use of it should be made.

He then suggested the following four modifications to the Detailed Land Use Plan. He noted that these modifications were presented in detail by members of the Central Honolulu Community Association:

1. On the school problem, he concurred with the very exhaustive study done by Mr. Hirata and the Deaprtment of Education.

2. He urged that the plan show improved interchanges between the H-1 Freeway and Piikoi Street and Keeaumoku Street.

3. He urged that the rapid transit line be indicated on the plan and marked as a tentative alignment.

He explained that the alignment shown on the Association's plan is based on the OTS alignment that says that there should be a line branching in the vicinity of the HIC and McKinley High School.

4. He urged that the DLUP show a lower density use makai of Nehoa Street and mauka of Wilder Avenue. The City Council has already set a precedent by reducing the density along the Punchbowl area. Similar to the University community, there should be a transition from high density use from the freeway to medium and low density next to the residential area along Nehoa Street.

Mrs. Linda Wan, owner of a property on Kapiolani Boulevard, inquired whether upon adoption of this plan, the zoning designations contained in the Comprehensive Zoning Code would be applied.

The Director explained to her that the proposed plan indicates land uses and not the specific types of zoning.

Mr. Richard Wong, Special Project Engineer for Victoria Ward, Ltd., owner of property in the Ala Moana-Kewalo area, concurred with the proposed plan as it applied to the properties owned by Victoria Ward., Ltd. Over the past few years, particularly the last six months, he has worked very closely with the Planning Director and his staff on the DLUP now proposed for adoption and thanked the Director and his staff for the opportunity to work with them and for the cooperation extended during the discussion period. He strongly urged the adoption of the plan as proposed.

There was no further testimony from the public.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission kept the hearing open and took the matter under advisement.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND
USE MAP
CENTRAL BUSINESS
DISTRICT

A public hearing, continued from October 17, 1968, was held to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu and the adoption of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for the Central Business District, for an area bounded by Nuuanu Stream, North King Street, Liliha Street, School Street, Nuuanu Avenue, Pauoa Road, proposed Pauoa Road-Auwaiolimu Street connector, Auwaiolimu Street, Prospect Street, Ward Avenue, Ala Moana Boulevard, Kewalo Basin and the ocean.

In compliance with the request of the Commission, the Director stated that the major changes suggested during the public hearing have been indicated on an overlay map. These relate to (1) designation of the mass transit line; (2) establishment of the Civic Center boundary; (3) retention of several historical buildings in the Merchant-Bethel Street area; and (4) closure of certain streets in the area.

The Commission discussed the four items separately and first received testimony on the mass transit line.

Mr. C. Beck, Executive Director of the Downtown Improvement Association, informed the Commission that on May 23, 1967, the City Council by Public Works Committee Report No. 978, relative to the Fort Street Mall and the Honolulu Central Business District Development Plan, recommended that: (1) the concept of the Fort Street Mall as proposed by the consultants be approved and accepted; (2) a 70-foot right-of-way width be established for Alakea Street; (3) the alignment for the mass transit lines be set on Hotel Street and building setback lines be established. With only one member, Mr. David Kaapu, absent, this indicated that the Council has at least approved in principle, the alignment of the mass transit line on Hotel Street.

He reported that presently in downtown, approximately 18,000 people live and work there. According to forecast derived from the Oahu Transportation Study, this figure is to increase to about 36,000 people in 1975, and to about 44,000 people in 1985. Also in the downtown area, a great deal of investment through major redevelopment projects has been put into the area. Some of these projects are the AmFac building costing about $27 million, the Bishop Trust building costing about $7-1/2 million and others which are actively being considered for a total investment in excess of $100 million. Therefore, the mass transit line should serve the City by going through its heart, which is Hotel Street, rather than along the upper perimeter.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Beck stated that numerous studies have been conducted for the downtown area. From these studies, they concluded that for optimum use, the downtown area should extend upward rather than to expand in the outer directions. Presently downtown is developed to an average of 1.69 stories with about five million square feet of developed area. They are now proposing an average of about 5 stories which would give room to develop an additional seven million square feet.

Mr. Aaron Levine, Executive Director of the Oahu Development Conference and also the Chairman of the OTS Citizens Advisory Committee which committee also had a subcommittee on mass transit, informed the Commission that the OTS was a study conducted jointly by the State, Federal and City and County governments. It is true that the final published report of the OTS showed the mass transit alignment on Beretania Street, but after the Planning Department completed its land use study, this study was discussed with other local groups and subsequently, the DMJM staff agreed on the Hotel Street alignment for the mass transit system. The reason Hotel Street is recommended is because many of them felt that downtown should be a compact area growing vertically rather than spreading out. Also, the proposal for Hotel Street as a pedestrian mall will result in its development at the same time as the mass transit line. If Beretania Street is dug for the mass transit line and Hotel Street developed as a mall at the same time, the motoring public will be greatly inconvenienced. It was a combination of these factors mentioned that resulted in their recommendation to indicate the mass transit line on Hotel Street with the understanding that it is to be clearly marked as tentative.

The Commission then received testimony on the proposal made to establish the Civic Center boundary on the Detailed Land Use Map. The proposed boundary was delineated on an overlay on the map displayed.

The Director explained that those who recommended the delineation of the Civic Center boundary wanted the adjoining land owners to be aware of that boundary so that consideration would be given to compatible uses and even compatible architectural design. The Director stated that the same type of control can be

accomplished through the establishment of the Historic and Cultural District under the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance and the boundary need not be shown on the DLUM.

No one testified on this proposal.

Testimony was then received on the request to retain several historical buildings in the Merchant-Bethel Street area. The land use proposal for the area is a parking garage.

The Director reported the receipt of a letter from Mrs. Dorothy W. Lindley, Chairman, Board of Directors of the Action for Beautification Council. He read the letter which stated that the ABC recently requested the Mayor to take the following actions:

"1. Officially recognize the existence of the list of buildings submitted to him by his Historic Buildings Task Force Committee.

2. Press for cooperation of all City Departments to halt the demolition of buildings as contained in the list, and actively encourage their preservation."

Recognizing the urgent need for parking for the Central Business District and also recognizing the need to retain the significant older buildings to make the CBD an interesting and unique part of the City, the ABC suggested that the buildings along the frontage of Merchant Street be retained and the back designated for the parking structure.

When asked about the scheduling for demolishing of these buildings, the Director stated his understanding that the proposed parking structure for the area is still in the preliminary design stage. The possibility of locating the Traffic Court within the same structure is still under discussion.

Mr. Mike McCormack, representative of the Hawaii Shopping Center Corporation, was pleased to note the many requests made to retain the four historic buildings on the proposed parking structure site. He stated that their organization has definite plans for utilization of those structures and they would like an opportunity of informing the Commission of their plans. They recognize the need for additional public parking facilities for the area and is therefore asking that consideration be given to retaining these structures and to construct the parking structure behind the buildings. If these buildings were of wooden construction and required tremendous renovation, they would not ask for this consideration, but the buildings play a significant role in forming the history of Honolulu and they believe that they can make it feasible to retain those buildings. They wanted an opportunity to approach the City or the State for long-term leases on these structures.

The Commission then discussed the suggestions made to modify certain portions of the street pattern.

The Director reported that the suggestions involve:

1. The closing of Punchbowl Street between Vineyard Boulevard and Beretania Street.

2. The closing of Kapiolani Boulevard Extension from Beretania Street to Kapiolani Boulevard.

3. The closing of Halekauwila Street between Ala Moana and Punchbowl Street.

For the above three proposals, the Director noted that the City Council had taken action to keep those streets open when it adopted the Development Plan for the Central Business District.

4. The closing of Kawaiahao Street between King and South Streets and made into a pedestrian mall.

5. Establishment of a setback along Miller Street below King Street in line with the face of the Federal building.

The Director stated that the land involved is all State property so that the setback could be established later without a specific designation as an open green area on the plan.

6. Designation of the extension of the Capitol Mall up to Vineyard Street.

The Director stated that this designation could be made to indicate a future action.

In discussing the Civic Center boundary, Mr. Yamabe asked for comments from the public should the Civic Center boundary not be reflected on the map.

Dr. Chester Terpstra felt it better to show the boundary so that people would be aware of it and to avoid a later hassle that might come up.

Mr. Levine stated that the boundary should be shown for two reasons. First, when the CZC becomes effective on January 2nd, the special district contained therein could be applied to this area. Property owners within the area will certainly be affected as well as those in the abutting areas so that the designation now will give notice to these people of the extent of the Civic Center boundary and the new regulations that would be applicable to the area. Second, the State House, during the last session, passed a house concurrent resolution asking that the Hawaii State Capitol complex be adopted, not in detail but in principle on the master plan, and one of the first consideration is to define the area, and this is the reason they are suggesting that the boundary be shown on the map.

Mr. Lemmon noted that the Civic Center boundary cuts across Punchbowl. If Punchbowl is to be included, he believed that the boundary should include the entire

area of Punchbowl. At the lower end of the boundary, he also noted that the boundary included a small portion of the industrial designated area of Fort Armstrong and he asked for an explanation from Mr. Levine.

Since he did not see the staff's overlay showing the boundary of the proposed Civic Center area, Mr. Levine stated that he could not check it with the Warnecke plan. He explained that the upper boundary does not include all of Punchbowl because the line shown is the extent of the jurisdiction of the Civic Center Policy Committee. He stated that the line was extended farther in the Koko Head direction to Ward Avenue at Thomas Square because that is the principle entrance to the Civic Center and the recommendation is to have heavy tree plantings at this entryway. He will check further into the line that extends into the industrial area.

Mr. Lemmon was receptive to the proposal to establish the boundary at this time if that is firmly to be the boundary, but he was reluctant to include industrial property in the Civic Center complex unless there is a proposal to convert that property into some other use.

Mr. Levine stated that they will make it very clear that the boundary is not the property acquisition boundary but merely an area within which certain controls and regulations would eventually be placed. It is primarily for visual impact of the Civic Center area so that the industrial areas, for example, will require plantings to a certain height to hide them and not be in conflict with the Federal building.

Referring back to the parking structure area and the request for retention of certain historic buildings, Mr. Ellis stated that the Downtown Improvement Association very strongly supported the City's plan for the construction of this perimeter high-rise off-street parking structure. The Traffic Director also took a strong position on the need for that parking structure. He asked for Mr. Beck's comment on the proposal made to slice off a portion of the parking area in order that the historic buildings might be retained.

Mr. Beck stated that Mr. William Lahmann did submit a plan for restoration of the historic buildings for consideration by the Executive Committee of the DIA but the Committee has not had an opportunity to consider that plan so that he could not offer any comment on it at this time. However, parking is vitally needed in the downtown area, therefore, the DIA had taken a strong position in support of the City's parking projects especially this project at Bethel Street.

Regarding the proposed Civic Center boundary, Mr. Beck had one reservation about showing this line at this time because no set policy or guidelines have been established as to how the area is to be policed, what

the architectural or development controls are to be, how the developers and property owners in the area are to be affected, and such other considerations. It is also quite possible that some delay and trouble would be encountered by the public because they must first have their plans approved by both the State and the City agencies.

Following the same thought, Mr. McCormack asked what effect the establishment of the boundary would have on property owners with small parcels and those with commercial zoned properties. For commercial properties, he asked whether this would establish land values.

The Director noted that the area below Punchbowl is designated for medium density apartment use so that one effect might be the limitation on the height of buildings. The density will remain the same but as a result of the lower height, a different configuration would be obtained. For commercial areas, the main consideration would probably be architectural design and landscaping.

Mr. McCormack stated that majority of the property owners do not understand the concept under consideration here. Recalling the incident which occurred where the density of properties in the Punchbowl area was reduced from 200% to 100% without the knowledge of some of the property owners and the subsequent deflation of the value of their properties as a result of that reduction, Mr. McCormack suggested that a special notice be given to the property owners before the proposed boundary is established.

In reply to Mr. Yamabe's inquiry, Mr. Levine and Mr. Beck stated that they have no objection to marking the proposed Civic Center boundary as tentative and later to hold a public hearing prior to establishing the line as permanent.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Lemmon, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

Mr. Ellis inquired how the Commission is to receive further testimony from the DIA regarding the parking structure if the public hearing is closed.

The Director stated that the Commission in the past has accepted written material even after the closing of a public hearing. In this instance, the Executive Committee of the DIA can apprise the Commission of its decision on the proposal submitted by Mr. Lahmann.

ACTION: Later in the meeting, upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission deferred further consideration of this matter until the next meeting.

GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
KALAUAO
MAKAI SIDE OF
KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY
BETWEEN KALAUAO
STREAM AND THE
SEWAGE TREATMENT
PLANT
(COMMERCIAL,
MEDIUM AND LOW
DENSITY APARTMENT
USES)

The Commission again considered a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa to Halawa by changing the land use designation from Industrial use to Commercial, Medium Density Apartment and Low Density Apartment uses for land situated on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway between Kalauao Stream and the City and County Kalauao Sewage Treatment Plant in Kalauao, Ewa, Oahu, and identified by Tax Map Key 9-8-14. The public hearing held on October 17th was closed, and the Commission deferred action for receipt of further information.

The Director reported that the Commission had requested information on the lease term of the property under lease to Urban Equipment, Inc., from the McCandless Heirs. The subject property containing 89,161 sq. ft. is situated between Kalauao Springs Ditch and the proposed extension of Lipoa Place, and Urban Equipment had objected to the proposal to designate this parcel for low density apartment use because of its intent to develop the property for industrial uses. The adjoining land owner, Bishop Estate, had also objected to the designation of low density apartment use for its land situated between the Springs Ditch and Kalauao Stream and requested that the land be retained in industrial use.

The Director stated that the McCandless Heirs have submitted a letter stating that their parcel of land at Kalauao is under a long-term lease to Urban Equipment, Inc., whose intention is to develop the property for industrial use. The proposed land use change will prevent such a development and they requested that no change be made for that subject parcel.

Urban Equipment, Inc., has also submitted a letter indicating that it has entered into a 55-year lease, commencing September 1, 1962 and ending August 31, 2017, on the subject property. The lease rental is $922 per month for the first 15 years, $1,110 per month during the next 10 years, and during each of the next three 10-year periods by agreement or arbitration. It had also expended sums of money in lease rental, property taxes, broker's fee, and so forth for a total expenditure of $80,085. Within a year or two, it intends to proceed with the development of the area for heavy equipment storage and repair shop, a carpenter shop, a service station and car wash establishment, and also storage of paint and miscellaneous construction equipment and material. Amending the use designation of the area would make it virtually impossible for the Company to recoup its investment, and it requested that no change be made for the subject parcel.

Although the letter does not state it, the Director stated that orally he was informed that the lease term does not restrict the use of the property to industrial use only.

On the Detailed Land Use Map displayed, the Director pointed out the area under consideration and the proposals to designate the tier of lots fronting on

Kamehameha Highway for commercial use, the interior lots predominantly in apartment use to medium density apartment use, and the 9.7 acres of land situated east of Lipoa Place and between Kalauao Springs Ditch and Kalauao Stream to low density apartment use. He also pointed out the uses in the surrounding areas. He indicated that the proposals under consideration would be in conformity with adjoining uses.

The Commission discussed the requests of the opponents and the reasons given for their opposition. It took into consideration the existing uses in the area and also in the surrounding areas. The area in dispute is presently vacant. Since the proposed use of the property under lease to Urban Equipment is for mixed commercial and industrial type of uses, the Commission discussed the possibility of extending the proposed commercial use designation to include the front portion only and to retain the industrial designation for the back portion of the parcel.

The Director recommended against such an action because this would result in a strip of commercial uses along Kamehameha Highway frontage and this is the type of development that he is trying to discourage. However, the area proposed for commercial use designation is presently developed with commercial uses.

When questioned about the width of the Springs Ditch, the Director stated that it is wider than this room.

In view of that information, the Commission believed that the Ditch as well as the Kalauao Stream and Kamehamhea Highway created a natural buffer to contain the industrial uses to this subject area.

When asked by the Commission for his comment, Mr. James Oshiro, attorney, representing Urban Equipment, Inc., pointed out the boundary of the property under lease from the McCandless Heirs. In view of the proposal to develop the area for industrial types of uses as mentioned, he requested that the subject area be retained for industrial uses.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr.Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission recommended approval of the proposals to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa to Halawa by changing the land use designation from Industrial to:

(1) Business for land fronting on Kamehameha Highway between the Sewage Treatment Plant and Kalauao Springs Ditch; and

(2) Medium Density Apartment use for land situated to the rear of the business use and bounded by Kalauao Springs Ditch, Pearl Harbor (East Loch) and the Sewage Treatment Plant;

and to recommend the retention of Industrial use for land situated east of Lipoa Place

and between Kalauao Springs Ditch and Kalauao Stream proposed by the Planning Director for Low Density Apartment use.

STREET NAMES
MAUNALUA
HAWAII-KAI
KAMILONUI
AGRICULTURAL
SUBDIVISION

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, recommended approval of the following street names:

(1) Roadway within the Kamilonui Agricultural Subdivision at Hawaii-Kai, Maunalua:

KAMILONUI PLACE - Deadend roadway extending off Hawaii-Kai Drive and running in a mauka direction to a deadend.
Meaning: District name

STREET NAMES
PEARL CITY, EWA
MOMILANI SUBURB,
UNIT X SUBDVN.

(2) Roadways within Momilani Suburb, Unit X Subdivision at Pearl City, Ewa:

HOOMOANA STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a mauka direction from Komo Mai Drive.

HOOHAI STREET - Extension of an existing roadway within this unit so that it runs from the mauka intersection with Hoomoana Street in a makai direction and again crosses Hoomoana Street and terminates at deadend.

HOOHAI PLACE - Deadend roadway off Hoohai Street between Hoomoana Street and Hoolaulea Street.

HOOLAULEA STREET - Extension of an existing roadway from Hoolehua Street across the drainage channel to Hoomoana Street.

HOOHOIHOI STREET - Roadway extending from Hoomoana Street in a Waipahu direction being between Hoohai Street and Komo Mai Drive.
Meaning: To entertain

HOOKAHUA STREET - Roadway from Hoomoana Street to Hoohai Street and between Hoolaulea Street and Hookumu Place.
Meaning: To lay a foundation

HOOKUMU PLACE - Deadend roadway off Hoohai Street between Hookahua Street and Hoomoana Street.
Meaning: To originate; to establish; to start

STREET NAMES
WAIPIO, EWA
WAIPIO HEIGHTS
SUBDIVISION,
UNIT 2
(CRESTVIEW)

(3) Roadways within Waipio Heights Subdivision, Unit 2 (Crestview) at Waipio, Ewa:

LUMIAUAU STREET - Extension of an existing roadway from Lumiaina Street in a makai direction to terminate at its connection with Kamehameha Highway.

LUMIHOAHU STREET - Extension of an existing roadway from Lumiaina Street in a makai direction thence toward Honolulu to terminate at its connection with Lumipolu Street.

LUMIHOAHU PLACE - Deadend roadway off Lumihoahu Street between Lumiauau Street and Lumiloke Street.

LUMIKULA STREET - Extension of an existing roadway from Lumiaina Street in a makai direction to terminate past Lumipolu Street.

LUMIALANI STREET - Roadway extending from Lumihoahu Street to Lumiauau Street between Lumiaina Street and Lumimoe Street.
Meaning: Orange Room

LUMILOKE STREET - Roadway extending from Lumialani Street to Lumihoahu Street and being between Lumimoe Street and Lumialani Street.
Meaning: Rose Room

LUMIMOE STREET - Roadway extending from Lumihoahu Street to Lumiauau Street between Lumiloke Street and Lumihoahu Street.
Meaning: Bedroom

LUMIPOLU STREET - Roadway extending from Lumikula Street in a mauka direction past Lumihoahu Street.
Meaning: Blue Room

LUMIPOLU PLACE - Deadend roadway off Lumipolu Street between Lumikula Street and Lumihoahu Street.

STREET NAMES PEARL CITY, EWA MOMILANI SUBURB, UNIT VIII DELETION OF "HOOKANI STREET"

The Commission also recommended the deletion of HOOKANI STREET from Resolution No. 309 of August 13, 1968, and to substitute thereto:

HOOKANIKE STREET - Roadway running from Hoomalu Street to Hoohulu Street between Hooiki Street and Hoohaaheo Place within the Momilani Suburb, Unit VIII Subdivision at Pearl City, Ewa, Oahu.
Meaning: To toll the bells

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima

Carole A. Kamishima
Secretary-Reporter II

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
November 14, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, November 14, 1968, at 1:45 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Richard K. Sharpless presiding:

PRESENT:

Richard K. Sharpless, Chairman
Philip T. Chun
Robert L. Muller
Arthur A. Rutledge (excused at 5:30 p.m.)
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Moses Lum Hoy, ex-officio

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director
Denis Leong, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Cyril W. Lemmon
Robert F. Ellis, ex-officio

MINUTES:

The minutes of September 19, and October 3, 1968, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING APARTMENT
DISTRICT C
PAUOA
BETWEEN AUWAIOLIMU
STREET AND
PUOWAINA DRIVE
R. HOLLINGER

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to change the zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District C, in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Plan for Lower Pauoa, for two parcels of land containing a total area of 24,312 sq. ft., situated between Auwaiolimu Street and Puowaina Drive, east of Whiting Street in Pauoa, and identified by Tax Map Key 2-2-13: Parcels 8 and 10.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of November 3, 1968 was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the property owner, and to the Punchbowl Community Association. No written comments or protests have been received to date.

The Director explained the proposal by pointing out the subject two parcels on the Detailed Land Use Plan map displayed. One parcel fronts on Auwaiolimu Street and the other parcel fronts on Puowaina Drive. Existing rental units are to be demolished and the proposal is to construct a five-story, 15-unit apartment on the Auwaiolimu Street side of the property. Water and sewer facilities are adequate to serve the proposed development. The

owner is willing to comply with the requirements of Ordinance No. 2412 which require the construction of sidewalks. Since the rezoning proposal conforms to the Detailed Land Use Plan of the area and the necessary utilities are available and will be made available under an improvement district project soon to be initiated, the Director recommended approval of the rezoning proposal.

No one spoke in opposition to this rezoning proposal.

Mrs. Theresa K. Malani, residing in the near vicinity of the subject property, spoke in favor of the proposal to rezoning the property for apartment use.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Class A Residential to Apartment District C for the two parcels of land situated between Puowaina Drive and Auwaiolimu Street in Pauoa.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
WAIKIKI
337 ROYAL
HAWAIIAN AVENUE
DR. DONALD W.
HEWITT

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Hotel-Apartment District to Business for two parcels of land containing a total area of 7,200 sq. ft. at 337 Royal Hawaiian Avenue, situated on the Mauka-diamond head corner of Royal Hawaiian Avenue and Lauula Street in Waikiki, and identified by Tax Map Key 2-6-19: Parcels 13 and 14, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Plan for Waikiki.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of November 3, 1968, was read by the Director who reported that copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the applicants, Urban Renewal Coordinator, and to the Waikiki Improvement Association. No letters of comment or protest have been received to date.

The Director explained the proposal by reporting that Royal Hawaiian Avenue which fronts these two parcels has a right-of-way width of 60 feet and a pavement width of 32 feet in fair condition. There are concrete sidewalks and standard curbs and gutters. Under Ordinance No. 2412, it is possible that the sidewalk could be increased in width. Each lot contains an area of 3,600 sq. ft., and while one lot is vacant, the other lot has an old dwelling on it. This dwelling is to be removed and the two lots consolidated for the proposed development of a car rental structure, measuring 30 feet by 20 feet, containing a waiting area, work space, bathroom facilities, office, counter space, and storage areas for a total floor area of about 540 square feet. It is to be a one-story structure and the remainder of the property is set aside for the rental cars. Water and sewer facilities are adequate and available to service the proposed development.

Referring to the Detailed Land Use Map displayed, the Director pointed out the subject two parcels. He stated that abutting property owners within this block indicated no desire to have their properties zoned for business use at this time, and as a result, only the zoning of these two parcels was initiated. Since the proposed zoning conforms to the Detailed Land Use Plan of the area and utilities are available, the Director recommended approval of the rezoning proposal.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Morio Omori, attorney, representing the applicant, confirmed that the existing dwelling house is to be demolished and the two lots consolidated to permit the commercial development.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Muller, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Hotel-Apartment District to Business for the two parcels of land situated at 337 Royal Hawaiian Avenue in Waikiki.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING RESORT-
HOTEL DISTRICT
NO. 1
LAIE
55-289 KAMEHAMEHA
HIGHWAY
THERESA K.
MALANI AND
WOODROW W. MIGGS

Prior to holding of the following public hearing, Mr. Chun declared a conflict of interest and left the room.

The Director read the notice of public hearing published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of November 3, 1968, to consider a proposal to change the zoning from Highway and Rural Protective Zone to Resort-Hotel District No. 1, for a 117,676 sq. ft. parcel of land at 55-289 Kamehameha Highway, situated on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway between Kaipapau and Anemoku Streets on the Kaneohe side of Laie Point at Laie, identified by Tax Map Key 5-5-02: Parcel 3, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Plan for Koolauloa. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to Zions Security, and to the Laie Community Association. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

The Director explained the proposal by pointing out the location of the subject property situated on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway in Laie and designated for resort use on the adopted Detailed Land Use Map of the area. He stated that:

1. This is the same property for which the City Planning Commission on December 5, 1957, granted a variance to permit Pat's at Punaluu to relocate its existing restaurant facilities to this parcel. However, because the plans to relocate the restaurant did not materialize, the variance permit was terminated by the Commission on November 12, 1958.

2. Subsequent applications for a zoning change to Business and also to Hotel and Apartment were denied on November 9, 1959, and on December 14, 1959, respectively, on the basis that the requests did not conform to the General Plan for Laie.

3. The present request conforms to the adopted Plan for the Laie area.

4. The Board of Water Supply does not have a line extending to this area and commented that the private water system serving this area is not adequate to serve the proposed use. As a result, the developer will be tapping into the Board of

Water Supply line which is some distance away to bring water to the area.

5. Public sewerage facilities are presently not available and the developer will use the Cavittete system as approved by the Board of Health.

6. Kamehameha Highway is a State highway and it presently has a right-of-way width of 50 feet and a pavement width of 21-1/2 feet with no sidewalks, curbs and gutters.

7. Kamehameha Highway is proposed to be widened and the developer will respect this street widening setback area.

8. The development plan submitted shows the construction of a 5-story, 108-unit apartment structure with 157 parking spaces. The total floor area of 64,800 sq. ft. is less than 100% FAR which is permitted in the Resort-Hotel District 1.

9. The development plan also shows a swimming pool, a concrete walk and a seawall in the back of the property. The developer was apprised of the zoning regulation relating to 10-foot setback from the Zone of Wave Action and as a result, the plan will be revised to observe the setback requirement.

10. The State Highway Department reported no objection to the proposed rezoning.

Since the proposed zoning conforms to the General Plan, and water and sewer facilities will be made available, the Director recommended approval of the rezoning proposal.

Testimony was heard from the public. No one spoke in opposition to the proposal, but Mr. N. Muraki asked whether or not water and sewer facilities are presently adequate as stated on the agenda.

The Director explained that the developer will be meeting the Board of Health's requirement on sewage disposal, and for water, he will be extending a line to the Board of Water Supply's system at his own expense. He was informed that the extent of this line will be approximately 6,000 feet.

Mr. Robert K. Fukuda, attorney, represented the owner and the developer of the subject property. He had nothing to add to the presentation made by the Director and stated that the applicants will comply with all the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

There was no further testimony from the public.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Muller, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Highway and Rural Protective to Resort-Hotel District No. 1 for a 117,676 sq. ft. parcel of land at 55-289 Kamehameha Highway in Laie. (Mr. Chun was not present at this time.)

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING CLASS A-2
RESIDENTIAL
WAIPAHU
BETWEEN WAIPAHU
STREET AND H-1
HIGHWAY
OAHU SUGAR COMPANY,
LIMITED

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to change the zoning from Class A-1 Residential and Rural Protective zone to Class A-2 Residential for an area of land situated between Waipahu Street and the Interstate Highway (H-1), and easterly of Mahoe Street in Waipahu, identified by Tax Map Keys 9-4-07, 9-4-23 and 9-4-24, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for Waipahu.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of November 3, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to Oahu Sugar Company, Waipahu Businessmen's Club, and the Wailani, Crestview and Waipio Community Associations. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

Referring to the Detailed Land Use Map of the area, the Director reported that 43.9 acres of land are to be changed from Rural Protective zone to Class A-2 Residential, and 14.9 acres changed from Class A-1 Residential to Class A-2 Residential. In order to provide for uniformity in zoning, the Class A-2 zoning was extended to include the August Ahrens School property situated at the corner of Mahoe Street and

Waipahu Street and presently zoned Class A-1 Residential. Since the Rural Protective zoning permits 5,000 sq. ft. lots, it seems reasonable to zone to Class A-2 Residential which increases the lot size to 6,000 sq. ft. Although the 14.9 acres of Class A-1 zoning are to be decreased in size, the residential zoning classification is in keeping with the residential character of the neighborhood.

The Director pointed out on the map the alignment of the H-1 Highway, Waipahu Street, existing uses in the surrounding area, and the existing zoning in the abutting areas which are Class A and A-2 Residential. He stated that water and sewer facilities will be installed by the developer as the land is subdivided. He recommended approval of the rezoning proposals.

Mr. Yamabe inquired of the Director whether he intended to utilize much of the Class A zoning classification in areas outside of Honolulu.

The Director replied that this would depend on the type of development proposed. He noted that there are a number of Class A zoned districts as well as the Rural Protective districts in this area of Waipahu subdivided into 5,000 sq. ft. lots. He had no particular objection to 5,000 sq. ft. or 6,000 sq. ft. lots, but generally, zoning should be uniform rather than allotted into small pieces of different zoning classifications.

Mr. Yamabe commented that an administrative policy statement made several years back indicated that the Class A zoning was best suited for areas where sufficient land is not available and this type of development was needed, and it was not to be used primarily in a new area. Following this line of thought, if the A-2 zoning is to be utilized in this area, he felt that further consideration should be given to extending this zoning to the surrounding areas.

There was no one to speak either in opposition to or in favor of the proposed rezoning.

<u>ACTION:</u> Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval

of the change in zoning from Class A-1 Residential and Rural Protective zone to Class A-2 Residential for 58.8 acres of land situated between Waipahu Street and the H-1 Highway in Waipahu.

PUBLIC HEARING
AMENDMENT TO THE
SUBDIVISION RULES
AND REGULATIONS,
SECTIONS 10-M
AND 10-N

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to amend the Subdivision Rules and Regulations by amending Section 10-M, relating to requirements of lot area; and Section 10-N, relating to requirements of lot width to:

1. Conform to the requirements of the Comprehensive Zoning Code (Ordinance No. 3234);

2. Permit a minimum lot width of 25 feet for attached dwellings; and

3. Prohibit irregular boundary lines.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of November 3, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the American Institute of Planners, the A.S.C.E., the American Institute of Architects, Real Estate Board, Home Builders Association, the Outdoor Circle, and to the Chamber of Commerce. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

The Director read the specific wordings of the amendments as follows:

Section 10-M is to read as follows:

"M. LOT AREA. The term 'minimum lot area' is defined as that area of a lot exclusive of easements or rights-of-way for ingress and egress in favor of others and easements for drainage channels; provided that easements and/or rights-of-way for water, sewer, and/or other public utility purposes shall be excluded from the provisions hereof.

The minimum lot area for each lot in a subdivision shall conform to the requirements of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, Ordinance No. 3234."

Section 10-N is to read as follows:

"N. LOT WIDTH. The minimum lot width for each lot in a subdivision shall conform to the requirements

of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, Ordinance No. 3234. For attached dwellings minimum lot width shall be twenty-five feet. Irregular boundary lines, in order to conform to building spacing or yard requirements, shall not be permitted."

The Director explained that Item one regulates the minimum lot area for each lot in a subdivision to conform to the particular lot size requirements of that zoning district as contained in the CZC and defines the term "minimum lot area". Item two, is to permit a minimum lot width of 25 feet for attached dwellings, such as a townhouse development with common walls, which could either be sold in fee simple or leasehold without going into horizontal condominium development. Under the present regulation, the minimum lot width permitted is 50 feet for lot sizes of 6,000 sq. ft. or less and 60 feet for lots larger than 6,000 sq. ft. Under the new zoning ordinance, townhouses and cluster developments are permitted on a minimum lot size of 2,500 sq. ft. per dwelling unit, but for single detached dwellings, no subdivision into 2,500 sq. ft. lots is permitted. Presently the townhouse type of development is permitted only in the apartment districts, but because of the demand in Hawaii for this type of housing, it will now be permissible in the R-4, R-5, and R-6 Residential districts.

Regarding the third item on irregular boundary lines, the Director stated that the present language in the Subdivision Rules and Regulations is too vague to allow him to disapprove subdivisions which create irregular boundary lines. As a result, the new language states that irregular boundary lines, in order to conform to building spacing or yard requirements, shall not be permitted.

In reply to questions from the Commission, the Director proceeded to illustrate on the Board, various patterns of irregular boundary lots some of which have acute angles making it difficult to maintain those areas. Sometimes the irregular boundary lines are created because of the topography of the area while at other times it is to go around an existing building. He stated that flag lots will automatically be eliminated because the zoning ordinance specifies a front yard

requirement and a flag lot will not be able to meet that requirement.

Regarding the 25-foot minimum width for attached dwellings, the Director explained that this is permitted for townhouse development or a development similar to row housing where a row of houses are attached together with common walls in-between. However, the ordinance specifies a maximum number of eight units only so that if this type of development is to be continued, the next row of eight units must be separated from the other row of eight units by an open space and vary its setback. Each of the units would be sited on an individual lot having a minimum area of 2,500 sq. ft. and can be owned individually in fee simple or as a leasehold. For mortgage loan purpose, the separate ownership makes it that much easier for a person to obtain a loan. Later, the Building Code and the Housing Code would have to be amended to allow this type of development.

Referring to the item on irregular boundary lines, Mr. Yamabe asked whether this is to be a mandatory prohibition and who is to determine what is a regular or an irregular boundary line.

The Director stated that he faces this problem of irregular boundary lines every week, and while in some cases it cannot be avoided, in others it can be improved upon and the subdivider is requested to make the improvement, but if the subdivider does not, he is powerless to disapprove that subdivision. Elsewhere in the Subdivision Rules and Regulations, there is a provision for granting modifications and he has the authority to do this when a situation is presented where it is impossible or impractical for the subdivider to conform fully to the requirements of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations. This new amendment gives him a more effective guideline for determining what is an irregular boundary line and deny that subdivision, and while he does not expect a 100 percent improvement, it should accomplish a greater percentage of better laid out lots.

Mr. Yamabe then inquired about the exclusion of road easements and drainage channels from the total area calculation of a lot.

The Director stated that the exclusion on road easement is presently in effect and the amendment carries out the same intent. Exclusion of easements for drainage channels was added because the Public Works Department has established areas of building lines along these stream channels so that those areas should be excluded from the lot area calculation. However, similar to the present regulations, easements for water, sewer and other public utilities can be included in the total area for building purpose. Existing lots of record would not be affected by this new provision which is to be applied to new subdivisions. Therefore, after deducting the road easement or channel easement, if the new lots to be created cannot meet the minimum lot size requirement of that zoned district, the subdivision would not be approved.

No one responded to the Chairman's call for testimony either in favor of or in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Subdivision Rules and Regulations.

The Director reported his receipt of several phone calls about the proposals but no comments in writing have been received.

With no objection from the Commission, the Chairman deferred this item until the end of today's calendar.

Later in the meeting, the Commission continued this public hearing.

The Director reported that he has just received a letter from the Home Builders Association of Hawaii. The Association is recommending that instead of 25 feet, the minimum width for attached dwellings be set at 20 feet together with a minimum depth of 90 feet. They contend that a livable unit can be built on this size lot and it would add substantially to making this type of moderate income housing available.

The Director stated that he did discuss this provision with the Association previously. His experience in working with two projects of this type has been that even a 30-foot minimum creates a problem because not many street frontages are left for visitor parking.

Mr. Yamabe had some reservations about the provision which excludes the areas of road easements from the total lot area because this makes it difficult for some lots to

be further subdivided.

The Director explained that road easements have always been excluded. Basically, the amendments are merely to make the requirements on lot area and lot width to conform to the requirements contained in the Comprehensive Zoning Code which is to become effective on January 2, 1969.

No one testified.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposed amendments to Section 10-M, relating to requirements of lot area, and Section 10-N, relating to requirements of lot width, of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP OF KANEOHE
TO KUALOA (AMEND)
KANEOHE-HEEIA
VARIOUS CHANGES

A public hearing, continued from October 31, 1968, was held to consider a proposal to amend the Kaneohe-Heeia portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe to Kualoa area by:

1. Changing certain land use designations within the area covered by the ahupuaa of Heeia; and

2. Modifying the right-of-way width of Kamehameha Highway between Waikalua Road and Lilipuna Road from 100 feet to 84 feet.

The hearing had been kept open to allow the residents in the area to be apprised of the various changes proposed.

The Chairman informed the audience of the receipt of a phone call from Senator Hulten who stated that some groups in the area had not yet considered fully the proposals discussed at the public hearing held two weeks ago, and therefore, requested that this matter be deferred for two weeks. However, noting the presence of a number of interested persons in the audience, the Chairman proceeded with the hearing for receipt of new testimony.

Mr. T. F. McCormack, developer of Bishop Estate's land in Heeia, spoke on the proposal to redesignate the apartment-marina complex of about 150 acres situated in the marsh land mauka of the Heeia Viaduct to Residential-Golf Course complex. He

stated that two weeks ago when the plan was presented to the public at the hearing, he noted that approximately 10 acres of land immediately mauka of the Heeia Viaduct were designated for park purpose at the request of the Parks Department in order to save the mangrove trees growing there. He stated that the people interested in developing the golf course were of the understanding that 150 acres were involved, but when they learned that the area was reduced to 140 acres, they withdrew their interest. As a result, he is now requesting the Commission to remove the proposed Residential-Golf Course complex designation for the subject area and retain the present Apartment-Marina complex shown on the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the area. He is also requesting that the residential designated area near the City's Corporation Yard and below a cemetery be changed to apartment use because several people have indicated their interest in living near the water of Kaneohe Bay and enjoying the view.

When asked by the Commission whether the golf course developer would still be interested if the 10-acre parcel designated for park use were to be changed to golf course use, Mr. McCormack replied in the affirmative.

When asked whether the golf course could be expanded elsewhere and not be confined to this particular section requested by the Parks Department, Mr. McCormack stated that no other suitable land for golf course use is available in the immediate adjoining areas. The lands are too steep and not adaptable for golf course use. For that reason, a portion of the golf course crosses to the other side of the roadway.

Replying further to questions from the Commission, Mr. McCormack stated that no one discussed with him, this proposal to take 10 acres from the golf course area. He was surprised to learn about it two weeks ago and because of the shortness of time, he has not had an opportunity to discuss the matter with the Parks Department. He assumed that the Parks Department is not going to develop the area as a park but just to protect the mangroves that grow there. At this time, he felt that the present Apartment-Marina use designation of the area should

be retained on the Plan so that in the event the 10-acre parcel cannot be changed from park use to golf course use, resulting in no development of a golf course, they would not have to come back and ask to have the area changed back to apartment use.

The Director then acknowledged receipt and read the following letters which were placed on file:

1. The Kaneohe Community Council, after receiving the presentation made by the Planning Department staff on Wednesday evening, November 6, took the following position:

   a. For Haiku Road, the existing right-of-way should remain at 100 feet and the medial strip retained.

   b. For Kamehameha Highway, the existing right-of-way should remain at 100 feet and the medial strip retained.

   c. Positive documented assurance that the Kahekili Highway end of the proposed light industrial area will be adequately screened from the view of adjacent residences and motorists on Kahekili Highway.

   d. That strict control of the interior development and use of the light industrial area be maintained so as to preserve the scenic beauty presently available to residents of the area and passers-by.

   The Council expressed concern that the proposed commercial and light industrial areas will compound the existing traffic congestion in the area and pose a threat to safety. The reduction of existing right-of-way widths would be poor planning and could tend to limit the full development potential of the area. They recognize the need for additional industrial area in their community, but they are fearful that the helter-skelter development and use of the light industrial area will do irreparable harm to the Kaneohe community.

2. The Kaneohe Outdoor Circle submitted the following recommendations for the Commission's consideration:

a. The medial strip in Haiku Road between Kamehameha and Kahekili Highways should be retained.

b. Retain the strip of apartment zoning along Kahekili Highway instead of changing the use to industrial.

c. Whatever light industrial development that is permitted in the area should be limited in height, type, etc., to preserve esthetics to the surrounding residential neighborhood.

d. Detailed notice should be sent well in advance to the communities in the future when such changes are proposed.

3. The Haiku Plantation Association took the following stand:

a. It is opposed to the recommended change to extend the light industrial area to Kahekili Highway.

b. It is opposed to the reduction in width of both Haiku Road and Kamehameha Highway.

4. The Windward Citizens Planning Conference requested that additional time be given to examine possible alternatives to the proposals set forth in the staff's recommendations. These related to park and school sites, industrial uses, and the widths of Haiku Road and Kamehameha Highway. It also requested the assistance and cooperation of the Planning Department staff in meeting with its task force to discuss the studies which led to the staff's recommendations so that optimum solution and recommendations can be made for the best possible plan.

When asked by the Commission whether the request by the Windward Citizens Planning Conference had been considered by the Planning Department, the Director stated that this is the first time he has seen the letter and the request.

Mr. O. K. Stender, President of the Windward Citizens Planning Conference, who was in the audience was asked how long a time period is he requesting.

Mr. Stender did not wish to delay the matter too long and indicated that they would be working on it as fast as they possibly could depending on their meeting with the Planning Department.

Mr. Darryl Rose, President of the Chamber of Commerce of Windward Oahu, stated that the Chamber fully supports and encourages the orderly development of more business and light industry in Windward Oahu. They are aware of the shortage of industrial zoned or master planned land in Windward Oahu and because of their desire to create more jobs for the citizens and to ensure the economy of the area, the Chamber endorses the proposal to create 47 acres of light industrial area off Kahekili Highway near Keaahala Road. This endorsement was subject to the establishment of a buffer strip of not less than 40 feet along Kahekili Highway with attractive tree plantings and maintenance of the strip. The Chamber was also opposed to high-rise development within the industrial park.

Mr. Dale Trenhaile, President of the Kaneohe Community Council asked Mr. Rose for the Chamber's position on highway widths.

Mr. Rose replied that the Chamber is not taking any position on highway widths.

In view of the request made for deferral by the Windward Citizens Planning Conference and Senator Hulten, Mr. Trenhaile also requested deferral to give the people further opportunity to study the various proposals.

Mr. Yamabe asked Mr. Trenhaile to clarify the Kaneohe Community Council's position on the light industrial area. According to the letter, positions three and four taken requested positive documented assurance that the light industrial area along Kahekili Highway will be adequately screened and that strict control of the interior development and use of the light industrial area be maintained. Yet, the letter further states the Council's opinion that the creation of the proposed commercial and light industrial areas will immediately compound existing traffic congestion and pose a threat to safety along the major routes. Mr. Yamabe asked whether the reference is to the same area.

Mr. Trenhaile stated that the reference to traffic congestion was not to the undeveloped area at Kahekili Highway and Keaahala Road but to Kamehameha Highway and the proposed commercial development on the makai side of the highway. A shopping center is proposed to be developed there and the anticipated increase in traffic generated in the area will require a wider road. Since the right-of-way width is set aside now, he felt that it should be retained. The road need not be widened now but the right-of-way should be set aside for future need. On the proposed light industrial area, they had taken a position to seek assurance that certain controls would be taken to screen the area.

In view of the requests made for deferral of this item again and to give the people ample opportunity to study the various proposals, the Chairman suggested that the public hearing be kept open and the matter reconsidered in four weeks.

The Commissioners were agreeable to the suggestion but Messrs. McCormack, Trenhaile and Stender stated that four weeks was too long and that two weeks should be sufficient.

Mr. George Hasegawa, developer of the proposed industrial area, was against the delay. He reminded the Commission that the proposed General Plan amendments have been held in abeyance since July of 1966. The proposals were made known to the community association as far back as August, 1966, and discussed as recently as two weeks ago. In the meantime, the officers of the association have changed, membership increased, and their first proposals delayed that much longer. He noted that at the meetings, different groups of people are present each time, and although he respect the pros and cons of the issue and the people's request for more time to study the proposals, the arguments presented by them over the years have not changed and he has yet to hear a concrete suggestion made that would be acceptable. He emphasized that this constant delay is costly. As far as the type of development proposed, he noted that there should be adequate control through the Comprehensive Zoning Code.

ACTION: In the interest of the community and based on what has been expressed this afternoon, Mr. Yamabe

moved to keep the public hearing open until the next meeting of the Commission and to take action on this matter at that time. The motion was seconded by Mr. Chun, and carried.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
PLAN AND DEVELOP-
MENT PLAN
CENTRAL HONOLULU
DISTRICT (MAKIKI,
PAWAA, ALA MOANA)

A public hearing, continued from October 31, 1968, was held to consider a proposal to adopt the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan for the Center Honolulu District, Planning Area No. 13 (Makiki, Pawaa, Ala Moana); and amendment to that portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu for land bounded by Kewalo Basin, Ward Avenue, Prospect Street, Nehoa Street, Punahou Street, Beretania Street, Kalakaua Avenue, Ala Wai Canal and the shoreline, including Magic Island.

Since the last hearing, the Director reported on the receipt of another letter from the Dillingham Development Corporation. The Corporation had suggested that the proposed school and park site at Queen, Kamakee and Waimanu Streets be relocated to a site where the public need would be served. After further study, the Corporation now makes another suggestion that the extension of Pensacola Street be made to connect with Queen Street rather than with Auahi Street as shown on the Detailed Land Use Map. A sketch showing the proposed extension to Queen Street was displayed. The Corporation believed that the extension to Queen Street would help relieve traffic on Ala Moana and on Kapiolani Boulevards by acting as another connector street to disperse traffic straight into the Central Business District.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. George K. Houghtailing, consultant, planner, and civil engineer, spoke on behalf of the Dillingham Development Corporation. Referring to the sketch plan shown, he elaborated on the proposal made to extend Pensacola Street to tie in with Queen Street instead of Auahi Street as presently proposed. He indicated that this route will facilitate the movement of traffic from the Makiki area straight into the Central Business District and the Civic Center thus alleviating heavy traffic flow into Ala Moana and Kapiolani Boulevards. The Auahi Street route, whereas, would carry traffic to Ala Moana, opposite Pier 2, and cause a traffic congestion at that intersection.

The Commission noted that under the staff's proposal, traffic can flow onto Queen Street as well as onto Auahi Street.

Mr. Houghtailing noted a jog at the intersection with Queen Street so he believed that traffic would use Auahi Street. He did not believe that traffic should be encouraged to use Auahi Street and out into Ala Moana Boulevard to congest that intersection.

The Commission noted that under the new proposal, a short section of Auahi Street still extends out to Ala Moana so that traffic can still enter Ala Moana.

Mr. Houghtailing believed that this short section of Auahi Street could be closed, but he noted that Ward Estate which owns property in the area might have its own development plan for the area. By revising its plans, he felt that Ward Estate might be agreeable to closing that section of Auahi Street.

Noting a representative from the Ward Estate in the audience, the Commission asked him whether the Estate had any plans for developing the area.

Mr. Richard Wong stated that the Estate presently has no plans to close that street.

When asked by the Commission whether he had discussed the proposal with the staff, Mr. Houghtailing replied that he did, but within the staff level itself, there is a difference of opinion.

Mr. Muller asked for an explanation on the suggestion made to relocate the school-park complex designated at Queen, Kamakee and Waimanu Streets.

Mr. Houghtailing stated that they had asked for the relocation because those uses are not compatible in the area. The new proposal to extend Pensacola Street to tie in with Queen Street will cut through the area. He did not believe that the anticipated population in the area would justify a school site there and the closeness of Ala Moana Park makes a park site there unnecessary.

When asked for the Planning Department's justification for proposing a school-park site in the area, the Director stated that

the proposed high density development in the area will justify the need for another elementary school site in the area. It is quite possible that the school district boundary could be adjusted, but the staff felt that a site should be designated in the area. The community association had suggested that a site be selected within the Sheridan Tract area but he noted that it is most difficult to find a site in that area because it is completely built up on small individual lots and with narrow streets. Other schools in the vicinity are Kaahumanu Elementary School and Linekone School which is a special school for handicapped children. A new elementary school site is proposed within the HSPA property in Makiki because the anticipated population growth in that area shows a need for another elementary school. Pohukaina School which is situated in the Kakaako industrial area is also used for handicapped children. He believed that the Department of Education will continue to use that school for the handicapped children.

Mr. Rutledge asked whether consideration was given to the fact that a school will bring in more traffic into the area during those hours of the morning and in the afternoon when school is out to mix with the commercial traffic. He also asked whether the Traffic Department had studied such a possibility, and whether there are bus services to the area.

The Director did not believe that the Traffic Department studied the street pattern proposal in relation to schools but he stated that it did look at the overall street pattern for this planning area. It is quite possible that there will be a combination of working people traffic mixed with the school traffic because parents are known to drop their children off at school on their way to work. There are bus services along Kapiolani Boulevard and on Ala Moana Boulevard.

In discussing the school proposal further, the Director pointed out the boundary of the area which would be serviced by the proposed school in the Ala Moana-Kewalo area. He stated that the Department of Education is not ready to release Pohukaina School as an elementary school.

He understands that Linekone School might either be used as the main library or the headquarters of DOE. This question has not been resolved as yet. Regarding the selection of school sites, he stated that these selections were made jointly with the Department of Education after considerable study and discussion. The proposal to extend Pensacola Street to Queen Street was discussed with Mr. Houghtailing but the staff has concluded that the connection with Auahi Street was better.

No one else testified.

Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

ACTION: Later in the meeting, the Commission deferred further consideration of this matter upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND
USE PLAN
CENTRAL BUSINESS
DISTRICT

The Commission deferred further consideration and action on a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu and to adopt the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for the Central Business District bounded by Nuuanu Stream, North King Street, Liliha Street, School Street, Nuuanu Avenue, Pauoa Road, proposed Pauoa Road-Auwaiolimu Street connector, Auwaiolimu Street, Prospect Street, Ward Avenue, Ala Moana Boulevard, Kewalo Basin and the ocean. The public hearing held on October 17, 1968, was continued on October 31 and closed.

ZONING CLASS A,
A-1, & AA RES.
MAUNALUA
HAWAII-KAI
DEVELOPMENT
KAISER HAWAII-
KAI DEVELOPMENT
COMPANY

The Commission again considered proposed changes in zoning from existing Farm District and Unrestricted Residential to Class A, A-1 and AA Residential for land situated within the Hawaii-Kai development at Maunalua, in conformity with the General Plan. The proposed zoning changes involve 506.730 acres to Class A Residential, 145.509 acres to Class A-1 Residential, and 163.440 acres to Class AA Residential. The developer will construct all the required improvements including streets, utilities, and drainage facilities at the time the area is ready to be subdivided and developed.

The public hearing held on October 31, 1968, was closed and the Commission had deferred action for two weeks to permit the developer to meet with the hog farmers and apprise the farmers of the time schedule of development and when the farmers would be expected to move from the area. The Director stated that he has not been informed about the result of that meeting.

Mr. Donald Iwai, attorney, representing the Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company, stated that he did submit a letter to the Planning Director and also a copy of that letter to Mrs. Lillie Wong, President of the Koko Head Farm Bureau, with respect to the schedule of development and the relocation notification to the farmers in the Kalama Valley area, east of Kamehame Ridge. His letter states that after conferring with members of the Hawaii-Kai staff including the project manager, it was concluded that Hawaii-Kai will be ready to go into the area within a year and probably can commence construction of the roadway because it takes about a year to construct the roadways. However, Hawaii-Kai is willing to make a commitment that it will not cause the farmers to move from the area for at least 18 months. They have prepared a notice to this effect for sending to the farmers, a copy of which was attached to the letter to the Director.

When asked by the Commission whether he had discussed this commitment with the farmers, Mr. Iwai replied that he did not. It was not his understanding that he was supposed to meet with the farmers to work out a time schedule for relocation of the farmers. He explained that the farmers in the area are presently on the premises on a month-to-month basis. The notice merely states to the farmers that their month-to-month tenancy will be terminated in 18 months or starting from December 1, 1968 until May 1, 1970.

Mrs. Lillie Wong was asked whether she had any comment to make.

Mrs. Wong stated that this is the first she has heard about the letter and its content. She has not received a copy of that letter. Since the last Commission meeting and about three months prior, the hog farmers attempted to meet with Mr. Iwai but with no success. She met with the hog farmers

last evening and she stated that the farmers are quite concerned about being displaced because they have no where to go and eventually may have to terminate their farm business. She mentioned that in 1959, the State Legislature passed a concurrent resolution asking that the State, the City and County of Honolulu, Bishop Estate, Hawaii-Kai and others help find suitable farm land where the hog farmers could locate. At the time the Hawaii-Kai Development had its initial start, they did go to the State for help in locating land that could be made available to the hog farmers. Since then they have gone back continually to the State but so far has had no success. She stated that the hog farmers in Hawaii-Kai provide 46% of the pork industry for Hawaii but over the years the number of hog farmers has decreased. There were 30 hog farmers in the area but recently two had moved out.

When informed by the Commission that regardless of what action taken by the Commission on the rezoning proposals, Hawaii-Kai can still evict the farmers, Mrs. Wong replied that the farmers realize that. They just don't know what to do. They have been hog farmers all their lives and they would hate to leave that business. She introduced Mr. Tokio Okudara, manager of the Island Pork Corporation, to speak on the pork industry.

Mr. Okudara stated that in previous years, the Koko Head area was the major pork production area for Oahu but it has dropped down to 15% of production because two years ago it underwent a control program to eradicate brucellosis which is a disease that afflicts the mother pig so that the litter died within two weeks. As a result, pork production is at an all time low and the price of pork is very high. Should the farmers in the Blow Hole area be affected too, within a short period of time, about 90% of the total Oahu production will be lost. They would then be placed in a position where they cannot compete with the mainland producers. He stated that about 70% of the farms are within the validated area or cleared of the disease. Their major concern is time since they would need about two more years to validate the remaining 30%. Their request, therefore, is to give them time to complete the brucellosis control

program and until they have reached the stage where they can supply the need of the market.

Mr. Rutledge commented that the Commission has been very sympathetic with the plight of the farmers and, as a result, it had delayed the rezoning actions for lands affecting the crop farmers until a satisfactory negotiation on relocation had been completed with Hawaii-Kai. In this instance, the farmers are again asking the Commission to help them in their negotiation with Hawaii-Kai to delay their displacement from the area and, at the same time, to help them find a suitable site to relocate. The Commission is still in sympathy but he felt that the farmers were appearing before the wrong Commission in seeking help to locate another site. They should go to the State government or seek help from a Farm Bureau. Their request for a delay in displacement from the area is also before the wrong body. He felt that the farmers were depending too much on the Planning Commission for help. They should take the initiative to help themselves by discussing their problem with the proper agencies and to negotiate with the land owner about their plight on displacement because sooner or later, they would have to face the problem of relocation.

Mr. Okudara stated that their first concern is time and their ability to satisfy the market demand.

After questioning Mr. Okudara and obtaining further information, Commissioner Yamabe explained to the Commission what is involved in the brucellosis control program. He stated that brucellosis is a disease that causes the mother pig to abort and as a result the litter is lost. In conjunction with the State and the Federal government, the pork producers have initiated a program to eradicate the disease by completely eliminating their pigs and starting their whole operation from the very beginning. About 70% of the farms have been cleared of the disease and 30% remains. In the process of this eradication, the pork industry has suffered a sharp drop in production and cannot supply the demand on Oahu.

Therefore, this additional problem of displacement is of great concern to the farmers. Hawaii-Kai has offered them a delay of 18 months while the farmers are requesting two years, for a difference of only six months.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Okudara stated that it takes time to start from the beginning until they can reach the stage of peak production. Two years should give them sufficient time to reach that peak production stage. The farmers are quite aware that they must eventually move from the area, and those who are able financially will be gradually moving from the area.

Mrs. Wong apologized if she had given the impression that they were seeking the Commission's help in locating a site for the hog farmers because that is not her statement. She stated that the farmers know that they must move from the area and they have met with the Farm Bureau for negotiation with the State to find a site for relocation. They were seeking information on the time schedule for development of the area so that there can be an orderly transition from the area.

ACTION: Mr. Rutledge moved to recommend approval of the changes in zoning from Farm District and Unrestricted Residential to Class A, A-1 and AA Residential for land situated within the Hawaii-Kai Development at Maunalua. The motion was seconded by Mr. Chun and carried.

The Commission suggested to Hawaii-Kai and the hog farmers that they continue their discussion and negotiation on the scheduled timetable for relocation.

LAND USE
COMMISSION
PETITION
WAIMALU AND
WAIAU
(BISHOP ESTATE
AND BISHOP TRUST
CO.,--AUSTIN
HEIRS)
URBAN DISTRICT

The Commission considered at the same time, the petition submitted by the Trustees of the B. P. Bishop Estate and the petition submitted by the Bishop Trust Company and the Austin Heirs for an amendment to the Land Use Commission District Boundary by changing the district classification from Agriculture to Urban District for land involving 702 acres in Waiau situated between the proposed H-1 Interstate Highway and the boundary of the Conservation District (TMK: 9-8-02: 03) owned by the Bishop Estate, and the adjoining land involving

1,276 acres in Waimalu (TMK: 9-8-08: 3 and 9-8-11: 8) owned by the Austin Heirs.

Three maps were displayed on the Board. The first map represented the existing land uses in the area extending from Aiea to Pearl City with the two land holdings outlined and showing the dividing lines of the Conservation, Agricultural and Urban Districts. The second map represented the tentative development plans for the two areas by showing the various types of land uses proposed and the extent of the urban district boundary requested with an overlay showing the urban boundary recommendation of the staff, and the existing detailed land use plan of the area. The third map indicated the slope of the land in different identifying colors: black represented land below 20% slope which is generally considered developable land; medium brown, 20 to 30% slope; and dark brown, over 30% slope, the latter considered as undevelopable land.

The Director explained that the different types of land uses shown are not the subject of discussion today. The two requests are for a boundary change to Urban District under the Land Use Commission Act. As shown on the map, the applicants' requests follow the boundary shown in blue while the staff's recommendation is slightly below and is shown in red outline. For the steep undevelopable lands recommended for inclusion in the Urban District, the staff will later recommend that they be designated as Preservation District which is a new district provided for in the new Comprehensive Zoning Code. Also within the Urban District, a small section in the upper area will be indicated for agricultural use under the jurisdiction of the City and County of Honolulu. Therefore, the staff's recommendation is for a total of 1,367 acres to be placed in the Urban District. The breakdown would be, 793 acres of usable urban development, 211 acres in agriculture, and 363 acres in the Preservation District. The remaining acres requested by the applicants would be retained in the Conservation District.

In reply to questions from the Commission, the Director confirmed that this is the same area that the Commission considered sometime last year for a boundary change to Urban District. At that time, the

Commission recommended approval of the applicants' requests but the staff had recommended approval only up to the boundary of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map designation for residential use. Recognizing the fact that this area is sandwiched in between two developed urban areas and in time will go into urban use, the staff now believes that the urban line can be extended farther up and beyond the urban use boundary of the Detailed Land Use Map. However, a small section of the applicants' request was eliminated because the area is considered too steep for urban development.

He indicated that the basic question is timing of development. The developers will be installing most of the utility lines for water and sewer, and the street improvements as the land is subdivided, but this would in turn create a demand for schools, parks, and other public facilities so that there must be sufficient notification to the different public agencies involved to meet with the developers to schedule the needed facilities together with the development of the area.

The area recommended for agricultural use is presently in cane cultivation. Because of the isolation of the area and the terrain which is a little difficult to develop for residential purposes, the area will later be zoned as agriculture under jurisdiction of the City and County zoning ordinance.

Mr. Morio Omori, attorney, represented both applicants since the lands adjoin each other and the issues, facts, and the applicable regulations affect both petitioners. He first cited the provisions of the Land Use Commission Act under which the petition for a boundary change is being made. Under provisions of that Act, he reminded the Commission that they are not present today for consideration of a General Plan amendment or zoning changes, but to obtain a recommendation from the Planning Commission as to whether or not the area should be changed to an Urban District designation. The development plans submitted were merely to indicate the developable areas and how the land could be developed.

He indicated that the proposed boundary change is the first step in a long process for development of the area. Should they be successful in obtaining the Urban District designation for the area, they must then come back to the Planning Department to have the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map amended and at that time, the details of how much acreage should go into residential, apartment, preservation, and so forth could be discussed. After the General Plan amendment is made, they must again come to the Director and the Commission with a zoning plan and at that time more detailed plans for utilities, schools, parks and other requirements could be determined.

Since this application is a rehash of the same application made last year, he wondered whether he should present again, the justification for the change. However, he noted that the Commission at that time did recommend approval of their request based upon their testimony.

Mr. George K. Houghtailing, also representing the applicants, referred to the existing land use map of the area and stressed that the two subject lands are the only area left vacant between two urbanized areas. Their prior request went up to the forest reserve line, but this revised request comes down a little and ties in with the existing urban line on both sides.

Regarding the proposed Preservation District area and the different types of land use classifications shown on their development plan map, he indicated also that these uses could be worked out with the staff later after the area is placed in the Urban District. He pointed out that their request and the staff's recommendation differs only slightly. They certainly would not develop the areas that have adverse topography, but in order to have flexibility in development and also to avoid, so-called, irregular boundary lines, they are requesting that the Commission approve the boundary as submitted by the applicants.

Regarding the boundary, Mr. Omori stated that a better example would be a situation that occurred in Nuuanu where a developer had developed lands situated within the Conservation District. Because the

developer had checked a small-scaled map and having difficulty in determining exactly where the Conservation District line started, the violation had occurred. In order to preclude that type of situation, they feel that the boundary requested by them should be approved. He emphasized that when they apply for a General Plan amendment followed by zoning, the staff can specify more exactly where the urban use boundaries should be, and this could be based upon the topography of the land.

Should the Commission recommend approval of the boundary proposed by the staff, the Commission commented that the landowners could submit another application for the balance of the area by showing a need for the change.

Mr. Omori reiterated the situation that occurred for land in Nuuanu and also in the Kuliouou area where there was a dispute on the exact boundary of the Conservation line. To avoid situations of that nature, they require flexibility of movement. Due to the long process involved in getting the boundary changed first, followed by a General Plan amendment, then zoning, they would prefer not going through that lengthy process again if the difference in boundary can be settled now. He also reiterated that the control on the actual urbanization line still rests with the Commission at the time of the General Plan amendment and zoning.

The Commission asked Mr. Omori what bases were used to determine the mauka boundary line.

Mr. Omori replied that the line was determined on market feasibility and in accordance with the best planning concept being imposed on the land. This included the consideration of slope, the location of utilities--water, sewer, etc.--and also consideration of the various amenities that a subdivision of this nature would have to provide with reference to schools, playgrounds, and so forth.

Mr. Houghtailing indicated that they would have to construct water reservoirs in the upper area to serve the area below in accordance with the Board of Water Supply's requirement. Even though the land is not usable for residential

purpose, they can put in the reservoirs which must be placed at a distance of about 100 feet away from the developed areas. If those reservoirs are placed in the Conservation District, they must make an application to the State Board of Land and Natural Resources for permission. In order to avoid this additional procedure, they prefer that the land where the reservoirs are to be placed would be in the Urban District. This designation is to be done with the understanding that they would not develop those areas of adverse topography.

Due to diverse reasons given by the staff and the petitioners for determining the mauka boundary, the Commission felt that they should meet with each other and come to some sort of agreement on the boundary.

Mr. Houghtailing replied that they did meet with the staff and the line shown is the compromise line.

The Director confirmed this fact and noted that Mr. Houghtailing had extended that line.

The Commission took into consideration the testimony given that the water reservoirs must be situated about 100 feet above the last lot line and that at the time of the General Plan amendment and zoning, those areas with slopes of 20% and over could be placed in the Preservation District. It noted that the difference between the staff's recommendation and the petitioners' boundary is very slight. It asked whether the Conservation District line is also the Forest Reserve line.

The Director replied that the Forest Reserve line is farther up and the applicants' requests do not go up that far.

ACTION: Mr. Yamabe moved to recommend to the Land Use Commission that the petitions submitted by the Trustees of the B. P. Bishop Estate, the Bishop Trust Company and the Austin Heirs for land in Waiau and in Waimalu for a change in the district classification from Agriculture to Urban District be approved in accordance with the boundaries of their requests. The motion was seconded by Mr. Chun and carried.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director:

ZONING BUSINESS MAKAHA HANA AND ORANGE STREETS ANN LEUNG LAU	(1) Change in zoning from Rural Protective to Business, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 19,914 sq. ft. parcel of land situated on the southeast corner of Hana and Orange Streets in Makaha, Waianae.
ZONING BUSINESS WAIANAE 87-282 FARRINGTON HIGHWAY DAVID AWONG	(2) Change in zoning from Highway Protective to Business, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 10,000 sq. ft. parcel of land situated at 87-282 Farrington Highway in Waianae.
GENERAL PLAN DLUM (AMENDMENT) KANEOHE-HEEIA 45-773 KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY (COMMERCIAL USE) DR. M. KAGAWA	(3) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe-Heeia by changing the land use designation from Residential to Commercial use for a 20,725 sq. ft. parcel of land situated on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway, at the corner of Kamehameha Highway and Meli Place in Kaneohe.
GENERAL PLAN DLUM OF WAIAWA TO HALAWA (AMEND) KAONOHI, KALAUOA VARIOUS CHANGES	(4) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa to Halawa by changing certain land use designations for parcels of land located in Kaonohi, Kalauao, Ewa, Oahu, as follows:

a. From Park use to Commercial and Public Facility uses (hospital) for land situated between the proposed Moanalua Road realignment and the existing Moanalua Road;

b. From Park and Commercial uses to Agricultural use for land situated on the makai side of the existing Moanalua Road;

c. From Residential and Low Density Apartment uses to Public Facility use (school site) for land situated mauka of the H-1 Interstate Highway, along Kaonohi Street;

d. From Residential use to Public Facility use (school site) for land situated between the H-1 Highway and the proposed Moanalua Road realignment;

e. From Public Facility use (school) to Parks and Recreation for land situated between the H-1 Highway and Moanalua Road realignment; and

f. From Residential use to Agricultural use for land situated mauka of the proposed school site along Kaonohi Street.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT KAONOHI, KALAUAO MAUKA OF MOANALUA ROAD, EWA OF LEEWARD HOSPITAL (OFF-STREET PARKING USE)

(5) A request for a Conditional Use Permit to use for off-street parking purposes, parcels of land located on the ewa side of the Leeward Hospital, mauka of existing Moanalua Road at Kaonohi, Kalauao, and adjoining a Business District, in compliance with the provisions of Section 21-250 of Ordinance No. 3234 of the City and County of Honolulu.

STREET NAME HEEIA, KAHALUU AHUIMANU UNITS 1-B, 2 & 3 SUBDIVISION

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, recommended approval of the following street name for a roadway within the Ahuimanu Units 1-B, 2 and 3 Subdivision at Heeia, Kahaluu, Koolaupoko:

HUI IWA STREET - Extension of an existing roadway from Hui Ulili Street in a makai direction to cross Kahekili Highway thence terminating at a deadend.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT TO THE CIP FOR FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 1968 TO JUNE 30, 1969 (SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 2)

The City Council had referred to the Planning Commission for its review and recommendation, Bill No. 172 entitled: "Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 2. An Ordinance amending Ordinance No. 3188, as amended, relating to Capital Improvements of the City and County of Honolulu for the fiscal year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969." (A copy of Bill No. 172 was incorporated into the minutes.)

Mr. Moses Lum Hoy, Acting Budget Director, explained the amendments as follows:

NEW CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS:

Reimbursement to the Improvement Revolving Fund for funds advanced to purchase land for the Kaneohe Corporation Yard.....$ 20,421

Kaimakani Street widening from Moanalua Highway to Ulune Street..... 215,000

Salt Lake Boulevard for planning and engineering studies.....	50,000
Acquisition of a 5,500 sq. ft. parcel of land at 2476 Kuhio Avenue, Waikiki, designated on the General Plan for public use (off-street parking).	135,000
Total New Projects: $	420,421

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR EXISTING PROJECTS:

Aiea Recreation Center Improvements (construction of bleachers).....$	1,250
Coconut Avenue Area Improvement District (planning and engineering).....	222,000
East Kaimuki Improvement District (planning and engineering).....	127,000
Fort Street Mall, Beretania to Queen (construction, City's share).....	148,000
Kalihi-Uka Sewers, Section V, Improvement District (construction).....	95,000
Kapiolani Boulevard Overpass at Kalakaua Avenue (planning and engineering).....	100,000
East Loch Interceptor Sewer, Section IV, Phase II (construction).....	35,000
Miscellaneous Land Acquisition for Sewer Projects (land).....	50,000
Sewer Extensions and Connections--Property Owners Share (construction).....	297,000
Sewer Extensions and Oversizing--City's Share (construction).....	309,000
Ala Moana Park Drainage Canal--Kalia (construction).....	200,000
Bethel-King Off-Street Parking Facility (land, planning and engineering).....	685,000
Total Additional Requirements:	$2,269,250
TOTAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM:	$2,689,671

METHOD OF FINANCING:

Current Revenues.....	$ 313,671
General Obligation Bonds...	658,000
Transfer of Appropriations from the Highway Improvement Bond Fund.....	1,718,000
TOTAL:	$2,689,671

The Program is also to be amended as follows:

CULTURAL RECREATION:
Honolulu Children's Zoo--First Increment
Add "and preparation of the master planning of the entire Children's Zoo and the detailed planning for the first increment of construction."

PARKS AND PLAYGROUND:
Kalihi-Waena Playground
Add "and landscaping."

The Chairman reported that a member of the Planning Department staff did apprise him of the proposed amendments in advance of today's meeting.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission recommended approval of Bill No. 172.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

The Chairman appointed Mr. Robert L. Muller as the Chairman of the Sub-Committee to review Capital Improvement Program items in advance with the staff.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima
Carole A. Kamishima
Secretary-Reporter II

(AMENDED)

ORDINANCE NO. _____
(BILL NO. 172 , 1968)

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 2

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 3188, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU FOR THE FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 1968 TO JUNE 30, 1969.

BE IT ORDAINED by the People of the City and County of Honolulu:

SECTION 1. Ordinance No. 3188, as amended, relating to Capital Improvements of the City and County of Honolulu for the fiscal year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969, is hereby further amended as follows:

a) Appropriating the following amounts of moneys which are in addition to the amounts of moneys estimated from current revenues and proceeds to be realized from the sale of general obligation bonds appropriated by Ordinance No. 3188, as amended:

General Fund.....	$ 293,250	
Highway Fund.....	20,421	
General Improvement Bond Fund.....	629,000	
Highway Improvement Bond Fund.....	29,000	
Total.....		$ 971,671

b) Reducing the appropriations in the following amounts for projects financed out of proceeds to be realized from the sale of general obligation bonds as authorized by Ordinance No. 3188, as amended:

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT BOND FUND

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS		
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS--GENERAL:		
Division of Engineering		
Fort Street Mall, Beretania to Queen.....	1,148,000	
Keolu Drive Improvement District, Vicinity of Shopping Center to Kalanianaole Highway.....	570,000	
Total Reductions.....		1,718,000
TOTAL.....		$2,689,671

are hereby appropriated for the purposes as set forth in Section 2 hereof for the fiscal year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969.

SECTION 2. The moneys as appropriated in Section 1 hereinabove shall be and are hereby appropriated for the following projects:

	General Fund	Highway Fund	General Improvement Bond Fund	Highway Improvement Bond Fund	Total
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION					
PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS:					
Aiea Recreation Center Improvements	$ ---	$ ---	$ 1,250	$ ---	$ 1,250
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS					
CORPORATION YARDS:					
Division of Engineering					
Kaneohe Corporation Yard	---	20,421	---	---	20,421
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS--GENERAL:					
Division of Engineering					
Coconut Grove Area Improvement District	---	---	---	222,000	222,000
East Kaimuki Improvement District	---	---	---	127,000	127,000
Fort Street Mall, Beretania to Queen	---	---	---	148,000	148,000
Total Improvement Districts--General	---	---	---	497,000	497,000
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS--SEWERS:					
Division of Sewers					
Kalihi-Uka Sewers, Section V, Improvement District	---	---	95,000	---	95,000
ROADWAYS:					
Division of Engineering					
Kaimakani Street Widening, Moanalua Highway to Ulune Street	---	---	---	215,000	215,000
Kapiolani Boulevard Overpass	---	---	---	100,000	100,000
at Kalakaua Avenue	---	---	---	50,000	50,000
Salt Lake Boulevard	---	---	---	365,000	365,000
Total Roadways	---	---	---	365,000	365,000
SEWERS:					
Division of Sewers					
East Loch Interceptor Sewer, Section IV, Phase II	---	---	35,000	---	35,000
Miscellaneous Land Acquisition for Sewer Projects	---	---	50,000	---	50,000
Sewer Extensions and Connections--Property Owners Share	297,000	---	---	---	297,000
Sewer Extensions and Oversizing--City's Share	---	---	309,000	---	309,000
Total Sewers	297,000	---	394,000	---	691,000
STORM DRAINS:					
Division of Engineering					
Ala Moana Park Drainage Canal--Kalia	---	---	---	200,000	200,000

	General Fund	Highway Fund	General Improvement Bond Fund	Highway Improvement Bond Fund	Total
UNCLASSIFIED:					
Division of Engineering					
Acquisition of Parcel TMK:2-6-24:2 Located at 2476 Kuhio Avenue.....	---	---	135,000	---	135,000
TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.....	297,000	20,421	624,000	1,062,000	2,003,421
TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT					
OFF-STREET PARKING:					
Bethel-King Off-Street Parking Facility.....	---	---	---	685,000	685,000
TOTAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	$297,000	$20,421	$ 625,250	$ 1,747,000	$2,689,671

SECTION 3. This Ordinance shall take effect upon its approval.

INTRODUCED BY:

DATE OF INTRODUCTION:
October 22, 1968
Honolulu, Hawaii

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Deputy Corporation Counsel

308-C

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CAPITAL PROGRAM
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 1968 TO JUNE 30, 1969

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 2

NEW CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS FOR 1968-1969 FISCAL YEAR

CORPORATION YARDS:		
Kaneohe Corporation Yard		
Reimburse Improvement Revolving Fund for Advanced Funds for Land Acquisition		$ 20,421
ROADWAYS:		
Kaimakani Street Widening, Moanalua Highway to Ulune Street--Construction	$ 215,000	
Salt Lake Boulevard Planning and Engineering	50,000	265,000
UNCLASSIFIED:		
Acquisition of Parcel TMK:2-6-24:2 Located at 2476 Kuhio Avenue		135,000
TOTAL NEW CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS FOR 1968-1969 FISCAL YEAR		420,421

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS 1968-1969
FISCAL YEAR PROJECTS

PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS:	
Aiea Recreation Center Improvements Construction of Bleachers	1,250
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS--GENERAL:	
Coconut Avenue Area Improvement District Planning and Engineering	222,000
East Kaimuki Improvement District Planning and Engineering	127,000
Fort Street Mall, Beretania to Queen Construction, City's Share	148,000
Total Improvement Districts--General	497,000
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS--SEWERS:	
Kalihi-Uka Sewers, Section V, Improvement District Construction	95,000
ROADWAYS:	
Kapiolani Boulevard Overpass at Kalakaua Avenue Planning and Engineering	100,000
SEWERS:	
East Loch Interceptor Sewer, Section IV, Phase II Construction	35,000
Miscellaneous Land Acquisition for Sewer Projects Land	50,000
Sewer Extensions and Connections--Property Owners Share Construction	297,000
Sewer Extensions and Oversizing--City's Share Construction	309,000
Total Sewers	691,000

STORM DRAINS:

Ala Moana Park Drainage Canal--Kalia		
Construction		200,000
OFF-STREET PARKING:		
Bethel-King Off-Street Parking Facility		
Land	$ 525,000	
Planning and Engineering	160,000	685,000
TOTAL ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS 1968-1969 FISCAL YEAR PROJECTS		2,269,250
TOTAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM		$2,689,671

METHOD OF FINANCING

CURRENT REVENUES	
General Fund	$ 293,250
Highway Fund	20,421
BOND PROCEEDS	
General Obligation Bonds	658,000
TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATIONS	
Highway Improvement Bond Fund	1,718,000
TOTAL	$2,689,671

AMENDMENTS TO PROGRAM ONLY

CULTURAL RECREATION:

Honolulu Children's Zoo--First Increment

Add "and preparation of the master planning of the entire Children's Zoo and the detailed planning for the first increment of construction."

PARKS AND PLAYGROUND:

Kalihi-Waena Playground

Add "and landscaping."

FLASH NO. 2

PLANNING COMMISSION

INDEX TO MINUTES

NOVEMBER 27, 1968 TO JUNE 5, 1969

BOOK NO. 125

Note: For purposes of the Comprehensive Zoning Code which became effective January 2, 1969 and changed various zoning classifications, indexing for the period from November 27 to December 26, 1968, is separated from matters considered in 1969.

Also, items are indexed according to the DATE of their occurrence, and under the various CLASSIFICATIONS (i.e. - Capital Improvement Program, Conditional Use Permit, etc.).

November 27, 1968 to December 26, 1968

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM:		PAGE
Dec. 12, 1968	Amendment to the C.I.P. for Fiscal Year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969 (Supplementary No. 3)	58

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:		
Nov. 27, 1968	Kaonohi, Kalauao - Mauka of Moanalua Road - Ewa side of Leeward Hospital - Off-Street Parking Use - Amfac Trousdale	11
Dec. 26, 1968	Makaha-Waianae - Makaha Valley - Ilikai Hotel	69

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN:		
Nov. 27, 1968	Central Honolulu District (Makiki, Pawaa, Ala Moana) Planning Area No. 13	24
Nov. 27, 1968	Central Business District	25
Dec. 12, 1968	(Planning Area 13) - Makiki-Pawaa-Ala Moana (Central Honolulu District)	43
Dec. 12, 1968	Central Business District	49
Dec. 12, 1968	Tantalus-Makiki - (Planning Area No. 12)	55

GENERAL PLAN AND/OR DETAILED LAND USE PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN (AMENDMENT):		
Nov. 27, 1968	Kaneohe to Kualoa - Kaneohe-Heeia - Kamehameha Highway and Meli Place - Commercial use - Dr. Miyozo Kagawa	4
Nov. 27, 1968	Waiawa to Halawa - Kaonohi-Kalauao - Various changes	8

GENERAL PLAN AND/OR DLUP AND DP (AMENDMENT): (Cont.)

Nov. 27, 1968	Kaneohe to Kualoa - Kaneohe-Heeia - Various changes	13
Nov. 27, 1968	Wahiawa - Grandview Tract Subdivision - Sewage Pump Station	26
Dec. 12, 1968	Wahiawa - Within the Grandview Tract Subdivision	30
Dec. 12, 1968	Kaneohe to Kualoa - Kaneohe-Heeia - Various changes	37
Dec. 26, 1968	Waiawa to Halawa	69

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION:

Dec. 12, 1968	Waipahu - Abutting Pearl Harbor - Herbert K. Horita Realty, Inc. - By: Roy Takeyama, Attorney - (Urban District)	57
Dec. 26, 1968	Waipahu - Abutting Pearl Harbor - Herbert K. Horita Realty, Inc. - By: Roy Takeyama, Attorney - (Urban District)	64
Dec. 26, 1968	Kahaluu - Melekula Road - Bulldozing Services, Ltd. - (Urban District)	67

MISCELLANEOUS:

Dec. 12, 1968	State Land Use District and Regulation Review Presentation	59

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT-HOUSING:

Dec. 26, 1968	McCully - Off Kapiolani Boulevard - Reed & Martin Investment Corp.	69

SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE:

Dec. 12, 1968	Amendment to Section 22-5.1	58

SUBDIVISION RULES AND REGULATIONS:

Dec. 12, 1968	Amendment to Sections 10, 11 and 19	58

ZONING - APARTMENT DISTRICT C:

Dec. 12, 1968	Pauoa - Between Pacific Heights Road and Pali Highway, Makai of Pauoa Road - State of Hawaii	58
Dec. 26, 1968	Pauoa - Between Pacific Heights Road and Pali Highway, Makai of Pauoa Road - State of Hawaii	63

ZONING - BUSINESS:

Nov. 27, 1968	Makaha - Hana and Orange Streets - Eugene K.F. and Ann Leung Lau	1
Nov. 27, 1968	Waianae - 87-282 Farrington Highway - David Awong	2
Nov. 27, 1968	Kapahulu - 3046 Monsarrat Avenue - Young Hung	25
Nov. 27, 1968	Aiea - 99-236 Moanalua Road - St. Timothy's Episcopal Church	26
Dec. 12, 1968	Kapahulu - 3046 and 3058 Monsarrat Ave. - Edward Ho and Young Hung	27
Dec. 12, 1968	Aiea - 99-236 Moanalua Road - St. Timothy's Episcopal Church	28
Dec. 26, 1968	Kaonohi, Kalauao, Ewa - Owner: B.P.Bishop Estate - Developer: Amfac-Trousdale	69

ZONING - INDUSTRIAL:

Dec. 26, 1968	Kaneohe - Mauka of Kam. Highway across Duncan Tract, and approximately 100 feet south of City Mill premises - Messrs, Thomas T. Kozuma, Richard Azama, et al	69

ZONING - NOXIOUS INDUSTRY:

Dec. 12, 1968	Ewa - Barbers Point, within The Campbell Industrial Park - Estate of James Campbell	58
Dec. 26, 1968	Ewa - Barbers Point, within The Campbell Industrial Park - Estate of James Campbell	61

ZONING - RESORT HOTEL DISTRICT #1:

Dec. 26, 1968	Makaha Valley, Waianae - Makaha Valley, Incorporated	69

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

January 9, 1969 to June 5, 1969

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM:

Mar. 6, 1969	Amendment to the C.I.P. for Fiscal Year 1968-1969 (Supplementary No. 4)	129
Apr. 3, 1969	Amendment to the C.I.P. for Fiscal Year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969 (Supplementary No. 5)	145
Apr. 17, 1969	Six-Year Capital Improvement Program 1970-1975	156
May 1, 1969	Amendment to the C.I.P. for Fiscal Year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969 (Supplementary No. 6)	168
May 15, 1969	Amendment to Capital Budget Ordinance and C.I.P. for Fiscal Year 1968=1969 (Supplementary No. 7)	215
June 5, 1969	Amendment to the C.I.P. for Fiscal Year 1969-1970	219
June 5, 1969	Amendment to the C.I.P. for Fiscal Year 1968-1969 (Supplementary No. 8)	222

COMPREHENSIVE ZONING CODE:

Jan. 23, 1969	Amendment to Part C relating to Sign Regulations and Off-Street Loading Requirements	97
Feb. 6, 1969	Amendment to the CZC relating to Sign Regulations; Off-Street Loading Requirements; Use Regulations in the A-4 Apartment District; Minimum Yard Spacing in the H-2 Hotel District; B-2 Community Business District; and Transition Redistricting of Hotel-Apartment Districts	99
May 1, 1969	Amendment to Section 21-202(f) - Relating to Waiver of Requirements of Public Uses or Utility Installations	170
May 15, 1969	Amendment to Section 21-202(f) - Relating to Waiver of Requirements of Public Uses or Utility Installations	181

COMPREHENSIVE ZONING CODE: (Cont.)

June 5, 1969	Various Amendments: Section 21-110, Definition of "Family" and "Ground Elevation" and adding definition of "Retaining Walls" Section 21-202(a), Front Yards Section 21-202(d), Fences and Walls in Yards Section 21-280(i)(4), Cluster Developments Section 21-301(c), Conditional Uses in Agricultural Districts Section 21-501(c), Conditional Uses in Residential Districts Section 21-501(b), Accessory Uses in Residential Districts Heights provisions in the Preservation, Agricultural, Residential and A-1 Apartment Districts	232 235

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:

Jan. 9, 1969	Makaha Valley - Approximately 1,000 feet mauka of Farrington Highway, Kaena side of Makaha Golf Course - Makaha Valley, Inc.	75
Mar. 6, 1969	Kalauao, Ewa - Off-Street Parking - Miyasato Family - By: Okumura and Takushi, Attorneys-At-Law	128
Mar. 20, 1969	Kalauao, Ewa - Mauka of Kam. Highway - approximately 150 feet easterly from Kihale Street (Off-Street Parking Use) - Miyasato Family - By: Okumura and Takushi, Attorneys-At-Law	131
Mar. 20, 1969	Maunalua - Luna-Kai Marina 8 - Private Recreational Center - Robert H. Grant & Co.	133
Apr. 3, 1969	Kalauao, Ewa - Mauka of Kam. Highway - approximately 150 feet easterly from Kihale Street (Off-Street Parking Use) - Miyasato Family - By: Okumura and Takushi, Attorneys-At-Law	134
Apr. 3, 1969	Maunalua - Luna-Kai Marina 8 - Lunalilo Home Road and Hawaii-Kai Drive (Private Recreational Center) - Robert H. Grant & Co. - By: Hong & Iwai, Attorneys	136
Apr. 3, 1969	Kaneohe - Westerly side of Likelike Highway - approximately 1,800 feet mauka of Kahekili Highway - Fathers of the Sacred Hearts - (Monastery and Seminary Use)	143
Apr. 17, 1969	Kaneohe - Westerly side of Likelike Highway - approximately 1,800 feet mauka of Kahekili Highway - Fathers of the Sacred Hearts - (Monastery and Seminary Use)	148
Apr. 17, 1969	Maunalua - Luna-Kai Marina 8 - Lunalilo Home Road and Hawaii-Kai Drive (Private Recreational (Center) - Robert H. Grant & Co. - By: Hong and Iwai, Attorneys	150
May 15, 1969	Manoa - Off Pamoa Road - Scope Corporation	215

FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAM:

Jan. 9, 1969	State Department of Transportation, Highways Division - Extension of Runway 4R22L, Honolulu International Airport	86
Feb. 6, 1969	Nanakuli Interceptor Sewer, Sections 1A and 1B - City and County, Department of Public Works	108

FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAM: (Cont.)

May 1, 1969	Salt Lake Boulevard, County Federal Air - Secondary Route No. 670 - City and County, Department of Public Works	167
May 15, 1969	Bus Transportation to serve the needs of the City and County of Honolulu - City and County, Office of the Managing Director	204
May 15, 1969	Halawa to Middle Street Interstate Route H-1 Construction - State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation, Highways Division	207

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN:

May 15, 1969	Kailua - Development Plan for the area bounded by Kawainui Drainage Canal, Kawainui Swamp, Kaelepulu Stream and the Shoreline	216

GENERAL PLAN AND/OR DETAILED LAND USE PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN (AMENDMENT):

Jan. 23, 1969	Waiawa-Halawa - Widening of Moanalua Road, between Aiea Stream and Kaimakani Street	88
Feb. 6, 1969	Wahiawa - Within the Grandview Tract Subdivision	108
Feb. 6, 1969	St. Louis Hts. - Palolo - Extension of 5th Ave. in the mauka direction beyond Waialae Ave. to meet Palolo Avenue	110
Feb. 6, 1969	Kaimuki-Kapahulu - Deletion of a portion of 15th Ave. between Harding Avenue and the freeway	110
Feb. 20, 1969	St. Louis Hts. - Palolo - Extension of 5th Ave. to meet Palolo Ave.	116
Feb. 20, 1969	Kaimuki-Kapahulu - Deletion of a portion of 15th Ave. between Harding Ave. and the freeway	118
Feb. 20, 1969	Wahiawa - Within the Grandview Tract Subdivision	125
Mar. 6, 1969	St. Louis Hts. - Palolo - Extension of 5th Ave.	127
Mar. 6, 1969	Kalihi-Uka - Deletion of Kilohi Street extension	128
Mar. 20, 1969	Kalihi-Uka - Deletion of Kilohi Street extension	130
Mar. 20, 1969	Mapunapuna - Fort Shafter - Deleting a portion of Kilihau & Kakoi Street extensions	132
Apr. 3, 1969	Mapunapuna - Fort Shafter - Deletion of Kilihau Street extension and Kakoi Street extension into Mokumoa Street - State Department of Land and Natural Resources	141
Apr. 3, 1969	Nanakuli, Lualualei, Maili, Waianae, and Makaha - Planning Area No. 27 - Commercial Use	143
Apr. 17, 1969	Nanakuli, Lualualei, Maili, Waianae and Makaha - Planning Area No. 27 - Commercial Use - Mr. and Mrs. David T. Okimoto - By: Sidney I. Hashimoto, Attorney-At-Law	147
Apr. 17, 1969	Kahuku, Kawela Bay, Pupukea (Planning Area No. 27) - Resort Use	152
May 1, 1969	Kahuku, Kawela Bay, Pupukea (Planning Area No. 27) - Resort Use - Del E. Webb Corp. - By: Robert Jones of Donald Wolbrink & Associates, Inc.	160
May 1, 1969	Ewa Beach - Between Fort Weaver Road and Kimopelekane Road (North Road) - Residential Use	169
May 15, 1969	Kahuku, Kawela Bay, Pupukea (Planning Area No. 27) - Resort Use - Del E. Webb Corporation	183
May 15, 1969	Hawaii-Kai - Mauka corner of Kalanianaole Hwy. and Lunalilo Home Road - Commercial Use (Bishop Estate, Owner) (Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co., Developer)	215
May 15, 1969	Deletion of the Hart Street Extension	216

GENERAL PLAN AND/OR DETAILED LAND USE PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN (AMEND.): (Cont.)

May 15, 1969	Ewa Beach - Changing the Land Use Designation from Apartment to Residential Use	216
June 5, 1969	University Community Plan (Planning Area 14) - Makiki Stream Realignment and Widening	235
June 5, 1969	Kaneohe to Kualoa (DLUM Amendment)	235

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION:

Mar. 20, 1969	Waipahu - Off Waiawa Road - Bishop Estate (Urban Use)	131
Apr. 3, 1969	Waipahu - Off Waiawa Road - Bishop Estate (Urban Use)	142
Apr. 17, 1969	Kahuku - Between Kuilima and Kahuku Points - Inscon Development Company (Urban District)	153
May 1, 1969	Kahuku - Between Kuilima and Kahuku Points - Inscon Development Company (Urban District)	165
May 1, 1969	Ewa - Off Farrington Highway - Wilson Lau (Urban District)	166
May 15, 1969	Kahuku - Between Kuilima and Kahuku Points - Inscon Development Company (Urban District)	199

MISCELLANEOUS:

Jan. 9, 1969	Meeting with Consultants to the State Land Use Commission	85
Feb. 6, 1969	1969 Hawaii Congress of Planning Commissioners and Directors	110
Feb. 6, 1969	Resolution - Kaneohe - Keapuka Flood Disaster area	111
Mar. 6, 1969	ASPO 1969 National Planning Conference	129
May 15, 1969	Bill No. 114 - Proposed Ordinance to Dedication of Land for Parks and Playgrounds or the Payment of Money in lieu thereof	216

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT HOUSING:

Jan. 9, 1969	McCully - Off Kapiolani Boulevard - Reed & Martin Investment Corp.	80
Jan. 23, 1969	-do-	92
Feb. 6, 1969	-do-	107
Feb. 20, 1969	-do-	119

STATE LAND USE LAW:

May 7, 1969	Review of the proposed changes to the State Land Use District Boundaries and Regulations	171

STREET NAMES:

Feb. 6, 1969	Heeia - Crown Terrace, Tract 2, Unit 2, Subdivision	109
Feb. 6, 1969	Lanakila - "Alaneo Street"	110
Feb. 6, 1969	Ewa - Makakilo City - Deletion of "Nohouka Street	110
Feb. 20, 1969	Wahiawa - Off California Avenue - Bill Agena Subdivision	124
Feb. 20, 1969	Maunalua - Hahai Kai Marina - Unit 5	124
Feb. 20, 1969	Kailua - Kailua Heights - Subdivision Unit 5-B	124
Mar. 6, 1969	Kamananui, Waialua - Subdivision	128
Apr. 3, 1969	Mililani Town	144
Apr. 3, 1969	Maunalua - Transmarina Road, Sections 1 and 2	144

STREET NAMES: (Cont.)

Apr. 3, 1969	Kapahulu - Luakaha Subdivision	144
Apr. 3, 1969	Maunalua - Luna-Kai Marina, Unit No. 9	144
May 1, 1969	Waikiki - Deletion of "Cocoanut Avenue"	168
May 15, 1969	Kuliouou - Kuliouou Terrace Subdivision	207
May 15, 1969	Makaha - Roadway to Makaha School	208
May 15, 1969	Waipio - Mililani Town	208
May 15, 1969	Heeia - Crown Terrace - Tract III	212
May 15, 1969	Makakilo City	213
May 15, 1969	Kaneohe - HHA Halawa Project HA 1-30	213
May 15, 1969	Ahuimanu Subdivision	214
May 15, 1969	Kalihi - Angco Subdivision	214
May 15, 1969	Pearl City - Hale Ola Development	214
June 5, 1969	Puuloa, Ewa - Ewa Estates, Unit II Subdivision	229
June 5, 1969	Kapalama - Kapalama Improvement District No. 158, Units II & III	231

SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE:

Jan. 9, 1969	Amendment to Section 22-5.1	73

SUBDIVISION RULES AND REGULATIONS:

Jan. 9, 1969	Deletion of Section 10-(L); Amendments to Sections 11-(C) and 19	71

ZONING - B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT:

Jan. 23, 1969	Kaonohi, Kalauao - Ewa - Between the proposed Moanalua Road alignment and the existing Moanalua Road - Amfac-Trousdale	89

ZONING - H-1 RESORT-HOTEL DISTRICT:

Jan. 9, 1969	Makaha Valley - Makaha Valley, Incorporated	
May 15, 1969	Makaha - 84-325 Makau Street - Mrs. Mahealani J. Fernandez - By: James Trask	202
June 5, 1969	Makaha - 84-325 Makau Street - Mrs. Mahealani J. Fernandez - By: James Trask	224

ZONING - I-1 LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT:

Jan. 23, 1969	Kaneohe - 45-55[illegible] to 45-580 Kam. Highway - Thomas T. Kozuma, Richard Azama, et al	90

ZONING - R-6 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT:

Jan. 23, 1969	Kaneohe - Off Kokokahi Place - Francis Hughes, et al	96
Feb. 6, 1969	Kaneohe - Off Kokokahi Place - Francis Hughes, et al	98

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
November 27, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Wednesday, November 27, 1968, at 1:30 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Richard K. Sharpless presiding:

PRESENT:

Richard K. Sharpless, Chairman
Philip T. Chun
Robert L. Muller
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Moses Lum Hoy, ex-officio (excused at 2:30 p.m.)

Wallace S. W. Kim, Deputy Planning Director

ABSENT:

Cyril W. Lemmon
Arthur A. Rutledge
Robert F. Ellis, ex-officio

MINUTES:

The minutes of the meeting of October 17, 1968, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Muller.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
MAKAHA
HANA AND ORANGE STREETS
EUGENE K. F. AND ANN LEUNG LAU

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from Rural Protective to Business for a 19,914 square foot parcel of land situated on the southeast corner of Hana and Orange Streets, 200 feet mauka of Farrington Highway, in Makaha, and identified by Tax Map Key 8-4-11: Parcel 2, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Plan for the Waianae area.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of November 17, 1968, was read by the Deputy Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the owner of the land, John Ramsey, Waianae Model Cities Agency, and to seven different community and civic organizations in the Waianae and Makaha areas. No written protests have been received to date.

The Deputy Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the property and reported that in accordance with the development plan submitted, the owner proposes to construct a commercial structure measuring approximately 50' x 80' which will contain a restaurant, bar and snack bar, and ancillary facilities, such as restrooms, kitchen and storage areas. The necessary off-street parking facilities will be provided in the front of the structure. He reported that Hana Street which fronts this property has a right-of-way width of 50 feet with a pavement width of 16 feet and with no curbs,

gutters or sidewalks. If the public agencies require compliance with Ordinance No. 2412, which is the requirement for frontage improvement, the developer must widen the pavement and install curbs, gutters and sidewalks. Water is available. Public sewerage facilities are presently not available but the owner will use the Cavittete system in accordance with Board of Health requirements.

There were no questions from the Commission. No one spoke either in support or in opposition to the proposed zoning.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Rural Protective to Business for the subject parcel of land situated at the southeast corner of Hana and Orange Streets in Makaha.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
WAIANAE
87-282 FARRINGTON HIGHWAY
DAVID AWONG

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to change the zoning from Highway Protective to Business for a 10,000 square foot parcel of land at 87-282 Farrington Highway, situated on the mauka side of Farrington Highway and at the corner of Keliikipi Street, in Waianae, identified by Tax Map Key 8-7-13: Parcel 122, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Plan for the Waianae area.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of November 17, 1968, was read by the Deputy Director who reported that copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to seven different community and civic organizations in the Waianae-Makaha area, and to interested persons. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

The Deputy Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the property and reported as follows:

1. The subject parcel is designated for commercial use on the adopted Detailed Land Use Map of the area.

2. The Development Plan for Waianae indicates no setback for widening of Farrington Highway or for Keliikipi Street except for the rounding of the corner at the intersection.

3. Board of Water Supply reported that water is available and adequate to serve the area.

4. Division of Sewers reported that public sewerage facilities are presently not available; however, the owner will be required to provide cesspool or Cavittete in conformity with the Board of Health requirements.

5. The Division of Engineering reported that the subject parcel is low and is subject to ponding; therefore, the owner will be required to rectify the situation by proper fill before a building permit will be issued.

6. The principal access to the property is off Farrington Highway which has a right-of-way width of 50 feet and a pavement width of 22 feet in fair condition. Since Farrington Highway has no curbs, gutters or sidewalks, Ordinance No. 2412 (frontage improvement requirement) is applicable, and if the public agencies require it, the owner must install the necessary street frontage improvements at the time he develops the property.

7. As shown on the development plan submitted, the owner proposes to construct a three-story structure which would contain two stores and a bar on the ground floor and apartment units on the second and third floors. Parking is to be provided in the front with the structure recessed to the back of the lot.

The Deputy Director reported that under the Comprehensive Zoning Code, the proposed apartment units will not be permitted in the business district. The Zoning Code is to become effective on January 2, 1969, so that unless the owner can obtain his building permit before the end of December, he must utilize his entire structure for commercial purposes.

There was no one to speak either in support of or in opposition to the rezoning proposal.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Muller, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Highway Protective to Business for the parcel of land at 87-282 Farrington Highway in Waianae.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND
USE PLAN
KANEOHE TO KUALOA
KANEOHE-HEEIA
KAMEHAMEHA
HIGHWAY AND
MELI PLACE
COMMERCIAL USE
(DR. MIYOZO KAGAWA)

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe-Heeia by changing the land use designation from Residential to Commercial use for a 20,725 square foot parcel of land situated on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway, at the corner of Kamehameha Highway and Meli Place, in Kaneohe, and identified by Tax Map Key 4-5-28: Parcel 4.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of November 17, 1968, was read by the Deputy Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to seven different community and civic organizations in the Kaneohe-Heeia area, and to interested persons. No written protests have been received to date.

The Deputy Director read a letter of support submitted by Dr. Richard K. Yokoyama, a dentist. Dr. Yokoyama mentioned the lack of a suitable site from which professional people, particularly the dentists and the doctors, could operate. Although a large area has been set aside as a regional shopping center, they have not been successful in locating in the area and many of them operate from makeshift office spaces. He feels that the zoning of this particular parcel for business purpose will help resolve the problems of the professional people in their desire to locate in a first-class office space.

The Deputy Director explained the proposal as follows:

1. This proposal dates back to January, 1964, when a request made for business designation of the subject parcel was denied by the Planning Commission.

2. In 1968, the owner again requested a change in designation to business use which request was denied by the Planning Director.

3. As a result of the denial, the owner submitted the same request to the City

Council which felt that the request merited consideration and directed the Planning Director to take the necessary steps to amend the General Plan.

4. The Planning Director's reasons for denying the request were:

   a. The subject property fronts a major thoroughfare with access directly out to Kamehameha Highway, a situation where traffic might be impeded. The Department is attempting to eliminate uses which tend to create traffic along our major highway systems.

   b. There are ample commercial designated properties in the Kaneohe area, and particularly out in Heeia, much of the land has not been put to commercial use as yet.

5. The owner feels that his request is reasonable because the property adjoins existing business uses which are two stores and two service stations. A dentist's office and other types of business uses are in the near vicinity. The fairly large size of the property will permit him to provide the necessary parking so that this should tend to reduce some of the traffic problems.

6. Meli Place which adjoins this parcel is a narrow unimproved deadend roadway serving five lots in the back.

7. The owner attempted to obtain permission to use Meli Place for ingress and egress purposes; however, there is an intervening right-of-way next to Meli Place owned by the rear property owner. The owner has not been able to get permission to cross that right-of-way for access to Meli Place.

Referring to the Detailed Land Use Map of the area, the Deputy Director oriented the Commission to the location of the property. He pointed out the existing business uses mentioned earlier and also the residential uses in the surrounding area. A major drainage channel runs alongside this property on the Kahuku side.

In reply to questions from the Commission, the Deputy Director indicated that the parcel in the back is in residential use while the property on the Honolulu side is low and unusable. He stated that although the

Planning Department is opposed to the proposed change in land use designation, the City Council can take independent action upon receiving a recommendation from the Planning Commission. No report has been received from the Traffic Department.

There was no one to speak in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Matthew Pyun, attorney, represented his father-in-law Dr. Miyozo Kagawa, owner of the land. He noted the presence of the architect who designed the proposed site plan which was presented before the City Council. He stressed that this area is not entirely a residential area and he proceeded to point out the various business uses scattered throughout this area and also the Honda Store which is immediately adjacent. The land in the back is a proposed school site but it is not developed now. He stated that property taxes paid on this particular parcel of land were based on a business use up until last year when it was discovered that this was a mistake. They are asking that the commercial designation be extended to include this property.

The Commission asked him for the types of business uses proposed on the site and whether or not retail stores are proposed.

Mr. Pyun replied that the proposal is to construct a business and professional building. There will be approximately six to eight offices for use by dentists, doctors and lawyers. No retail stores are proposed.

At the request of the Commission, Mr. Dennis Toyomura, architect, explained what is proposed on the site. He indicated that Kamehameha Highway at this location has a medial strip so that all movements into and out of the property will be by right turns. Cars will enter through one driveway, circle around the parking area and exit through the other driveway. This should eliminate much of the concern expressed about traffic congestion.

Regarding the proposed structure depicted on the plot plan, he indicated that its actual size is unknown at the present time. He believed that anyone familiar with land utilization and land economy will understand that without knowing the potential of the neighborhood and the economics of the whole project, the actual size of the building

cannot be determined at this time. The building is shown schematically on the plan in a rectangular shape with an opening or court in the center, properly landscaped to give a pleasing atmosphere. The building is planned as a low type structure. Sufficient parking has been provided with emphasis on light, air, and open space with landscaping around the property so that the development would not mar the neighborhood. Presently the drainage ditch is covered with heavy foliage and acts as a natural barrier. The area next to the right-of-way will be landscaped but not to the extent that visibility to the highway would be affected.

Since economics, involving the highest and best use of the land, was mentioned, the Commission asked whether the land was actually to be developed for professional offices and whether or not any negotiations had been started with professional people who might be interested in locating at this site.

Mr. Toyomura stated that they intend to construct a commercial building for housing professional people. As stated earlier, they do not know what the actual size of the building will be although they are considering a two-story building. As far as obtaining tenants for the building, he indicated that in all fairness to the prospective tenants, they could not represent their intended development when they don't know whether or not the property would be properly zoned for business purpose. They prefer to have the property zoned before asking the professional people whether or not they would be interested in locating there.

Mr. Pyun stated that they definitely intend, bearing any radical, unforeseen circumstances, to establish a business and professional center on this property. As a start, Dr. Kagawa and himself will be located in the building.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun.

The Commission considered this matter later and expressed its belief that the traffic situation might not be as critical as that mentioned by the Deputy Director because all movements into and out of the property will be right hand turns.

The Deputy Director's concern was to the continuous adding of traffic onto a heavily travelled highway. Another concern was the

encouragement of strip commercial development along a major thoroughfare. If this request is granted, it would be difficult to determine where the business line should stop and would create a problem to deny other similar types of request so that eventually, there could be a strip of commercial uses all the way to the Windward City Shopping Center, a distance of about 1,600 feet from this property.

The Commission noted that the property does adjoin an existing business property and Meli Place on the other side could act as a stopping point. It did not foresee a major traffic problem because of the medial strip which would confine all movements to right hand turns.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Muller, the Commission recommended approval of the proposed amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe-Heeia by changing the land use designation from Residential to Commercial use for a 20,725 square foot parcel of land situated at the makai-Kahuku corner of Kamehameha Highway and Meli Place in Kaneohe.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND
USE MAP OF WAIAWA
TO HALAWA
KAONOHI-KALAUAO
VARIOUS CHANGES

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider proposed amendments to the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa to Halawa by changing certain land use designations for parcels of land located in Kaonohi, Kalauao, Ewa, Oahu.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of November 17, 1968, was read by the Deputy Director who reported that copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community, civic and business organizations in the area, and to interested persons. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

By referring to the Detailed Land Use Map of the area, the Deputy Director explained the various amendments, as shown on the overlay, as follows:

(a) From Park use to Commercial and Public Facility use (hospital) for land situated between the proposed Moanalua Road realignment and the existing Moanalua Road (Tax Map Key 9-8-12: 5, 6 & 7 and Tax Map Key 9-8-12: portion of 3);

The subject parcels are situated on both sides of a drainage channel which was to be left in its natural condition. However, under the development program for the area, the developer is going to line this channel and improve it in accordance with City and County requirements so that the adjacent commercial area can be expanded up to the channel on the ewa side. For the open space area on the Kokohead side of the channel, the adjacent hospital should be given an opportunity to expand its operation up to the lined channel.

(b) From Park and Commercial uses to Agricultural use for land situated on the makai side of the existing Moanalua Road (Tax Map Key 9-8-16: 2, 11, & 16);

The developer is desirous of using this area for agricultural purposes by promoting the raising of taro (present use). The drainage channel is on the Kokohead side and the watercress farm is on the makai side. The area contains about 2-1/2 acres.

(c) From Residential and Low Density Apartment uses to Public Facility use (school site) for land situated mauka of H-1 Interstate Highway along Kaonohi Street (Tax Map Key 9-8-11: 4);

As a result of a detailed study of the total development in the Kaonohi Ridge area, it was determined with the Department of Education that an elementary school site would be needed in the area mauka of the H-1 Freeway. This site was selected as the most logical area for the school. This decision was based on the cost of acquiring land since lands on the Kokohead side of Kaonohi Street are already zoned for low density apartment use and are presently being developed as condominium apartment units.

(d) and (e) From Residential use to Public Facility use (school site) for land situated between the H-1 Highway and the proposed Moanalua Road realignment (Tax Map Key 9-8-11: 4); and from Public Facility use (school) to Parks and Recreation for land situated between the H-1 Highway and Moanalua Road realignment (Tax Map Key 9-8-11: 4, 5);

A school site of 5 or 6 acres with an adjoining park site of 3 or 4 acres are presently designated on the General Plan in the adjacent area. However, upon completion of the improvement district plans for the realignment of Moanalua Road, it was learned that because

of adverse topography and the need to connect the realigned Moanalua Road to meet the existing Moanalua Road, the difference in grade between the two roadways must be in heavy cut. As a result of this cut, the frontage would not be usable for access purposes. In addition, the Parks Department has indicated that the 3 or 4 acre park site is not sufficient to serve the apartment area and preferred a much larger site.

Upon meeting with both the Department of Education and the Parks Department, it was agreed to designate a school site of about 6-1/2 acres in the area where access would not be permitted to Moanalua Road with an adjacent park site of 8-1/2 acres. Both areas are to be developed jointly with access to the school provided over the park area.

(f) From Residential use to Agricultural use for land situated mauka of the proposed school site along Kaonohi Street (Tax Map Key 9-8-11: 5 and 6).

In the study for a proposed school site in the mauka section, field inspection indicated that the land on the mauka side of the proposed school site had a differential in elevation with the adjacent area. Therefore, it seemed more logical to extend the agricultural use farther mauka to include this area of about 8 acres.

In the interrogation that followed, the Deputy Director explained that the proposed changes were initiated by the Director when the result of a study for involving a request for a change in land use designation for lands in the area indicated that there was further need to amend the General Plan.

He stated that the area proposed for agricultural use has fairly level areas which could be used for this purpose since it adjoined an area already designated for agricultural use.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. Hugh Shearer, attorney, represented the Episcopal Church of Hawaii, Mrs. Peter Stack, her brother, and her sister who are the owners in common of the parcels designated as Items (d) and (e) on the map; and Mrs. Stack, her

brother, her sister and her mother who are the owners in common of the parcels designated as Items (c) and (f) on the map. He indicated that the owners of the subject parcels have not applied for any changes in use involving their lands, and therefore, object to the proposed changes involving their lands. He stated that they had received no notification of these proposals and were quite surprised to learn of them when quite fortunately, Mrs. Stack saw the notice of the public hearing in the Sunday newspaper. If the City and County of Honolulu wishes to acquire these parcels for public purposes, it is free to do so by filing an appropriate complaint of eminent domain proceedings. However, to date, the owners are not aware of any such filing and they have not been served with any type of complaint.

At the request of the Commission, Mrs. Stack went up to the map and outlined the boundaries of the lands owned by them. She stated that two parcels are involved and they contain a total area of 24.4 acres.

There was no one to speak in support of the proposals.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

(Mr. Lum Hoy was excused from the meeting at this point of the discussion.)

In considering this matter later, the Commission noted that the objection of the land owners seemed to be on the question of what values should be established upon taking of their lands for public purposes through eminent domain proceedings and not on whether or not the uses are proper for the area. It stated that values can be negotiated and established later when the land is ready to be acquired for public purposes.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission voted to recommend approval of the various changes proposed by the Planning Director and as described in the public hearing notice for parcels of land located in Kaonohi, Kalauao, Ewa, Oahu.

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT
KAONOHI, KALAUAO
MAUKA OF MOANALUA
ROAD, EWA SIDE OF
LEEWARD HOSPITAL
OFF STREET PARKING USE
(AMFAC-TROUSDALE)

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 21-250 of Ordinance No. 3234 of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider an application for a Conditional Use Permit for off-street parking purposes, parcels of land located on the ewa side of Leeward Hospital, mauka of existing Moanalua Road and identified by Tax Map Key 9-8-12: portion of Parcels 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13, and Tax Map Key 9-8-11:

portion of Parcel 3, at Kaonohi, Kalauao, Ewa, Oahu.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of November 17, 1968, was read by the Deputy Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to four community associations in the Aiea to Pearl City areas, and to interested parties. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

The Deputy Director pointed out the subject area under consideration situated between the Leeward Hospital and the drainage channel. This is the same area just considered during the prior hearing to designate the area for expansion of the hospital. The owners of the land reported that they have a letter from the Leeward Hospital stating that it has no interest in acquiring the land for expansion of the hospital. Therefore, the owners are seeking permission through a Conditional Use Permit to utilize the area as an expanded parking area for the adjoining commercial development. A bridge is to be constructed over the drainage channel to give access to this area.

He explained that the requested use is permitted under the new Comprehensive Zoning Code. The enabling ordinance to permit the optional use of the Comprehensive Zoning Code prior to its effective date on January 2, 1969, has been adopted so that elements of the CZC can be applied at this time.

The Planning Director has recommended the granting of the Conditional Use Permit with provision for control relating to buffer area, landscaping, security measures and others which will be made a part of the Conditional Use Permit.

The Commission felt that there was a conflict in use because the prior hearing had designated the area for expansion of the hospital while the present use is for off-street parking purposes.

The Deputy Director explained that under the Comprehensive Zoning Code, lands adjoining a commercial or an apartment development may be utilized for parking but only through the granting of a Conditional Use Permit. This parking use is permitted in all underlying zoning so that legally there would be no conflict in use.

No one spoke in opposition to the application.

Mr. Lincoln Ishida, attorney, representing the applicant, had nothing to add to the presentation made by the Deputy Director and was ready to answer any questions from the Commission.

When asked by the Commission whether the conditions to be imposed have been written out, the Deputy Director replied that the staff is preparing a list of conditions that are to be imposed by following the specific requirements contained in the applicable section of the Comprehensive Zoning Code.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval to grant the Conditional Use Permit to use the subject parcel for off-street parking purposes subject to the preparation of the conditions that are to be imposed with the Permit.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP OF KANEOHE
TO KUALOA
KANEOHE-HEEIA
(VARIOUS CHANGES)

A public hearing, continued from November 14, 1968, was held to consider a proposal to amend the Kaneohe-Heeia portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe to Kualoa area by (1) Changing certain land use designations within the area covered by the ahupuaa of Heeia; and (2) Modifying the right-of-way width of Kamehameha Highway between Waikalua Road and Lilipuna Road from 100 feet to 84 feet. The hearing was kept open to allow the residents in the area the further opportunity to study and review the proposed changes.

The Chairman called for testimony not previously presented.

Mr. Arlie Carson, Deputy Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation, stated that his Department is not opposed to any of the proposals shown on the Detailed Land Use Map of the area. However, his Department had asked the Planning Department to designate two areas for park use and these are shown on the map as being the 10-acre site on the mauka side of the Heeia Viaduct or the mangrove swamp area earmarked as a botanical garden, and the 10-acre site in the mauka area adjacent to a school and near the proposed golf course. The developer of the land has indicated that he needs the 10-acre mangrove area for the golf course and had offered to grade and level an area in the upper section for a park in exchange for the

mangrove area; therefore, if this offer can be received in writing, the Department is willing to accept the exchange. However, in the event the golf course is not developed, the Department would like to have the mangrove area redesignated as a park site. If the golf course should be developed, the Department is hopeful that a buffer strip of mangrove would be retained along the highway to screen the golf course from the highway.

Mr. David Yagi read and filed a petition signed by 36 businessmen in the Kaneohe area who supported the proposal to reduce the present right-of-way width of Kamehameha Highway through the Kaneohe business district, between Waikalua Road and Lilipuna Road, from 100 feet to 84 feet. They also supported the proposed light industrial area between Kamehameha Highway and Kahekili Highway.

The Deputy Director informed the Commission that the staff had a meeting with the community groups and the proposed developers of the area and some of the problems expressed by the community groups had been resolved. He noted that the Commissioners had been provided with a copy of the staff's report outlining the various problems and the new recommendations of the staff agreed upon by the community groups.

Mr. Dale Trenhaile, President of the Kaneohe Community Council, confirmed that a meeting was held last Wednesday with the Deputy Director to obtain additional information and to discuss the various proposals. The discussion related to:

(1) Reduction of the width of Kamehameha Highway between Waikalua Road to Lilipuna Road from 100 feet to 84 feet as requested by the City Council.

He stated that some of the members felt that the 100-foot highway with a medial strip should be extended all the way through Kaneohe town and out to the residential area of Heeia-kea while others concurred with the City Council for an 84-foot right-of-way and elimination of the medial strip between Lilipuna Road and Waikalua Road. The majority agreed that from Haiku Road to Heeia-kea, there definitely should be a divided highway with a planting strip to provide not only safety for pedestrians but to improve the aesthetic condition of the area.

(2) Haiku Road widening.

Majority agreed that Haiku Road should be widened to 100 feet with a medial strip. This road is a major connector between Kahekili Highway and Kamehameha Highway and there is a backup of cars every morning going into Honolulu. The rapid growth in this area indicates the urgency to proceed with the widening and improvement of Haiku Road as soon as possible.

(3) Industrial area

Regarding the expansion of the light industrial area, he stated that opinions were divided. Some felt that this type of use should not be there at all; some felt that it was not too objectionable; while others felt that it should be there. He personally made an attempt to find another location for industrial uses to serve this community but he has not been successful in locating a site that would be suitable. They are aware of the need for an industrial area somewhere in the vicinity to serve the major users who are the businessmen and residents of the area.

(4) The 40-foot planting strip along Kahekili Highway adjacent to the light industrial area.

They agreed that the 40-foot planting strip was adequate provided that the developer planted the area with trees and other vegetation. The developer proposed that part of the hill that runs along the highway at the edge of the proposed development be left as it is now because it would provide a better buffer. They agreed to this.

(5) The 20-foot planting strip along the Kailua edge of the proposed light industrial development.

Since the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance requires a 6-foot wall at the Kailua edge of the development, they felt that this was adequate protection so that the proposed 20-foot planting strip should be moved and divided into 10 feet plus the required square foot setback under the CZC on each side of the proposed 60-foot roadway running through the light industrial area. Since this 60-foot roadway will become a public roadway, the 15-foot setback on both sides will screen the industrial development from passing motorists.

He noted that this road meets Kahekili Highway at the entrance road to the Haiku Village development. People purchasing homes in this development are not aware of what is being proposed across the street, and speaking on behalf of these people, he felt that the planting strip should be required.

At the request of the Commission, the Deputy Director clarified the statement just made by Mr. Trenhaile regarding Kamehameha Highway widening. He stated that the original development plan for the Kaneohe area had indicated a 100-foot right-of-way with a medial strip for Kamehameha Highway starting from William Henry Road to the Long Bridge at Heeia-kea. The City Council, in considering a request to either purchase setback areas on Kamehameha Highway situated within the Kaneohe business district or to issue building permits which would encroach into the setback area, discussed the possibility of reducing the width to 80 feet eliminating the medial strip. This would still provide the same number of lanes to handle the traffic volume through the area and the City would not have to purchase abutting high value business zoned properties and further reduce the already modest sized lots. The Council decided to establish the 80 foot width, but increasing the width of the sidwalk from 10 feet to 12 feet within the business district resulting in a total width of 84 feet for Kamehameha Highway between Waikalua Road and Lilipuna Road. The community groups were unanimous in wanting a 100-foot right-of-way with a medial strip from Haiku Road to the Long Bridge but opinions were divided for the area between Haiku Road and Lilipuna Road.

The Commission first discussed the proposed light industrial area. In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Trenhaile stated that there is a hill between Keaahala Road and the proposed light industrial area. There are some homes on this hill and people can look right down into the industrial area. He felt that the principal objectionable features about the industrial area would be dust and noise although the Comprehensive Zoning Code would control much of this type of nuisance in a light industrial area. The highest level of noise probably would be from carpenter's shops or from auto repair shops which use pneumatic equipment. If warehouses or similar uses were to be placed along the Kailua side of the access road as suggested, the closest residence

would probably be about 150 feet away, as a minimum, to about 250 feet.

When asked to comment on the golf course, Mr. Trenhaile stated that they are in favor of the golf course and hope that it can be developed.

Mr. Gordon Potter, representing the Windward Citizens Planning Conference, noted that a letter was sent to the Planning Commission outlining the several points of the proposals. He emphasized two major issues:

(1) The width of Kamehameha Highway and Haiku Road.

He stated that the Windward Citizens Planning Conference is very much opposed to the reduction of the right-of-way width of both Kamehameha Highway and Haiku Road. To provide for continuity, they believe that the present 100-foot width of Kamehameha Highway with a planted medial strip should be continued uninterrupted through the center of town. This would enhance the character of the area.

(2) Industrial site

They feel that the proposed industrial area is not an appropriate use for the area. They have not had the time to reexamine the area involved to satisfy themselves that no other possible alternate site exists. Therefore, they plan to examine the area and hope to be able to locate an alternate site which might be more appropriate for this purpose and they will be communicating with the City Council on this issue later. However, in the event the proposed industrial area is approved, they recommend that the following requirements be established:

(a) A 40-foot planting buffer strip be established along Kahekili Highway.

(b) A 15-foot building setback and landscaped strip be established along both sides of Lilipuna Road extension (industrial area).

(c) The use of the area be restricted to such industrial operations which emit an absolute minimum of noise, vibration, dust, smoke, and odor,

and which in general are compatible with the use of the adjacent residential lands.

(d) Some sort of enforceable commitment should be made between the land owners, the developers, and the City to ensure conformance to the standards mentioned.

When questioned by the Commission, Mr. Potter stated that they are aware of the fact that a 100-foot roadway with a medial strip will carry the same amount of traffic as an 84-foot roadway without a medial strip. They are also aware of the cost factor that was taken into consideration by the City Council when it proposed the road reduction. Notwithstanding the cost, they feel that the continuity of the highway width is needed to enhance the area.

Mr. Robert Hinazumi represented Mr. George Hasegawa, the developer of the industrial lands in the area. He stated that at the meeting held with the Deputy Director and representatives of the Kaneohe Community Council and the Windward Citizens Planning Conference, they came to an agreement on all issues except one which related to a proposal to provide for a 15-foot planting strip along both sides of the access road through the industrial area. This was to be in lieu of the 20-foot planting strip along the Kailua boundary of the development. He noted that the Comprehensive Zoning Code requires a minimum planting strip of 5 feet along the road frontages. At that time, he did not wish to make a commitment without first consulting with the developers and the owner. He also remembered that sometime ago the Hawaiian Electric Company indicated that it was routing a major electric line through the area and would require a 25-foot easement. He believed that the 20-foot buffer strip would overlap into that 25-foot easement area, but in view of the new suggested proposal to move that 20-foot strip, he wanted to check with the Hawaiian Electric Company to see whether the 25-foot easement could also be moved. However, upon checking with the Electric Company, the Company couldn't provide an answer without further studies.

He implored the Commission to consider the developers' side of this issue. In their attempt to satisfy the community groups, they agreed with almost everything that was suggested except this one item which they

couldn't agree on. Because of the 25-foot easement, the additional requirement for a 20-foot easement will seriously affect the developable area of the land. He assured the Commission that they want a good development with a minimum of conflict as possible. They had also accepted the suggestion made to place noise producing industrial uses as far away from residential uses as possible.

Mr. Hinazumi then proposed to make one change and this related to the 40-foot planting strip along Kahekili Highway. The natural bank alongside the highway will be retained. He stated that studies by their engineer indicated the existing ground conditions to be as shown on the sketch plan of the typical section submitted. Based upon what is shown, he felt that a 40-foot buffer was not necessary and that a 20-foot strip should be sufficient. He pointed out that there is a 24-foot strip from the edge of the pavement to the property line so that a 20-foot strip would give a buffer strip of 44 feet from the edge of the pavement. The 8-foot high bank will be left in its natural state and planted with some type of climbing vine and the 20-foot strip planted with paper bark trees. They are working with the Windward Beautification Conference people in trying to obtain as many trees as possible for the area.

Replying to questions from the Commission, Mr. Hinazumi stated that the back portion of the bank within the development area is either to be cut down to a 1-1/2 to 1 slope or cut straight down with a retaining wall and the material from the excavation will be used to fill the low areas. He stated that the City designated this area for light industrial purposes and they are merely asking an expansion of this use up to Kahekili Highway. He indicated that there are no other areas available in Kaneohe where industrial development can be located.

Mr. Mike McCormack, associated with his father T. F. McCormack as developers of portions of the land under consideration, commented on the proposed golf course development and the lands surrounding it. He indicated that a proposed plan for the area was submitted to the Planning Department quite some time ago and he displayed the proposed development plan on the wall. He noted that the plan showed a 150-acre golf course bordered by medium density apartment uses and a marina development of low rise garden type apartments and residential uses in the fish pond area makai of Kamehameha Highway. Since there

is a question on whether this fish pond area is in the Urban District or in the Conservation District, the Planning Department decided to delete the land use designations for this area until that question is settled with the State. They have no alternative but to accept this decision of the Planning Department, but he reported that when the proposed plan for the area was presented at the public hearing, he observed that much of the apartment areas were deleted and placed in residential use and the golf course was reduced in size in order to set aside a 10-acre park in the mangrove area at Heeia-kea. As a result of the reduction in area, a prospective golf course developer canceled his interest in developing the golf course.

He was pleased to hear that the Parks Department is willing to accept a compromise and is willing to relinquish the 10-acre park site at Heeia-kea. He stressed the point of the high cost of developing a golf course with modest return, and unless a use of higher density is permitted to surround the course, an economically feasible development cannot be achieved. It will require retention of all 150 acres to develop a full length, 18-hole golf course. Therefore, rather than withdrawing the entire proposal as previously requested, he suggested to the Commission that it consider amending the proposal of the Planning Director by designating the residential area next to King High School to low density apartment use and designating the strip of land bordering the golf course to low density apartment use. This would then ensure them a more reasonable return to offset the high cost of developing the golf course.

When questioned by the Commission about the fish pond area, Mr. McCormack stated that the adopted General Plan designated the area in urban residential use. Since the Land Use Commission district boundary map shows no designation for the area, they contend that it is in the Urban District in accordance with the City's General Plan, but the State claims that it is in the Conservation District. This matter is presently in litigation to settle the dispute. They have accepted the staff's recommendation to delete this portion from the proposed development plan until this dispute can be resolved. Since they are now left with only half of their

potential development, they are requesting the Commission to agree to the redesignation of the two residential areas to low density apartment use and the designation of 150 acres for the golf course.

When asked for his comments, the Deputy Director stated that the staff has no objection to the two changes requested. From the planning standpoint, the apartment use is a compatible use next to a golf course. He reported, however, the possibility that the proposed changes may not be legal since the public hearing notice indicated a different classification of land uses. The legal counsel would have to be consulted to see whether or not the Commission can modify the General Plan amendment proposal of the Planning Director.

Mr. Trenhaile asked the Commission for another opportunity for him to report back to the community about the proposal made by Mr. Hinazumi to reduce the buffer strip from 40 feet to 20 feet.

Mr. Potter commented that because of the proposal by the developer to reduce the planting buffer strip, it has become more urgent to eliminate the light industrial designation from the area.

There was no further testimony from the public.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun.

The Commission considered this matter later and discussed the various issues separately, as follows:

Kamehameha Highway

The proposal is to reduce the width of Kamehameha Highway between Waikalua Road and Lilipuna Road from 100 feet to 84 feet. One group recommended that the 100-foot width with a medial strip be extended through the business district and on out to the Long Bridge. Another group accepted the 84-foot width through the business district but indicated that the 100-foot width with a medial strip should be retained between Haiku Road to the Long Bridge. The businessmen in Kaneohe also supported the 84-foot width through Kaneohe town

because any proposed widening would affect existing businesses and also take a substantial portion of their parking areas.

The Commission felt that for aesthetic values, the planted medial strip through the residential section might be justified but for the heavily concentrated business center, a medial strip might tend to encourage "U" turns and thus create traffic problems. Widening of the road will also affect valuable business properties and the cost factor involved might not justify the widening.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission recommended that the right-of-way width of Kamehameha Highway between Waikalua Road and Haiku Road be reduced from 100 feet to 84 feet and to extend the 100-foot width with a medial strip from Haiku Road and beyond to the Long Bridge at Heeia-kea.

Haiku Road

The proposal is to reduce the width of Haiku Road from 100 feet to 60 feet.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission recommended that the right-of-way width of Haiku Road be retained at 100 feet with a medial strip.

Industrial Area

The proposal is to expand the existing light industrial area up to Kahekili Highway with a 40-foot planting strip along Kahekili Highway. The community groups had recommended that the 20-foot planting strip along the Kailua boundary of the light industrial area be moved and divided into 10 feet each plus 5-foot front yard spacing for a total of 15 feet of planting strip on both sides of the proposed 60-foot roadway.

Since the developers of the area requested a reduction of the 40-foot planting strip to 20 feet along Kahekili Highway, and the representative of the community groups wanted an opportunity to discuss the new request, some of the Commissioners felt that this matter should be deferred. Others questioned whether any new information of value would be forthcoming. They noted

that a representative of one of the community groups indicated that new information would be presented before the City Council.

The Commission also discussed the statement made by Mr. Hinazumi about the 25-foot easement of the Hawaiian Electric Company extending through the property so that the requirement for a 15-foot planting strip next to the proposed 60-foot roadway would drastically reduce the buildable area of the lot.

The Commission questioned whether it can impose an additional requirement for a planting strip when the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance indicates only a 5-foot setback. Since the zoning ordinance controls setback requirements and the Commission cannot impose conditions on zoning or land use designations, the Commission felt that this proposal is not within their jurisdiction.

The Deputy Director stated that the Commission can establish setback areas on the Detailed Land Use Map. This was done in the Airport District where a 20-foot setback was established along the road frontages for planting purposes. A similar type of setback was also established in the Waipahu industrial area. Other types of setbacks have been established relating to building setbacks and shoreline setbacks.

The Commission decided to defer action on this matter and be advised by Corporation Counsel as to whether it can or cannot establish additional setback areas beyond that required by the zoning ordinance.

Park, Golf Course, and Apartment Sites

The Deputy Director reported the willingness of the Parks Department to relinquish the 10-acre botanical park in the mangrove area at Heeia-kea provided that the area is developed as a golf course, but in the event it is not that the 10-acre park be retained. Regarding the 10-acre community park in the mauka section, the Parks Department preferred this site because it is flat and usable but the developers wish to develop this area and are willing to grade and level another site adjoining the proposed elementary school to make it suitable for park purposes. They pointed out that a 10-acre park in addition to the 3-acre park site adjacent to the elementary school complex was not reasonable from the standpoint of cost and use and felt

that a combined community park and school complex would be more reasonable and desirable. The Parks Department has agreed to the change provided that a commitment in writing guaranteeing that the land would be graded and leveled is obtained from the developers. The Department has not yet received the documented commitment.

The Commission was agreeable to the golf course plan and the low density apartment use designations for lands abutting including the small section in the area makai of Kamehameha Highway next to King High School. In view of the legal question brought out by the Deputy Director, the Commission stated that it could adopt these recommendations subject to an opinion from the Corporation Counsel.

ACTION: Mr. Muller made a motion to recommend approval of (1) the golf course plan involving 150 acres by excluding the 10-acre mangrove park area; (2) low density apartment designation for the strip abutting the golf course; (3) the 10-acre community park in the mauka section next to the proposed elementary school provided that a commitment can be obtained in writing from the developers that they will grade and level the area; and (4) low density apartment use designation for the area makai of Kamehameha Highway next to King High School; subject to the receipt of an opinion from the Corporation Counsel that the foregoing recommended changes can be done. The motion was seconded by Mr. Chun and carried.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN CENTRAL HONOLULU DISTRICT (MAKIKI, PAWAA, ALA MOANA) PLANNING AREA NO. 13

The Commission again reviewed a proposal to adopt the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan for the Central Honolulu District (Makiki, Pawaa, Ala Moana), Planning Area No. 13; and to amend that portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu. The public hearing held on October 31, 1968, and continued on November 14, 1968, was closed and the Commission had deferred action.

The staff submitted to the Commission, a summary of suggested changes made by individuals, community associations, and other civic organizations.

Since a bare quorum was present, the Commission stated that an item as extremely important as this should be considered before a fuller Commission.

The Chairman announced deferral of this matter until the next meeting of the Commission.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND
USE MAP
CENTRAL BUSINESS
DISTRICT

The Commission also deferred action on a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu and to adopt the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for the Central Business District.

The public hearing held on October 17, 1968, was continued to October 31, 1968, and closed. The staff had submitted a summary of all the suggested changes made by individuals and community and civic organizations.

IMPROVEMENT
REVOLVING FUND
DEPARTMENT OF
PARKS AND
RECREATION

By Resolution No. 384, the City Council had referred to the Planning Commission for its comments and recommendation, a proposal to transfer from the Improvement Revolving Fund to the Department of Parks and Recreation, the sum of $16,429.65 to settle a court case which resulted from the City's condemnation of the Cleghorn property for a beach park in Waikiki.

The Deputy Director explained that the sum is to satisfy a claim for a leasehold interest held by John Patrick Betro and the estate of Vern V. and Violet G. Gilligan in a portion of the arcade building which was formerly situated on the property. The judgment in favor of Mr. Betro and the Bishop Trust Company, trustees for the Gilligan Estate, was handed down by the Circuit Court in a jury-waived trial. In view of the circumstances, he recommended that the Commission approve the proposed transfer of funds.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission recommended approval of Resolution No. 384, with the understanding that the Improvement Revolving Fund will be reimbursed when funds become available in the Capital Improvement Budget Ordinance.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, authorized the calling of public hearings on Thursday, December 12, 1968, to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director:

ZONING BUSINESS
KAPAHULU
3046 MONSARRAT AVENUE
YOUNG HUNG

(1) Change in zoning from Class B Residential to Business, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 5,244 square foot parcel of land at 3046 Monsarrat Avenue in Kapahulu.

ZONING BUSINESS
AIEA
99-236 MOANALUA ROAD
ST. TIMOTHY'S
EPISCOPAL CHURCH

(2) Change in zoning from Class A Residential to Business for a 42,741 square foot parcel of land at 99-236 Moanalua Road, adjacent to the Aiea Shopping Center, in Aiea, in conformity with the General Plan.

GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
WAHIAWA
GRANDVIEW TRACT
SUBDIVISION
SEWAGE PUMP STATION

(3) Amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Wahiawa by changing the land use designation from Residential use to Public Facilities use (Sewage Pump Station) for a parcel of land situated within the Grandview Tract Subdivision in Wahiawa.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima
Carole A. Kamishima
Secretary-Reporter II

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
December 12, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, December 12, 1968, at 1:35 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Richard K. Sharpless presiding:

PRESENT:

Richard K. Sharpless, Chairman
Philip Chun
Robert L. Muller
Arthur A. Rutledge (present from 1:47 p.m.)
Thomas N. Yamabe II

Moses Lum Hoy, ex-officio

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director
Denis Leong, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Cyril W. Lemmon
Robert F. Ellis, ex-officio

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
KAPAHULU
3046 and 3058
MONSARRAT AVENUE
EDWARD HO AND
YOUNG HUNG

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing Class B Residential to Business for parcels of land at 3046 and 3058, Monsarrat Avenue, situated on the ewa side of Monsarrat Avenue and makai of Kanaina Avenue in Kapahulu, same being the Monsarrat Store and Mac's Market premises, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for Kaimuki-Kapahulu.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of December 1, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicants, applicable governmental agencies, Kapahulu Businessmen's Association, Kapahulu Community Association, and to John Ramsey of Pacific Business News. No letters of protest or comment have been received.

The Director presented the proposal and pointed out the subject properties which are the premises of Mac's Market and the Monsarrat Store. The owners are requesting the change in zoning to conform to the existing business operation.

The subject properties are within the Hinano Project, Kapahulu Neighborhood Renewal Project area. The Honolulu Redevelopment Agency indicated that it has no objection to the proposed rezoning. The approved Urban Renewal Plan designates the subject parcels for Commercial use.

The Board of Water Supply reports that its facilities are adequate to serve the proposed use. The Division of Sewers reports that sewers are available and adequate for the proposed development. No road widening is proposed.

Since the proposal conforms to the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for Kaimuki-Kapahulu, the Director recommended approval of the zoning change.

In response to questions from the Commission, the Director stated that steps are being initiated by the Department of Education to acquire the property occupied by Dairy Queen on Monsarrat Avenue. He pointed out the areas planned for commercial uses under the General Plan and noted that there are some commercial developments on Campbell Avenue, such as a service station, a dwelling being used to rent household appliances, and so forth.

Upon the call by the Chairman, no one spoke in opposition to or in favor of the application.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, closed the public hearing and recommended approval to the change in zoning from existing Class B Residential to Business for parcels of land at 3046 and 3058 Monsarrat Avenue in Kapahulu, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for Kaimuki-Kapahulu.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING BUSINESS
AIEA
99-236 MOANALUA ROAD
ST. TIMOTHY'S
EPISCOPAL CHURCH

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing Class A Residential to Business for a 42,741 square foot parcel of land at 99-236 Moanalua Road, situated on the mauka side of Moanalua Road, between Aiea Stream and Puakala Street in Moanalua, same being the St. Timothy's Episcopal Church premises, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa to Halawa.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of December 1, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, Aiea Community Association, and to John Ramsey of Pacific Business News. No letters of protest have been received.

The Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the subject property, same being the St. Timothy's Episcopal Church premises. He stated that:

1) The Planning Commission approved an amendment to a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa to Halawa to change the land use designation from Residential to Commercial use for this same area;

2) The applicant is proposing to sell this property to the Aiea Shopping Center for use as employee parking and, in the interim, to utilize the existing building for storage of the shopping center supplies, such as Christmas decorations, and other accessory storage needs of the shopping center;

3) Presently the employees are utilizing the prime parking stalls of the shopping center, thereby decreasing the parking spaces for use by the customers;

4) The shopping center presently does not meet the required number of parking spaces under the Comprehensive Zoning Code and the acquisition of the subject property will allow the shopping center to meet the parking requirement;

5) There is the possibility that sometime in the future, a bridge may be constructed over the stream to provide for customer parking or some other use;

6) The present request conforms to the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for Waiawa to Halawa;

7) The Board of Water Supply reports that its facilities are adequate to serve the proposed use; and

8) The Department of Public Works reports that the sewer line is adequate to serve the proposed use; however, a larger sewer line would have to be installed sometime in the future.

Since the proposed zoning conforms to the General Plan, and water and sewer facilities are adequate to serve the proposed use, the Director recommended approval of the rezoning proposal.

In response to questions from the Commission, the Director stated that if the shopping center expands, the parking requirement could be met by having several parking levels, similar to that of Ala Moana Shopping Center.

In the event the sewerage system is inadequate for any commercial development on this particular parcel, the Commission inquired whether there was any way in which the Commission could avoid requests by the property owners for sewerage service.

The Director replied that when the drawings are made by the architect, a check should be made with the applicable governmental agencies to determine whether all the utilities are adequate for the proposed use. If the utilities are inadequate, the architect will be so informed. However, if the architect does not

check whether the utilities are adequate, the building permit will not be issued until the utilities become available for the proposed use.

No one spoke in favor of or in opposition to the proposed rezoning.

ACTION: The Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from existing Class A Residential to Business for a 42,741 square foot parcel of land at 99-236 Moanalua Road, situated on the mauka side of Moanalua Road, between Aiea Stream and Puakala Stream in Moanalua, same being the St. Timothy's Episcopal Church premises, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa to Halawa, upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Rutledge.

PUBLIC HEARING GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) WAHIAWA WITHIN THE GRANDVIEW TRACT SUBDIVISION

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and Detailed Land Use Map of Wahiawa by changing the land use designation from Residential Use to Public Facilities Use (sewage pump station site), for a 7,045 square foot parcel of land situated at the end of Nonohe Place within the Grand View Tract Subdivision, Wahiawa, and covered by Tax Map Key 7-5-25: 98.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of December 1, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, Wahiawa Community Association, and to 11 property owners.

The Director acknowledged receipt of a letter signed by Mr. Roy Tanji, President of the Wahiawa Community & Businessmen's Association requesting a postponement of a decision so that the residents may be fully aware of the intended change in land use. He also acknowledged receipt of a letter of protest from four adjoining property owners and read the reasons given for the protest, as follows:

1) Dissemination of reasons by the City and County of Honolulu to adjoining property owners like ourselves regarding the nature and extent of a sewage pump station site has been sorely neglected by City officials in charge of this type of project;

2) We are not apprised at all as to whether or not said facility would cause pollution of air, excessive noise, and in general, any deleterious effect on adjoining property owners;

3) We purchased our properties under the assumption that adjoining lots would be utilized for construction of other homes. The placement of a sewage facility would definitely lower the value of our respective homes;

4) There are other vacant lots in the area that could possibly be utilized for placement of a sewage pump station site. If selection of another site is feasible, engineering wise, in an area where there are no homes built, then eventual purchasers of lots surrounding another sewage pump station site would then be apprised of such a facility and objections would not be forthcoming;

5) Construction, if contemplated, would cause a severe drainage problem for our homes. This objection can be more readily illustrated by actual viewing of our residences; and

6) As to the Richard Melville Ollila residence, Mrs. Ollila is employed on the night shift at the U. S. Post Office, and construction noises would definitely disrupt the peaceful enjoyment of her home.

The Director pointed out the proposed location of the sewage pump station which is to be located at the lowest point within this Grand View Tract Subdivision. All sewage from the area will flow by gravity to the proposed sewage pump station. The effluent will then be pumped to the main gravity line on California Avenue leading to the Wahiawa Sewage Treatment Plant in lower Wahiawa.

He stated that this sewage pumping station will be similar to other pumping stations located throughout the island, such as in Waimanalo, Whitmore Village in Wahiawa and other areas. The change in designation of land use must be shown on the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map before funds can be made available for the construction of the pump station.

The selection of the sewage pumping station site was made by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. Chew Lun Lau from the Department of Public Works was called upon to answer questions from the Commission.

When asked whether this proposed sewage pump station will service only the Grand View Tract Subdivision, Mr. Lau replied that the pump station will service an area of approximately 12 acres or about 67 house lots. Referring to the map displayed on the wall, he stated that the green line denotes the drainage district which will be served by the sewage pump station, the blue line denotes the main sewer line which will serve the upper portion of Wahiawa,

and the area shaded in yellow is the proposed site of the sewage pump station. He stated that the homes in this subdivision were constructed in the early part of 1960.

He noted that the topographic map of the area shows that the subject parcel is much lower in elevation than the abutting parcels. Because of the terrain of the land, the elevation along the main sewer line is about 1,244, 1,254, and 1,258 feet. The ground slopes toward the gully on the Waialua side of the subdivision. The slope of the subject parcel to the abutting property owner's property is approximately 3%.

When asked whether the sewage pump station could be located elsewhere, Mr. Lau stated that there are five vacant lots in this subdivision, but the cost would be much greater if those lots are used. The subject lot was selected because it is much lower than the other lots. It is a flag lot. He indicated that the problem of access will arise when the possibility is given to locating the sewage pump station outside of the drainage area. The maintenance men must visit the site daily. Although there is access to the proposed sewage pump station outside of the area where the main sewer line is located, he stated that because the contour of the land is steep, the cost will be much greater since heavy equipment will have to be brought to the site to do excavation work.

Mr. Lau explained that the areas surrounding the pump station will be landscaped. The pump station will be comprised of two compartments which will be located approximately 10 feet below ground level. One compartment will collect the sewage and the other compartment, known as the dry well, is where the pumps are located. The pumps will be operated automatically and when the sewage rises in one well, it trips on the pump automatically and when the well empties, it trips again and stops the pump. He did not believe that noise will emanate from the pumping operation itself.

Mr. Sharpless inquired what consideration is given when determining the need for a sewage pump station. Mr. Lau stated that initiation of the project depends on the CIP. In this instance, the pump station will be constructed through an improvement district project, but a determination must be made first to select a site that would be best suited for the sewage pump station. He explained that because this area was built without sewers, the means to provide collection systems for areas that are unsewered is through the Sewer Improvement Program. He noted that there are more than 500 defective cesspools in Wahiawa. Approximately two years ago, 7,000 calls were received to have the cesspools pumped. Each pumping operation represented a cost of $10. The proposed

sewage pump station will eliminate the necessity to have the cesspools pumped.

Mr. Lau was asked to comment on the letter submitted by the four property owners with reference to the concerns expressed regarding air pollution, excessive noise, and drainage problems as a result of the installation of the sewage pump station.

Mr. Lau did not believe that any excessive noise will be produced from the sewage pump station. The only noise will be a slight humming noise from the electric motor on the pump, but he noted that this pump will be located under ground.

When asked to identify the type of air pollution that the protestants are concerned about, Mr. Richard Ollila, one of the property owners who signed the letter, explained that their reference was in connection with the odor that the sewage pump station might emit.

Mr. Lau did not believe that odor will be produced from a small neighborhood sewage pump station such as this. He stated that no complaints about odor have been received from residents in areas where a sewage pump station was constructed. However, he noted the possibility of odor from a large sewage pump station collecting raw sewage from several other drainage areas or collecting sewage which have been pumped several times.

Further replying to questions from the Commission, Mr. Lau believed that the drainage system will be improved because a retaining wall will be constructed. There is an existing drainage system to the parcel. The proposed sewage pump station will be constructed of hollow tile, measuring 12 feet x 12 feet with a flat concrete roof. He cited an example of this type of structure located in Wahiawa on the Waialua side of Leilehua High School near Nakula Street. This particular station is located in a gully and to the rear of three homes, but to his knowledge, no complaints have been registered regarding odor, drainage problem, etc. He indicates that the Beachwalk Pumping Station in Waikiki, which is surrounded by apartments, is a very large station pumping a peak of 30 million gallons of sewage. Initially, there were problems of odor, but this problem has been rectified. No special effort is being made to suppress noise or odor from the type of structure proposed since they have found this to be unnecessary.

Testimony was received from the public.

Mr. Sunao Kamisugi, owner of the subject property under consideration as the sewage pump station site, stated that he purchased the property about six years ago with the intention of building a home. He assumed that the Department

of Public Works selected his property as the most logical place for the sewage pump station because it is vacant. He indicated that his property is one of the most beautiful view lots in Wahiawa and therefore he had purchased the land from the original subdivider. He was unable to understand the City's reason for selecting his property on which to construct the pump station. Although his chief interest was over the probable loss of his property, he expressed concern about the problems which may arise affecting the other homes in the area; he was unwilling to envision a nice residential area burdened with the results of such a proposal.

He had checked with the person living next to Leilehua High School and near the sewage pump station and was informed by her that the odor from the pump station was nauseating.

In response to inquiries from the Commission, Mr. Kamisugi stated that the contour of the land to the left of his property is very steep and there is a slight roll to the land on the right. Beyond that is the forest reserve. There is an easement leading to his property. A stream is located at the bottom of the hill and to the left of his property.

He felt that there was no necessity for a sewage pump station to serve the area at this time. No such request was submitted by the property owners. Possibly in 10 years such a need might arise. He was unaware that the City was being called upon to pump cesspools, as reported by Mr. Lau, since he does not live in that area.

Mr. Richard Ollila, the adjoining property owner, referred to the complaint made by the person living near the sewage pump station near Leilehua High School. He had visited the site and noted that the sewage pump station is located about 20 to 30 feet below the complainant's dwelling. In comparison, the proposed sewage pump station would be only a few feet away from his ventilated lanai and he would suffer the full effects of any odor which may emanate from the sewage pump station.

In describing the contour of the land, he stated that his property drops four to five feet from the roadway. A drainage ditch that runs alongside his dwelling is actually on the property of the proposed pump station and along where the driveway would be. Water is also collected from the adjoining properties. In order to have a large enough driveway for trucks, etc., the ditch would have to be filled. This is the drainage problem referred to in the letter.

They had asked for a postponement because they feel that consideration should be given to utilizing other possible sites in this area. He noted that the proposed site is a conspicuous

site and as indicated before, no request was made by the people for a sewage pumping station. All of the homes are serviced by cesspools.

Mr. Ollila, also, was unaware that the City was receiving requests to pump the cesspools inasmuch as he had purchased his home about three months ago. He mentioned that he did not receive a letter advising him of this hearing.

He stated that a sewer line was installed near a dwelling that he rented in Kokokahi, Kaneohe. There are exceptions to having the cesspools connected to the sewer line; for example: whenever the existing cesspool is old and inferior, and the cost of constructing a new one is more than deemed feasible, connecting the cesspool to the sewer line would be more advantageous. He was not convinced, however, that the cesspool connection to the sewer line is absolutely necessary.

The Commission informed him that it is mandatory that all cesspools be connected to the sewer line.

When asked whether he participated in any discussions sponsored by the Wahiawa Community Association when the postponement request was discussed, Mr. Ollila replied negatively. He was informed of this hearing today by Mr. Tanji of the Wahiawa Community Association.

Mr. George Tashiro, property owner located next to Mr. Kamisugi, stated that he has lived in this area for six years and has enjoyed the beautiful view which he believed could not be found anywhere else on Oahu. He noted that before construction of the homes, this was a scenic spot for the tourists. Architects occasionally drew sketches of the view. For this reason, he purchased the lot on which he lives and was unaware that the City was proposing to construct a sewage pump station. He registered his objection to the construction of the sewage pump station.

Mr. Earl Kubo, a property owner adjacent to Mr. Ollila, stated that this is probably the best view location in Wahiawa, as far as the mountain view is concerned. He stated that very recently he was offered $85,000 for his property. He has been in the vicinity of the pumping station near Leilehua High School and, during the "Kona Wind" or south wind, there is considerable odor. He believed that the people in the area were not objecting to the odor because many are military families renting the units for a temporary period of time.

Mr. Kubo stated that he has lived at the Grand View Tract Subdivision for seven years and constructed one of the better homes. The dwelling

across the street is the residence of Dr. Sunahara who has a beautiful home costing approximately $50,000. He felt that the construction of a sewage pump station would be a detriment. He stated that his cesspool is about 35 feet from the top so it will be some time before there is any danger of overflow.

He is employed by the Honolulu Police Department at the Wahiawa Substation and has occasion to work both day and night. In the past seven years that he has lived in this area, he has never seen a "honey wagon" in this area, but has seen it in the area below on California Avenue.

Mr. Kubo registered his protest to the odor which may be produced from the sewage pump station. He stated that he visited a sewage pump station, as well as a treatment plant in South Bend, Indiana, while in full operation, and noted that there was no odor produced. In view of this, he cannot understand why local sewage pump stations are faced with this problem. He stated that there is odor from the sewage pump station in Waipio, and also from the station in the Kennedy Tract where the wind blows in the direction of Kemoo and into Schofield.

He stated that this problem is always discussed during the Mayor's Safari. Since he is not familiar with the engineering involved, he would like to receive some assurance that the sewage pump station will not produce any odor. He believed that the noise of the motor will probably be drowned by the type of building proposed to be constructed.

Mr. Yamabe inquired whether the cost of pumping the cesspools can be borne by the property owners. Mr. Lau stated that the policy of the City is to provide free cesspool pumping service. Legal Counsel Leong indicated that he was not certain whether this could be done.

Because of the testimony presented by Mr. Lau regarding the cost of pumping cesspools, the Commission inquired of Messrs. Kubo, Ollila, Tashiro and Kamisugi if they would have any objections to bearing the cost of having their cesspools pumped. All replied that they had no objection.

Mr. Kubo stated that he would prefer to bear the cost of having his cesspool pumped rather than to have the proposed sewage pump station constructed. He added that the sewage pump station would affect the aesthetic value of the properties. He stated that he has not heard of any complaints about the cesspools in the area.

Mr. Lau verified that no cesspool complaints have been received from this area because this subdivision is new, but the residents below have been requesting for the cesspool pumping service.

In 1967 to 1968, there were a number of such requests, especially during the winter months. He cited an example where one cesspool had been pumped once a month during that time.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Lau stated that the construction of this pump station is part of the Wahiawa Sewers Improvement District. When asked what the pro rata cost would be to the property owner, Mr. Lau replied that it is based on 8¢ per square foot, depending on the zoning, and the City will bear the rest of the cost. He noted that this has amounted to one-third of the cost being borne by the property owner and two-thirds of the cost being borne by the City. In this case where a sewage pump station is to be constructed, the City will bear a greater portion of the cost.

When asked whether this improvement district has been approved by the community, Mr. Lau stated that this project is being initiated by the City which has a program for eliminating cesspools, and this does not require the approval of the residents. He stated that most of the residences would have to be sewered.

When asked about the length of deferment requested, Mr. Kamisugi stated that one month would be sufficient.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Muller, voted to keep the public hearing open for one month and instructed the staff to meet with the property owners to determine whether or not some solution to the problem can be found.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP OF KANEOHE TO KUALOA (AMENDMENT) KANEOHE-HEEIA VARIOUS CHANGES

The Commission again considered a proposal to amend the Kaneohe-Heeia portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe to Kualoa area by:

1. Changing certain land use designations within the area covered by the Ahupuaa of Heeia; and

2. Modifying the right-of-way width of Kamehameha Highway between Waikalua Road and Lilipuna Road from 100 feet to 84 feet.

The public hearing held on October 31, 1968, was continued to November 14 and closed. An architectural rendering showing the entrance from Kahekili Highway to the proposed Light Industrial area as submitted by the proposed developer was displayed.

The Director reported that the Commission had acted on a number of land use changes and street rights-of-way amendments but had deferred action on the proposals to establish a 15-foot building

setback and planting strip on both sides of the proposed 60-foot roadway running through the proposed Light Industrial area and a 40-foot planting strip along Kahekili Highway next to the Light Industrial area. He noted that the Commission had questioned the authority of the Commission to establish additional setback areas beyond that required by the zoning ordinance. The Comprehensive Zoning Code's requirement on front yard setback in a Light Industrial zone is 5 feet. For areas adjoining a residential use, a wall must be provided.

The Director presented briefly the several amendments to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map recommended by the Commission at its previous meeting. Regarding the several amendments involving land around the golf course, he reported that a question was raised and directed to the Deputy Corporation Counsel for an opinion. The question was whether or not these amendments could be made without holding another public hearing inasmuch as these amendments were not made by the Department and, as such were not shown on the map at the time the public hearing was held. It was the Deputy Corporation Counsel's opinion that another public hearing must be held.

In discussing the setback requirement, the Director presumed that the Commission can establish setback areas on the Detailed Land Use Map and as examples, he mentioned the planting strips shown on the Detailed Land Use Map of Waipahu along the boundaries of the industrial areas and also on the Detailed Land Use Map for the Honolulu Airport area within the airport industrial park complex. He asked for comments from the Deputy Corporation Counsel regarding the legality of this type of designation.

Legal Counsel Leong inquired of the Director about the applicable classification of land use designation to identify a planting strip. He asked whether it is to be park, residential, apartment, or any of the other types of land use designations reflected on the Detailed Land Use Map. He also asked what the underlying zoning would be for planting strips.

The Director felt that a planting strip could be indicated as such on the Detailed Land Use Map but for zoning it would be appropriate to place it in a Preservation District. He noted that in the past, zoning to industrial did not include these planting strips which were placed in some other zoning category.

Mr. Yamabe questioned the authority of the Commission to zone a planting strip or setback area. In the past, there were no planting strips related to zoning itself, but the area was kept in whatever zoning applicable at that time. He felt that if zoning, other than what is

established under the subdivision ordinance, were to be established for setback areas, this means that a multiple zoning is being created.

Mr. Leong stated that his office has rendered no formal opinion regarding this particular problem. He concurred with Mr. Yamabe that it is highly questionable whether a little strip of land can be called a planting strip for General Plan purposes. He is not questioning this as being something to be covered by the zoning ordinance. He believes that it has been covered in part where buffer zones have been set up within the subdivision ordinance and with setback requirements. Without saying it is illegal, he stated that planting strips to be reflected on the General Plan would be highly questionable.

In reply to questions from the Commission, the Director briefly explained the developer's reason for wanting the setback area reduced from the recommended 15 feet to 10 feet. He stated that Hawaiian Electric Company has a power line easement of about 30 feet running along the Pali side boundary of the property. This easement plus an originally recommended 20-foot buffer on the same side reduces the usable width of the lot by creating a long narrow strip of land which would be very difficult to develop for Light Industrial purposes. The alternative was to have no buffer strip on the Pali side boundary of the property because a wall will be constructed and to increase the front yard setback by establishing a planting strip off the 60-foot roadway to make the area attractive.

He stated that the adopted General Plan designates this area for Light Industrial purposes. The area was slightly enlarged. There are proposals to relocate some contractors' yards and other types of Light Industrial uses which are presently located in the Commercial areas so that the Commercial areas could be properly developed. He felt that each community needs a Light Industrial area located in close proximity to the developed areas to provide the necessary services to the residents; otherwise, the cost to residents in the area will be increased if these services must be provided from a great distance away. Although the Legal Counsel has doubts about the establishment of a planting strip on the Detailed Land Use Map, the Director felt that the Commission could take the risk by recommending the designation or it could defer this matter for receipt of a written opinion.

When questioned about the height of the proposed building, the Director could not give a reply because no plans have yet been designed by the developer. However, he stated that there is a height limitation of 350 feet for the interior portion of the lot. For areas adjoining a residential or apartment use, the height and setback requirements follow that of the adjoining lot.

For a residential area the height limitation is 25 feet while in an A-1 Apartment District the limit is 40 feet. In this instance, the height limitation would be 25 feet for that portion adjoining the Residential District. He stated that the only difference between a 5-foot and a 10-foot planting strip is that the 10-foot strip would have a larger area of landscaping. The Kaneohe Community Council had expressed their desire to see this industrial area developed in a park-like atmosphere with deep planting strips and landscaping.

The Commission then discussed the proposal to establish a 40-foot planting strip along Kahekili Highway next to the proposed Light Industrial area. The developer had requested that this strip be reduced to 20 feet because a natural mound along the highway is to be retained.

Mr. Robert Hinazumi, representing the developer, explained that the original plan showed the 20-foot buffer strip but later he noticed that this was increased to 40 feet. Under the 40 foot proposal, they were planning to grade the area down and use the material to fill the lower area, but the Kaneohe Community Council had expressed their desire to have the mound left in its natural state. Therefore, by leaving the mound, he felt that a 20-foot buffer is sufficient to screen the industrial area from the highway. He stated that they plan to prepare their development plan in accordance with the provisions of the new Comprehensive Zoning Code. He noted that there are 10 feet of fully paved sidewalk from the edge of the pavement of the 60-foot roadway. He is not saying that they are going to build a structure 5 feet from the property line, but he would like to have the flexibility of development.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Hinazumi stated that he did not wish to make any commitment at this time regarding the setback because their development plans have not progressed to that stage; however, they plan to conform to the Comprehensive Zoning Code requirement by providing a 5-foot planting strip.

After further discussion, Mr. Hinazumi agreed to the establishment of a 10-foot planting strip along the 60-foot roadway and the establishment of a 20-foot buffer strip along Kahekili Highway.

<u>MOTION</u>: Mr. Rutledge made a motion to recommend the establishment of a 10-foot planting strip along the 60-foot roadway between Kamehameha Highway and Kahekili Highway and the establishment of a 20-foot buffer strip along Kahekili Highway. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

In the discussion that followed, Mr. Chun questioned whether this action might not jeopardize

the adoption of the General Plan map and also the Comprehensive Zoning Code. It was his understanding that any zoning action taken subsequent to the adoption of the Detailed Land Use Map must be in conformity with that land use map. Therefore, if the land use is in conflict with the basic provisions of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, then a new ordinance would have to be adopted later. By continuously doing this type of change, the basic purpose of the Comprehensive Zoning Code will be defeated. In this instance, the Comprehensive Zoning Code provides for a 5-foot setback but the proposal is to establish a 10-foot setback on the Detailed Land Use Map requiring an amendment to the Comprehensive Zoning Code to provide for a 10-foot setback in this type of district. He was opposed to taking this type of action.

As an alternative, the Director suggested that the strip be shown in the Preservation District or Residential.

Mr. Yamabe felt that the proper action would be to designate 5 feet from the road as Preservation because the additional 5 feet setback is a requirement of the Comprehensive Zoning Code. This will give a total setback area of 10 feet.

Mr. Chun concurred that the first 5 feet should be shown as Preservation and the second 5 feet shown as Industrial.

The Director, however, pointed out that the front yard is measured from the lot line parallel to the street so that the 5-foot planting strip in the Preservation District can also be applied as the 5-foot front yard setback area. Since the Commission's objective is to provide for a 10-foot setback area, he suggested that the Commission proceed with this recommendation and the staff can work out the details later when an application for rezoning is made. In the meantime, the staff can consult with the Corporation Counsel on the various questions involving legality.

Mr. Rutledge withdrew his motion and Mr. Chun seconded thereto.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Muller, the Commission recommended that the Industrial designation be shown on the Detailed Land Use Map as indicated by the Planning Director with the intent that there be a 10-foot planting strip along the 60-foot roadway and a 20-foot buffer strip along Kahekili Highway.

The Commission then discussed whether or not it must hold another public hearing to consider the recommendation made by the Commission to designate two separate areas in the Heeia area

for low density apartment use because this use was not the recommendation of the Planning Director and was not reflected on the map presented at the public hearing.

Although Legal Counsel had stated his opinion that another public hearing must be held to consider the two proposals recommended by the Commission, the Director was of a different opinion. He referred to the Charter provision which authorizes the Planning Commission to review the General Plan and Development Plan and modifications thereof developed by the Director, and to recommend approval in whole or in part and with or without modifications or rejection of such plans. The Commission then transmits such plans with its recommendations thereon, through the Mayor, to the City Council for its consideration and action.

In this instance, the Commission is recommending the adoption of the majority of the proposals developed by the Director with some modifications for transmittal to the City Council so that he did not believe that another public hearing should be held. He noted that in the past when the Commission's recommendation differed from that which the Department had presented, the Commission's recommendations were shown on an overlay on the Department's plan map. It is only when the Department decides to change the map other than as advertised that the matter must be presented again at a new public hearing.

Mr. Yamabe concurred with the Director because it was also his understanding that the Commission can recommend amendments to the Department's plan without scheduling another public hearing. If this were not possible, he questioned how the Commission is to officially present its recommendations to the City Council.

When questioned by the Commission, the Director stated that he plans to submit his plan to the Council with an overlay showing the Commission's recommendations. He can also inform the Council that he has no objection to the Commission's recommendations.

Mr. Yamabe suggested that the Commission proceed on the basis of the action taken at the previous meeting with the omission of the contingency clause for receipt of an opinion from the Corporation Counsel. The other members concurred.

<u>ACTION</u>: Mr. Yamabe moved to state that the action taken by the Commission at its previous meeting to recommend the various land use changes on the Detailed Land Use Map developed by the Planning Director is the position of the Commission at this time. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE MAP
AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN
(PLANNING AREA 13)
MAKIKI-PAWAA-ALA
MOANA
(CENTRAL HONOLULU
DISTRICT)

(Mr. Chun was not present during consideration of the following matter.)

The Commission again considered a proposal to adopt the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan for street plans, utilities and public facilities, for Central Honolulu District (Makiki-Pawaa-Ala Moana) Planning Area 13, for land bounded by Kewalo Basin, Ward Avenue, Prospect Street, Nehoa Street, Punahou Street, Beretania Street, Kalakaua Avenue, Ala Wai Canal, and the shoreline including Magic Island; and to amend that portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu. The public hearing held on October 31, 1968, and continued on November 14, 1968, was closed and the Commission had deferred action for further study.

The staff's report summarizing the various recommendations for changes presented during the public hearing was distributed to the Commission members. The Commission discussed each issue as follows:

1. Mass Transit -- The Director took the same position as he did for the Central Business District, General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan. He recommended that the mass transit alignment not be shown on the plans at this time until the next phase of the mass transit study is completed and adopted. He noted, however, that the Commission had taken action to show the alignment on the Central Business District plan and had recommended the Hotel Street route; therefore, logically, if the alignment is to be shown on this plan, it should also follow Hotel Street and extend in the Waikiki direction. He reported that the Oahu Development Conference had recommended that the alignment branch off in the makai direction adjacent to the Honolulu International Center, then turn in the Waikiki direction along Kapiolani Boulevard.

For that part of the alignment continuing on Hotel Street to Thomas Square then on Young Street toward the Waikiki direction, the Director reported on a law passed a number of years ago prohibiting the extension of Hotel Street through Thomas Square. Whether or not this law also affects a mass transit proposal would have to be checked.

In reply to questions from the Commission, the Director stated that the Commission may recommend only one alignment and not show the makai branch going towards Waikiki. He stated that the City Council took a position to show the alignment only on the Central Business District plans. He indicated that nearby public facilities, such as the Academy of Arts, the Honolulu International Center complex, McKinley High School, Honolulu Community College, and so forth

are within easy walking distance of Hotel Street.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, recommended that the proposed Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan for the Central Honolulu District be amended to show the mass transit line along Hotel Street and extended beyond along Young Street.

2. H-1 Freeway - On and Off Ramps at Piikoi Street and at Keeaumoku Street -- The Director reported on the suggestion made by the Central Honolulu Community Association (CHCA) to have on and off ramps at the freeway intersection with Piikoi Street and with Keeaumoku Street. He explained that the on and off ramps at these intersections were not shown because the freeway design is determined by the Federal and State governments. The State Department of Transportation was apprised of this suggestion, but to date no reply has been received. Because of standards for interstate highways established by the Bureau of Public Roads, the Director doubted that the Bureau would approve the on and off ramps at the two intersections only one block apart.

Mr. Sharpless felt strongly that there should be an on and off ramp in this general area, possibly at Keeaumoku Street, for traffic wanting to go in the mauka or makai direction. Realizing that the ramp cannot be shown on the map, he felt that the general feeling of the Commission should be stated in writing.

ACTION: Mr. Yamabe's motion to state the Commission's feeling that there should be an on and off ramp somewhere in this vicinity, either at Piikoi Street or at Keeaumoku Street, was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried.

3. Grade Separation at Keeaumoku Street and Kapiolani Boulevard (Ala Moana Shopping Center) -- A proposal was made to have an overpass coming out of the Ala Moana Shopping Center and going over Kapiolani Boulevard to meet Keeaumoku Street.

The Director reported that the Planning Department has had this suggestion under study for several years, but nothing has been settled. He indicated that this proposal need not be shown if it is to be within the same right-of-way; however, if additional right-of-way is involved, widening of the street should be shown. Since no schematics have been prepared as to how the overpass is to be designed, the overpass was not shown on the plans. He suggested, instead, that the overpass proposal be mentioned in the written report to the City Council.

ACTION: The Commission accepted the Director's recommendation not to show the overpass proposal at Keeaumoku Street and Kapiolani Boulevard, but to mention it in the written report to the City Council upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Muller.

4. Alignment of Pensacola Street -- Dillingham Development Corporation had requested that Pensacola Street extension makai of Kapiolani Boulevard be established as connecting with Queen Street instead of Auahi Street as shown on the plan. One argument presented was that this would relieve traffic on Piikoi Street by channeling much of the traffic into Pensacola Street then straight into the Civic Center and the downtown areas.

The Director felt that this proposal presented a worse traffic situation because Queen Street narrows down to 56 feet, then to 50 feet and finally to 44 feet at its connection with Nimitz Highway in the downtown area. Two lanes of traffic would be trying to enter into one lane on Nimitz Highway. On the other hand, Auahi Street maintains the same right-of-way throughout, and there is a possibility that in the future when the South Street Connector is ready for construction, a better traffic system can be designed for the area.

When questioned whether this through traffic to Ala Moana Boulevard is really an important consideration in deciding which connection to make, the Director did not believe that much of the traffic heading downtown could be induced to use either Queen Street or Auahi Street. He felt that most of the traffic generating from the mauka section and going in the makai direction would either turn on Beretania Street, King Street, or Kapiolani Boulevard rather than going all the way makai and turning toward the downtown area. He noted that even if the Auahi Street connection is adopted, Queen Street still ties in with Pensacola Street. Queen Street extension is not constructed, but Auahi Street extension connecting with Ala Moana Boulevard is already completed.

When questioned about the potential development of the area based upon one connection versus the other, the Director did not believe that either one would alter significantly the development potential of this area. Dillingham Corporation preferred the Queen Street connection because it gives them a larger area to develop. The Ward Estate owns an adjoining property but it has expressed no views one way or the other. The street plans apparently do not alter its plans that much.

ACTION: Mr. Rutledge's motion to concur with the Director's plan to connect Pensacola Street with Auahi Street was seconded by Mr. Muller and carried.

5. Apartment Density Designation in Makiki -- The staff's designation is for medium-density apartment use in the area adjoining Nehoa Street then high-density apartment use in the makai direction to the freeway.

The Central Honolulu Community Association had recommended medium-density apartment use mauka of the freeway rather than low-density apartment use along Nehoa Street to give greater protection to the single-family residential areas mauka of Nehoa Street. The community association pointed out that the severe traffic congestion and parking problems in the area would be aggravated by a higher-density development.

The Director acknowledged that the existing street pattern and street widths are not the most desirable for apartment development and he proposed a system of one-way streets to alleviate much of the traffic congestion. He recommended no change in the existing land use pattern because the high-density zoning for the area had been established about 20 years ago and zoning commitments have been made to over 50% of the property owners with some buildings already constructed.

ACTION: Mr. Rutledge's motion to accept the recommendation of the Planning Department was seconded by Mr. Muller and carried.

6. Hotel Designation on the Mauka Side of Ala Moana Boulevard -- The Outdoor Circle had submitted a letter opposing this proposal and pointed out that Ala Moana Park is one of the most heavily used parks by local residents and its density should not be increased.

The Planning Department believes that this is a good location for apartment and hotel developments because the area overlooks open space (Ala Moana Park) and this might provide some relief to the congestion developing in Waikiki. The Central Honolulu Community Association supports the hotel designation. The Oahu Development Conference also supports this use and commented that the park is not heavily used during the week, but generally on weekends only. The Department recognizes that Ala Moana and Kapiolani Parks are the most heavily used parks so that efforts are being made to purchase and develop major parks in other areas of the island to relieve some of the pressures in Honolulu. In addition, a series of pocket parks are being proposed.

ACTION: Mr. Muller's motion to accept the recommendation of the Planning Department was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried.

7. School-Park Site (Ala Moana-Kewalo Area) -- An elementary school-park complex is shown in the area next to Queen Street in the Ala Moana-Kewalo area. The Department of Education has recommended a school site in the makai section to serve at least the first four elementary grades. Studies indicate the potential elementary-school-age enrollment of about 215 pupils from kindergarten through the fourth grade.

The property owners in the area have expressed their opinion that a school-park complex is not needed in this makai area. The Central Honolulu Community Association had proposed that the school-park be located in the Sheridan Tract area, but the Director noted that the area is completely built up and no site is readily available. He also noted that this site is too far to serve the school population in the makai section.

Mr. Sharpless did not visualize the need for an elementary school in the makai section because he believes that the type of apartment development proposed in the area would not generate much school-age children. He felt that consideration should be given to the use of Linekona School adjacent to Thomas Square, or further studies should be conducted to locate another site.

The Director suggested that this school-park designation be shown on the plan because the Department of Education requires a decision on a site. When the property owner is ready to develop the land and submits an application for a building permit, the land use can revert to its original zoning should the Department of Education indicate that it is unable to purchase the land.

ACTION: Mr. Muller made a motion to recommend approval of the Planning Department's plan to designate a school-park complex in the Ala Moana-Kewalo area as shown on the map. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yamabe and carried.

8. Kaahumanu School-Park Complex -- The Planning Department has proposed that half of the block mauka of Kinau Street and opposite the Kaahumanu School be designated as a park to permit the school to build more classrooms on the existing school grounds and use the park as its playground.

The Department of Parks and Recreation had recommended that the entire block, except for those lots fronting on Piikoi Street, be

designated for park use, but the staff is recommending only half of the block because of cost. To provide for more parks in the urban areas, mini-parks are being proposed.

ACTION: The Commission recommended approval of the Department's proposal upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Muller.

9. District Park at the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association Site -- In concurrence with the Department of Education, the plan shows a school-park complex on the site of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association property mauka of the freeway and retention of Cartwright Field makai of the freeway.

The Department of Parks and Recreation is opposed to splitting the park into two little neighborhood parks and proposed locating the school makai of the freeway in the present Cartwright Field and to use the entire Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association property as a district park.

The Planning Department believes that the school should be located in the district it is intended to serve and not on the makai side of the freeway. The bridge connection over the freeway can be used to gain access to the two parks.

ACTION: The Commission recommended approval of the staff's recommendation upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe and seconded by Mr. Muller.

10. Mini-Parks in the Makiki Area -- Several mini-parks are shown throughout this planning area. Because of problems involved in maintenance and upkeep, the Director noted that the mini-park concept has not been fully accepted by some of our governmental agencies. However, because of the high cost of land and the serious lack of recreational facilities in the Central Honolulu area, mini-parks scattered throughout the area might present some solution to the problem. Whether or not this would be successful, he could not say; but, he felt that this concept should be introduced and tried. He noted that a number of cities have experimented with mini-parks which seem to be accepted. As an example, he indicated that a park at the corner of Punahou Street and Wilder Avenue is considered a mini-park. This park is in use constantly.

ACTION: The Commission recommended approval of the Department's plan for mini-parks in the Makiki area as shown on the map upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge and seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Muller and a second by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission recommended approval of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan, as amended, for the Central Honolulu District, Planning Area 13 (Makiki-Pawaa-Ala Moana).

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT

The Commission reconsidered a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu and the adoption of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for the Central Business District, for an area bounded by Nuuanu Stream, North King Street, Liliha Street, School Street, Nuuanu Avenue, Pauoa Road, proposed Pauoa Road-Auwaiolimu Street connector, Auwaiolimu Street, Prospect Street, Ward Avenue, Ala Moana Boulevard, Kewalo Basin and the ocean. The public hearing held on October 17, 1968, was continued to October 31, 1968, and closed; the Commission deferred action for further study.

The staff's report outlining the major issues involved was distributed to the Commission members. The Commission considered the issues individually as follows:

1. Mass Transit

The Oahu Development Conference, the Downtown Improvement Association and the Civic Center Advisory Committee recommended that the tentative alignment of the mass transit line be shown on the Detailed Land Use Map and that this alignment follow Hotel Street.

The Planning Department's recommendation is not to show this alignment until the second phase of the mass transit study (involving the specific alignment, station stops, etc.) is completed.

The display map outlined three alternate routes of the mass transit line. One route followed Beretania Street; the second, Hotel Street; and the third, King Street.

The Commission discussed whether or not to show the mass transit line, and whether or not this line should be a tentative marking.

The Director felt that, if a designation is to be made, it should follow the recommendation made by the consultants who did the Civic Center Master Plan study which was to follow the Beretania Street alignment. The Oahu Development Conference and the Downtown Improvement Association, however, have recommended the Hotel Street alignment. The Director reported that completion of the next phase of the consultants' study is anticipated within the next 2 or 3 years. The request for funds is included in the Department of Traffic's operating budget for the next fiscal year and is subject to approval by the City Council. By designating

the alignment now, he believed that problems involving land speculation and values along the route might arise.

The Commission asked whether any advantage would be gained by designating the alignment tentatively in comparison with not indicating any designation at all pending the completion of the next phase of the transportation study. It seemed apparent to the Commission that a tentative designation would merely indicate that there will be a mass transit system going through the civic center and the downtown areas. This might prove detrimental later should studies indicate that the line should be located elsewhere.

Mr. M. L. Randolph from the Downtown Improvement Association stressed the importance of a firm alignment designation rather than a tentative one in view of proposed developments in the downtown area. In comparison with the Beretania Street alternate route, the Hotel Street alignment is overwhelmingly beneficial. Therefore, he suggested that no alignment be shown on the map at this time if the Commission is dubious about showing a firm alignment on Hotel Street.

In addition, Mr. Randolph's reply to further inquiry by the Commission specified that the consultants did study the cost differences of the various routes suggested. Admittedly, the Hotel Street line costs more than the Beretania Street plan, but he felt that the projected benefit to be derived from the Hotel Street alignment is so much more advantageous that the higher cost should not create any discord. The suggested King Street alternate route was not deemed any more beneficial than the Hotel Street plan. The Commission was reminded that the Public Works Committee of the City Council had adopted the Hotel Street alignment as a matter of policy. He felt it would be most helpful if a firm alignment can be shown on the plan since surrounding land uses would be affected by the location of stations; planning based on the fixed line can progress. Information regarding when the mass transit system would be operational or who would pay for it was not available at this time, but he suggested that the Commission establish the route to follow Hotel Street.

The Director explained to the Commission that the City Council's action to show a mass transit line involves only the downtown area and does not include other areas which would extend to Pearl City on one end and beyond Waikiki on the other end as recommended by Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall of Hawaii, consultants to the Oahu Transportation Study. The Phase II study will involve the recommendations for a fixed alignment, feeder lines, station stops, etc. Mr. Mancini, who was retained as a consultant, is laying out a program which would

lead ultimately to a mass transit system -- preferably, a fixed rail system -- and also studies involving the improvement of the bus route and services, and bus subsidies to the Leeward, Windward and Northshore areas where there are no transportation services presently. Also, he is preparing the Federal grant application for funds to proceed with the studies involving the improvement of the bus services as well as the application for the Phase II study of the mass transit system.

If the alignment is shown now, the Commission felt that land values might be created or that problems might arise later if a different alignment is selected as a result of the Phase II study. The Commission, however, took into consideration the fact that the City Council had taken action to look favorably upon the Hotel Street alignment and that any action taken by the Commission is merely advisory since the Council will make the final decision as to where the alignment should be designated.

Mr. Yamabe's motion to show Hotel Street as the alignment of the mass transit system, and that it be clearly marked as "tentative" died for lack of a second.

ACTION: Mr. Rutledge's motion to establish Hotel Street as the mass transit route and to recommend to the City Council that it gives serious consideration to adopting this alignment was seconded by Mr. Muller and carried.

2. Civic Center Boundary

The proposed boundary of the civic center was outlined in red on the map. The Director reported that this is the boundary recommended by the consulting firm of John Carl Warnecke and Associates in contract with the State. In working on the view plane ordinance for protection of Punchbowl, the Planning Department followed a slightly modified boundary.

The Department's recommendation is not to show the boundary because it is not necessary to show it on the Land Use Map. Under the new Comprehensive Zoning Code, a special zoning district called the Historic and Cultural District with its accompanying regulations regarding civic designs, office buildings, land uses, etc., can be established and shown on an overlay.

An inquiry was made whether the Legislature had adopted a resolution establishing the boundary of the Civic Center.

The Director explained that through a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature, the Civic Center report was referred to the City and County with a request that it adopt the report in principle. The Administration had some minor differences of opinion to the consultant's report

but had stated that it saw no objection to adopting the report in principle. To date, the City Council has not taken any action to adopt the report. It also had reservations on some of the recommendations contained in the report.

The Commission decided not to take any action on the proposal to show the Civic Center boundary.

3. Traffic Patterns

Several proposals were made to change the traffic pattern as shown on the adopted Development Plan as follows:

a. At the instruction of the City Council, Punchbowl Street between Vineyard Boulevard and Beretania Street was shown open. The City Council felt that until there was some assurance that the South Street Connector would be built, it would be inadvisable to close Punchbowl Street.

   The staff is aware that the closure cannot be done until the South Street Connector and other traffic changes are made. But, in planning for the long-range goal, the staff concurred with the recommendation made in the Warnecke report that this portion of Punchbowl Street should be eliminated and the extension of the Capitol Mall to Vineyard Street be shown on the plan.

   The Commission by hand vote concurred with the staff that the plan should reflect the extension of the Capitol Mall and the closure of Punchbowl Street between Vineyard Boulevard and Beretania Street.

b. Kapiolani Boulevard Extension between King and Beretania Streets was shown open. The City Council and the staff agreed that this section should be kept open although the Warnecke report recommended its closure. The reason for keeping it open was to permit the flexibility of using Beretania and King Streets as a one-way couplet before the South Street Connector is built. Some time in the future when the South Street Connector is built, this portion of Kapiolani Boulevard Extension could probably be closed.

   By hand vote, the Commission concurred with the staff to keep Kapiolani Boulevard Extension open.

c. Kawaiahao Street between King and South Streets was shown as a pedestrian mall. The staff had no objection to this proposal because this portion serves no real function as a traffic carrying arterial.

By hand vote, the Commission concurred with the staff to show a portion of Kawaiahao Street as a pedestrian mall.

d. Halekauwila Street between Kakaako and Richard Streets was shown open upon instruction from the City Council which felt that this portion of the street should remain open until complete review of the downtown corridor is made and the ability of other streets in the area to handle the traffic is proven.

The Warnecke report recommended its closure. The staff also felt that it should eventually be closed because Beretania, King and Queen Streets will be major streets bisecting the Civic Center. In addition, this would eliminate a very bad intersection (Richards Street, Ala Moana Boulevard, and Halekauwila Street) especially during the rush hour traffic.

When a hand vote was taken to concur with the staff's proposal to close Halekauwila Street, Commissioners Yamabe and Chun opposed the proposal.

Mr. Yamabe travels through the area quite often and has seen the need to keep the street open.

Mr. Chun noted many governmental offices in the vicinity and felt that further studies should be given to seeing how the traffic generated into the area could be handled.

The Commission took no action on the proposal to close Halekauwila Street.

4. Setback and Open Spaces

Setback and open spaces were proposed at the following locations:

a. Along Mililani Mall involving State, Federal and a few privately-owned lands.

b. The front portion of the Armed Services YMCA property fronting Hotel Street.

Since the proposed setback and open spaces along Mililani Street involved mostly State and Federal-owned lands, the staff felt it unnecessary to make these designations. It is

unlikely that existing Federal and State office buildings would be demolished, and the present right-of-way of Mililani Street would eventually become a pedestrian mall to provide adequate open space.

For the proposal to show open space on the Armed Services YMCA property, the Department also felt it unnecessary to make this designation at this time. The YMCA is not ready to relinquish this property unless another site centrally located could be found in exchange. At present, it has no plans for rebuilding or relocating.

By hand vote, the Commission decided not to show the setback and open space areas as discussed.

5. Preservation of Historic Buildings Along Merchant Street

The Historical Buildings Task Force had recommended that the historic buildings on Merchant Street within the area proposed as an off-street parking structure be retained. The proposal is to retain the historic buildings within this block and develop the area into something similar to Ghirardelli Square in San Francisco or the French Quarter in New Orleans. There was a proposal to have the State coordinate its planning functions with the City by having the Traffic Court on the upper floors of the parking structure. The design of the structure is presently in progress but no action has been taken to acquire the buildings or property.

Mr. Randolph who was in the audience urged the Commission to approve the parking structure plan because of the congestion and the lack of sufficient parking facilities in the downtown area.

Regarding the proposal to preserve the historic buildings, he believed that if the entrepreneurs were willing, the depth of one store and the height of one story with the preservation of the facade could be proposed with the parking facilities above.

By hand vote, the Commission concurred with the staff to designate the Merchant, Bethel Streets area for off-street parking.

6. Pedestrian Overpass

A request was made to consider the construction of a pedestrian overpass across Vineyard Boulevard between the Kauluwela and Kukui Project areas. Whether the City or the State is to construct this overpass is unknown at this time although the State did construct the pedestrian overpass across the Vineyard Boulevard at Central Intermediate School.

The staff recognized the need for the pedestrian overpass but without a study it is unable to recommend its exact location. A designation

at this time will require that it be built at that location; therefore, any changes will require an amendment to the Plan.

Since the overpass is to be built within an existing public right-of-way, the Director believed that it could be built without its designation in the Plan.

By hand vote, the Commission decided not to show the location of a pedestrian overpass across Vineyard Boulevard, but to express its view that there should be an overpass somewhere in the vicinity.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, the Commission recommended the adoption of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Central Business District, as amended, and to submit the entire plan to the City Council for approval.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN TANTALUS-MAKIKI (PLANNING AREA NO. 12)

The Commission again reviewed the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan for street plans, utilities, and public facilities for Tantalus-Makiki, Planning Area No. 12, as prepared by the Planning Director, for land situated mauka of Lusitana, Auwaiolimu, and Nehoa Streets between Pacific Heights Road and Round Top Drive. A public hearing was held on September 7, 1967, and action was deferred pending receipt of a feasibility report from the Honolulu Sake Brewery and Ice Company on the proposal of apartment use on its property in lieu of the present industrial use.

The Director stated that the only item to be resolved by the Commission is the property of the Honolulu Sake Brewery and Ice Co. located on Booth Road. Since the land use pattern of the community is predominantly residential, the staff's recommendation was to leave the existing industrial use of the Honolulu Sake Brewery and Ice Co. property under the nonconforming use category, and eventually when this use is removed or phased out, that the area be returned to residential use. However, the owners of the Honolulu Sake Brewery and Ice Co. did not wish to be placed under the nonconforming use category. The Commission then recommended an alternative suggestion to designate this area for apartment use. The Director mentioned that there are some areas across the highway designated for apartment use. He reported that a feasibility report has been received from Honolulu Sake Brewery and Ice Co. The report states that although the land value would increase under the medium density apartment designation and zoning rather than remaining in industrial uses, the actual conversion to apartment use would not be economically feasible because of the loss of building, demolition and

improvement costs, acquisition of a new site, and construction of another plant.

The staff studied the report and, realizing that the Honolulu Brewery Sake and Ice Co. will be at its present location for a number of years, the Director recommended that the present industrial use be retained. He felt it much more urgent to have the Detailed Land Use Map adopted at this time and indicated that sometime in the future, if the Honolulu Brewery Sake and Ice Co. should undergo some changes, consideration will be given to changes of the land use at that time.

In response to questions from the Commission, the Director stated that this light industrial use would be limited to the parcel owned by Honolulu Sake Brewery and Ice Co. The parcel contains an area of 2.46 acres and the company has operated its business on that location for 59 years.

He noted that if any changes in zoning are to be made, it would have to conform to the adopted plan. If the parcel is designated for Industrial uses, the proposed use must be limited to this category. He stated that within a Light Industrial District, 15 uses are permitted under the Comprehensive Zoning Code.

When asked whether it was possible to place an operation such as this under a Conditional Use Permit, the Director gave a negative reply and stated that this type of use is not included in the Conditional Use category.

Mr. Yamabe inquired whether the primary concern of the owners were (1) to continue the operation as a brewery contemplating future relocation; or (2) to retain the industrial zoning.

The Director recalled that the testimony presented at the previous meetings indicated that the owners wish to continue the present operation. They do not want to be placed under the nonconforming use category because the building cannot be repaired, reconstructed, enlarged or added to, nor can it be altered, renovated, or repaired to an extent exceeding 25% of its assessed valuation, and in order for the owners to do any repairs or other work, they may require a variance before the Zoning Board of Appeals. The owners have also indicated that their sales are expanding and they have developed different types of sake which they are now transporting to the mainland.

In the Light Industrial District, the Director stated that no apartments, single family residences or townhouses are permitted unless these are for use by the night watchman or guards. He believed that there are a few residences on the subject property which are being occupied

by some of the employees. He noted that this is not a permitted use in the future when applying for a building permit to construct another dwelling.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, accepted the Director's recommendation to designate the parcel owned by Honolulu Sake Brewery and Ice Co. for light industrial use and recommended the adoption of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan for Tantalus-Makiki, Planning Area No. 12, as presented by the Planning Department.

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION
WAIPAHU
ABUTTING PEARL HARBOR
HERBERT K. HORITA REALTY, INC.
BY: ROY TAKEYAMA, ATTORNEY
(URBAN DISTRICT)

The State Land Commission had referred to the Planning Commission for its comments and recommendation a petition submitted by Herbert K. Horita Realty, Inc., for an amendment to the Land Use Commission District Boundary by changing the district classification from Agricultural to Urban for approximately 17.9 acres of land in Waipahu bordering Pearl Harbor on the makai end and abutting the site of the future Waipahu High School on the mauka end.

The staff report was submitted to the Commission. The Director reported that the land was originally owned by the military. Since neither the Leeward Community College nor the State purchased the land, a private developer purchased the land and submitted a proposal to construct low or medium density apartment units to provide for the critical housing needs of students, faculty and staff members of the Leeward Community College. The subject property is within walking distance of the college.

The Director recommended approval of this request since the site is contiguous to urban use and suitable for urban development. The areas adjacent or nearby which are in the State Agricultural Districts are used for military purposes and which are more related to urban type uses than to agricultural uses. Only a small portion of the area is used for truck farming in low-lying areas.

Referring to the application submitted, Mr. Yamabe noted that some areas are being used for watercress and other types of farming. He requested further information as to whether or not this area is still used for cultivation purposes.

The Commission deferred action for receipt of further information and instructed the staff to submit a request to the Land Use Commission for an extension of time for submitting its comments and recommendation.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director:

ZONING NOXIOUS INDUSTRY EWA BARBERS POINT, WITHIN THE CAMPBELL INDUSTRIAL PARK ESTATE OF JAMES CAMPBELL	(1)	Change in zoning from Rural Protective to Noxious Industry, in conformity with the General Plan, for 57.516 acres of land situated at Barbers Point, within the Campbell Industrial Park in Ewa.
ZONING APARTMENT DISTRICT C PAUOA BETWEEN PACIFIC HEIGHTS ROAD AND PALI HIGHWAY, MAKAI OF PAUOA ROAD STATE OF HAWAII	(2)	Change in zoning from Class B Residential to Apartment District C, in conformity with the General Plan, for an 8,579 square foot parcel of land situated between Pacific Heights Road and Pali Highway, makai of Pauoa Road in Pauoa.
SUBDIVISION RULES AND REGULATIONS AMENDMENT TO SECTIONS 10, 11 and 19	(3)	Amendment to the Subdivision Rules and Regulations by amending Section 10, relating to Design Standards and Requirements of Subdivision; by amending Section 11, relating to Improvements Required; and by amending Section 19, relating to Exception, Agricultural Subdivision.
SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 22-5.1	(4)	An Ordinance to amend Section 22-5.1, R.O. 1961, relating to Installation of Utility Lines within Subdivisions.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT TO THE CIP FOR FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 1968 TO JUNE 30, 1969 (SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 3)

The City Council had referred to the Planning Commission for its review and recommendation Bill No. 206 entitled - "Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 3. An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 3188, as amended, relating to Capital Improvements of the City and County of Honolulu for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969."

The Director stated that this Capital Improvement Program relates to the appropriation of $200,000 for the Planning and Engineering work for the Honolulu Municipal Stadium at Halawa. The City Council passed the bill on first reading this past Tuesday. A recommendation from the Planning Commission is required before the Bill can be passed on third reading.

Mr. Sharpless felt that the Commission should not take any action and should leave the decision to the new City Council.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Muller, deferred action on the Capital Improvement Program, Supplementary No. 3.

MISCELLANEOUS
STATE LAND USE
DISTRICT AND
REGULATION REVIEW
PRESENTATION

The Director introduced Mr. Don Austin of the firm of Eckbo, Dean, Austin and Williams, consultants who have been retained by the State Land Use Commission to review the State Land Use District Boundaries and Regulations and to submit recommendations for the adjustments necessary. This review is mandated by the State Land Use law and must be done every five years. The consultants plan to meet with the Commission later in an informal discussion session for further analysis.

Mr. Austin introduced two staff members--Mr. Howard Altman and Mr. Chris Degenhardt--and his partner, Mr. Edward Williams. He welcomed the opportunity to comment briefly on their responsibilities and their intended accomplishment through the study. He stressed the importance of a close working relationship with all county planning commissions and the planning staff in establishing policies and regulations of the State Land Use Law. They have been involved in reviewing various applications, such as those which apply for special permits, boundary changes, etc. Questionnaires have been sent to special groups of people all over the Island in an effort to gather opinions about land use.

A report listing the preliminary issues regarding land use was distributed to the Commissioners. This report was also sent out to other governmental agencies.

He noted that their area of responsibility is to scrutinize the criteria for establishing district boundaries and regulations as established by the Land Use Commission, and to recommend improvements in the regulations which control the uses within the district boundaries as well as to recommend any changes in the boundaries themselves.

Mr. Howard Altman, speaking on the task assignment, stated that their first task involved attitude surveying and sampling work. Out of 1,600 questionnaires sent out, 650 questionnaires were returned. By the first of the year, he anticipated that the tabulations would be completed and available for publication. They are examining all of the district boundary changes which have occurred between 1964 and 1968 and also all special permits granted. They have interviewed various owners and developers concerned who have proposals for development to the year 1973 which is the extent of their review period. The first hearing is scheduled for April 1, 1969, when the four counties will be reviewed between April 1 and June 1, 1969. The final report is scheduled to be completed by August 15, 1969.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Altman believed that this is the first time that the questionnaire method has been used at this scale in this type of situation. The number of

questionnaires returned in such a short period of time were much more than anticipated because of the restricted sampling survey method. Even after the review of the land use district boundaries is completed, he felt that this sampling method would be expanded.

Mr. Austin added that personal interviews were conducted in addition to the questionnaire circulation and the response received was rather amazing. He stated that the basic underlying philosophy of their study or approach in planning involve the wise use of land and to look upon land, air, and water as basic natural resources which must be wisely managed, and in the management of these elements, if they are short-termed and in conflict with the long-term values, then the long-term issues must prevail.

When asked whether any other State has a law comparable to Hawaii's State Land Use Law, Mr. Austin gave a negative reply. He indicated that a similar study was prepared for the State of California three years ago. It was called the Urban Metropolitan Open Space Study which dealt with determining the amount of open space land necessary within the metropolitan region of the State. As an outgrowth of that study, an attempt was made to have a law enacted by the State legislature. That study was conducted by his partner, Mr. Edward Williams.

Mr. Yamabe inquired about the method used in selecting the people to whom the questionnaires were sent.

Mr. Williams disclosed that people knowledgeable in this field, such as: landowners, developers, realtors, lawyers, engineers, architects, etc., were selected. The questionnaire comprised of 8 pages. The postcards concerned only the result of the changes which occurred between 1964 and 1968. The recommendations received are being analyzed and he believed that this would help them in establishing their statement of goals. They hope to have similar analysis of actions to aid them in revising the land use issues and also in identifying failures in the present regulations of the administration.

MISCELLANEOUS
APPOINTMENT OF
MANAGING DIRECTOR

The Commission congratulated Mr. Sharpless on his appointment as the Managing Director of the City and County of Honolulu.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie Abbott
Hearings Reporter

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
December 26, 1968

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, December 26, 1968, at 1:40 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Richard K. Sharpless presiding:

PRESENT

Richard K. Sharpless, Chairman
Edward Brennan
Philip T. Chun
Cyril W. Lemmon
Robert L. Muller
Thomas N. Yamabe II

Robert F. Ellis, ex-officio

Frank Skrivanek, Planning Director
Albert Jeremiah, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT

Arthur A. Rutledge
Moses Lum Hoy, ex-officio

PERSONNEL
REAPPOINTMENT
OF COMMISSIONER
EDWARD BRENNAN

The Commission welcomed Commissioner Edward Brennan who was reappointed to the Commission on December 23, 1968.

MINUTES

The minutes of October 31, and November 14, 1968, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

PUBLIC HEARING
NOXIOUS INDUSTRY
EWA
BARBERS POINT,
WITHIN THE CAMPBELL
INDUSTRIAL PARK
ESTATE OF
JAMES CAMPBELL

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to change the zoning from Rural Protective to Noxious Industrial for three parcels of land comprising a total area of 57.516 acres, situated off Olai and Hanua Streets, within the Campbell Industrial Park Subdivision at Barbers Point, Ewa, and identified as Tax Map Keys 9-1-31: 3 and 9-1-26: 3 and portion of 26, in conformity with the adopted General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of December 15, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, and to the Leeward Economic Planning Board.

The Director acknowledged receipt of a letter of support from the State Department of Planning and Economic Development which commented that the proposed zoning is consistent with the urban land use district established by the State of Hawaii and is in conformity with the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu. The State reported further that a portion of the land under consideration for rezoning is being considered by the U. S. Department of Commerce for establishment as a Foreign Trade

Subzone. Recent public hearings on the subzone application by the State revealed considerable community support for the subzone.

The Director presented the request and pointed out the three parcels of land involved: Parcel A contains 42.904 acres; Parcel B, 8.730 acres; and Parcel C, 5.882 acres. These three are the only remaining parcels still zoned for residential use but within the area designated for industrial use on the General Plan. Under the Comprehensive Zoning Code, the zoning will become the I-2 Heavy Industrial District.

Parcel A was recently acquired from the U. S. Government by the Campbell Estate. Parcel C was given to the City by the Coast Guard and the City made a land exchange with the Campbell Estate for land to be developed as a public beach park.

A letter requesting its comments and recommendations was sent to the Department of Parks and Recreation but to date, no reply has been received. The Parks Department has stated orally that it had no objection to this rezoning. Water is available. The Department of Public Works reported that no public sewerage lines are available; however, most of the streets are privately owned with a right-of-way width of 60 feet.

No one spoke either in opposition to or in support of the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Yukio Taketa of the Department of Parks and Recreation stated that a letter dated December 6, 1968, was sent to the Planning Department stating that it had no objection to the proposed change in zoning.

It was the Commission's understanding that a petroleum refinery is to be constructed on the subject land and it inquired how the crude oil is to be received at the proposed refinery.

The Director believed that the method of operation will be similar to that of the Standard Oil Company's operation where the oil is piped in from the harbor at Barbers Point. At this time he did not know where the pipeline easements would be located.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Muller, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from Rural Protective to Noxious Industrial for three parcels of land comprising a total area of 57.516 acres, situated off Olai and Hanua Streets, within the Campbell Industrial Park Subdivision at Barbers Point, Ewa.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING APARTMENT
DISTRICT C
PAUOA
BETWEEN PACIFIC
HEIGHTS ROAD AND
PALI HIGHWAY,
MAKAI OF PAUOA
ROAD
STATE OF HAWAII

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to change the zoning from existing Class B Residential to Apartment District C (medium density) for two parcels of land totalling 8,579 square feet, situated between Pacific Heights Road and the Pali Highway, makai of Pauoa Road, opposite Olomana Lane in Lower Pauoa, and identified by Tax Map Key 2-2-09: Parcels 6 and 7.

The notice of the public hearing published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of December 15, 1968, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, Kawananakoa Place Association, Punchbowl Community Association, and to nine property owners.

The Director read a letter of protest which was placed on file, submitted by six property owners who expressed concern that their nice neighborhood is gradually being deteriorated with a slum area as a result of construction of apartments accompanied by problems created by such developments. They complained that their neighborhood has become the dumping ground for abandoned cars and the stripping of cars.

The Director outlined on the map displayed the location of the subject parcel and the parcels of the property owners submitting the letter of protest. Pacific Heights Road has a right-of-way width of 50 feet with curbs, gutters and sidewalks. He stated that the State acquired the two parcels at the time of construction of the Pali Highway and on July 18, 1968, the parcels were consolidated into one lot of 8,579 square feet. He indicated that two requests for apartment zoning in this area were granted during 1967.

When asked whether any development plans had been submitted, the Director reported that the State does not intend to construct apartments but plans to sell the property through public auction. The land was purchased by the State Highways Division and the auction will be conducted by the Department of Land and Natural Resources. The location of several apartments and commercial developments with apartments on the upper floors were pointed out.

Regarding the letter of protest, the Director believed that these objections should have been raised at the time of the public hearing when adoption of the land use plan for the area was being considered in 1964. The complaint cited should be reported to the Police Department and the Task Force appointed to dispose of abandoned cars.

Upon the call by the Chairman, no one spoke in opposition to the application.

Mr. Jack Meek, of the Department of Land and Natural Resources, stated that this land is jointly owned by the State and Federal governments. The Federal government had participated in the purchase of the land. This land is considered surplus to the needs of the Highways Division and its agent, the Department of Land and Natural Resources, will handle the property disposition through a public auction.
In order to develop the land to its highest and best use and obtain the highest revenue possible, the request for apartment zoning in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map was made by the State. He requested a favorable recommendation from the Commission.

ACTION: The Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from existing Class B Residential to Apartment District C (medium density) for two parcels of land totalling 8,579 square feet, situated between Pacific Heights Road and the Pali Highway, makai of Pauoa Road, opposite Olomana Lane in Lower Pauoa, upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Muller.

LAND USE
COMMISSION
PETITION
WAIPAHU
HERBERT K. HORITA
REALTY, INC.
BY: ROY TAKEYAMA,
ATTORNEY
(URBAN USE)

The Commission again reviewed a petition submitted by Herbert K. Horita Realty, Inc., for an amendment to the Land Use Commission District boundary by changing the district classification from Agricultural to Urban for 17.9 acres of land in Waipahu, bordering Pearl Harbor on the makai end and abutting the site of the future Waipahu High School on the mauka end, and identified by Tax Map Key 9-4-08: 23. The Commission had deferred action and requested the Director to ascertain from locally available farmers in the area whether or not a portion of the subject property is still in active cultivation.

The Director reported that no records are available of farmers in this area. He noted the presence of the applicant and his attorney who may be able to answer this question.

From the map displayed on the wall, the Director pointed out the subject property under consideration and the surrounding areas. He stated that the staff is recommending approval of this request since the site is contiguous to urban use and suitable to urban development.

In reply to inquiries from the Commission, the Director stated that there is an easement 44 feet in width located between the applicant's property and the Leeward College but he does not know whether or not it is intended to be used for roadway purposes. The access to the subject property is off Waipio Point Access Road where there is an easement for road and utility purposes.

There is indication of another easement through a 56-foot roadway specified for roadway purposes. He stated that there is a Federal-government-owned highway strip located in the Rural Protective zone in the area mauka of the subject property.

Mr. Yamabe inquired whether there were any artesian wells or underground water sources on the subject property. The Director did not have that information readily available, but the petitioner has indicated that the land has good drainage with no flooding problems, most of the land is lying fallow and some acreage is being used for watercress and other types of farming. The Land is predominantly vacant except for some farming operations by three farmers.

Mr. Herbert Horita, petitioner, and his attorney, Mr. Roy Takeyama were present. Mr. Takeyama stated that presently there are three tenants on the subject property of which only one is actively engaged in watercress farming and utilizing only one acre of the land available to him. Each tenant has his own cottage and rents the land area on a month-to-month basis. After the petitioner purchased the property from the Federal Government and upon notification by the tenants that because they were unable to afford their rent they desired to relocate elsewhere, the petitioner reduced the monthly rate from $50 to $15; $75 to $40; and $125 to $40. The one active watercress farmer had received permission from the petitioner to utilize as much land as his farming demanded for the same rental fee, but the farmer is utilizing only one acre.

In reply to Mr. Yamabe's inquiry on artesian well availability, Mr. Takeyama replied negatively and stated that the water used for the watercress farming operation originates from the petitioner's personally dug well.

When asked whether the petitioner pumps the water from underground as is done in Waiau, Mr. Horita stated that in his case, a hole must be dug to tap the water which is pumped out.

Mr. Yamabe inquired whether the petitioner plans to retain a portion of the land for farming or to develop the entire 17.9 acres.

Mr. Horita showed the Commission the proposed plans and stated that he acquired this land solely on the basis that this area would be changed to an Urban District. He stated that the subject property is in a pocket and low while the surrounding lands are approximately 130 feet higher. The land directly behind the subject property is owned by the Federal Government. Prior to acquisition of the land, he consulted with someone from the University of Hawaii to obtain information about projected housing

facility needs for the Leeward Community College. It was indicated that no housing facilities were being provided for either students or the faculty. He noted that some of the faculty will be coming from the mainland and in need of conveniently located housing.

Presently, there is a tremendous shortage of apartments in Waipahu where the vacancy factor is nearly zero, Mr. Horita stated. Confirmation of this fact was received from personnel at the Hickam Air Force Base who, with other military personnel, have been unable to obtain housing in the area. Military families fortunate in locating housing are paying as much as $175 monthly rent for unfurnished two-bedroom living quarters on a one-year lease basis. An estimated 4,000 (or more) Air Force personnel are unable to have their families accompany them because of the housing shortage. He pointed out the areas on the map where he proposed to construct either two or three story apartments with provision for some recreational areas.

Regarding access, Mr. Horita stated that they will use the access leading to the golf course to be operated by the City and County. According to the engineers, all the necessary utilities are available.

In response to Mr. Yamabe's inquiry about the Agricultural District, Mr. Ah Sung Leong of the State Land Use Commission stated that the State Land Use boundary line was based initially on the proposed alignment of the H-1 Highway. The Agricultural District is located on the mauka side of the H-1 Highway along the cane haul road and then along the Hawaiian Electric easement.

Mr. Yamabe inquired whether the properties on the downtown side of the petitioner's property are designated for agricultural uses to which Mr. Leong replied in the affirmative and stated that there are some urban lands but these are smaller subdivided parcels.

Mr. Takeyama stated that there are more than 30 acres owned by the Federal Government adjacent to the future Waipahu High School and about 35 acres which is owned by the Community College. Because there are some urban developments on the downtown side of the subject property, he could not consider this as being all in agricultural use.

Mr. Leong stated that the land between the petitioner's property and the urban development on the downtown side of the petitioner's property is zoned for agricultural purposes.

When asked whether this was the only area available for providing housing for the students and

faculty members of the Leeward Community College, Mr. Horita gave an affirmative reply.

At the request of Mr. Yamabe, Mr. William Gorst of the State Land Use Commission pointed out the location of the intermediate school presently under construction, the future athletic field located mauka of the petitioner's property, the military fuel dump, Leeward Community College, and the watercress farm which is located below the Community College.

ACTION: Mr. Muller moved to recommend to the State Land Use Commission that the petitioner's request for an amendment to the Land Use District Boundary by changing the district classification from Agricultural to Urban for 17.9 acres of land in Waipahu, bordering Pearl Harbor on the makai end and abutting the site of the future Waipahu High School on the mauka end be approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Chun and carried.

Mr. Yamabe solicited Mr. Horita's assistance in obtaining some statement from his tenants about their actual farming activities to which Mr. Horita agreed to comply.

STATE LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION KAHALUU MELEKULA ROAD BULLDOZING SERVICES, LTD. (URBAN DISTRICT)

The State Land Use Commission had referred to the Planning Commission for its comments and recommendation, a petition submitted by Bulldozing Services, Ltd., for an amendment to the Land Use Commission District Boundary by changing the district classification from Conservation to Urban for a 150,206 square foot parcel of land situated at Melekula Road in Kahaluu and identified as Tax Map Key 4-7-46: Parcel 37.

The Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the subject property. The staff's report submitted to the Commission recommended approval of the application for the following reasons:

1) The subject property is bordered on two sides by Residential uses in the Conservation District and on the other two sides by undeveloped areas in Preservation use;

2) There are ten residential structures on the property;

3) The zoning is Class AA Residential and the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map is for residential and open space; and

4) Water facilities are available which could be extended to service the entire parcel. Cesspools are being used as there is no sewer system.

The Director reported that the applicant was notified to be present at this hearing, but it was uncertain whether he would be able to attend as he is out on an inspection trip. The staff feels it appropriate to include the adjoining property identified by Tax Map Key 4-7-46: Parcel 16 to square off the boundary line. It is anticipated that upon review of the district boundaries, the adjoining lot would also be included in the Urban District.

In reply to inquiries from the Commission, the Director reported that a field inspection of the site revealed that grading work had been done on the property and that the applicant is in violation of the State Conservation District Regulations by constructing homes in an area classified as Conservation District. During the period from September 1, 1964, to July, 1966, building permits were issued by the City and County authorizing the construction of each structure situated on the property. It was the Director's understanding that the Department of Land and Natural Resources did not grant any special use permits for the grading or the construction of any residential structures on the subject parcel.

When asked whether there exists the possibility of drainage and flooding problems, the Director foresaw no problems according to photographs taken of the subject parcel. He recalled that the subject parcel slopes down to the street and the water flows to the stream next to the highway located to the rear of the Hygienic Store. A portion of this low area has been declared a flood hazard area and all building permits, subdivisions, etc., in this area must first receive the approval of the Chief Engineer. Because of topographic conditions, the runoff of water in the higher area compounds the condition in the lower area unless adequate drainage facilities are provided for the lower area.

Mr. Ellis stated that the Soil Conservation Service had recently completed a plan on flood control for the Kahaluu Valley which is presently being discussed by the Chief Engineer, the Soil Conservation District of Oahu, and the community association, all of whom have been provided with a copy of the overall plan.

The Director reported also that the State Highways Division has designed a new continuation of the Kahaluu Cut-Off Road to alleviate the drainage problem.

<u>ACTION</u>: Mr. Yamabe moved to recommend to the State Land Use Commission that the petitioner's request for an amendment to the Land Use District Boundary by changing the district classification from Conservation to Urban for a 150,206 square foot parcel of land

situated at Melekula Road in Kahaluu be approved; also, to recommend that the Land Use Commission include the adjoining parcel identified by Tax Map Key 4-7-46: Parcel 16 in the Urban District. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lemmon and carried.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Muller authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following proposals initiated by the Planning Director:

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT MAKAHA-WAIANAE MAKAHA VALLEY ILIKAI HOTEL	(1) Conditional use permit to construct and operate a temporary oxidation pond sewage treatment plant on an area of 8 acres situated at Makaha Valley in Makaha-Waianae.
ZONING RESORT HOTEL DISTRICT #1 MAKAHA VALLEY, WAIANAE MAKAHA VALLEY, INCORPORATED	(2) Change in zoning from existing Rural Protective to Resort Hotel District #1 for an area of 7.55 acres situated at Makaha Valley, Waianae.
GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) WAIAWA TO HALAWA	(3) Amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Waiawa to Halawa by widening Moanalua Road between Aiea Stream and Kaimakani Street from 50- and 60-foot rights-of-way to 80-foot right-of-way.
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT-HOUSING McCULLY OFF KAPIOLANI BOULEVARD REED & MARTIN INVESTMENT CORP.	(4) A proposal to create a Planned Development-Housing District, under the Comprehensive Zoning Code, for land containing 171,292 square feet situated off Kapiolani Boulevard in McCully and zoned A-4 Apartment District.
ZONING INDUSTRIAL KANEOHE MAUKA OF KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY ACROSS DUNCAN TRACT, AND APPROXIMATELY 100 FEET SOUTH OF CITY MILL PREMISES MESSRS. THOMAS T. KOZUMA, RICHARD AZAMA, ET AL	(5) Change in zoning from existing Class A-1 Residential to Industrial, in conformity with the General Plan, for land situated mauka of kamehameha Highway across Duncan Tract, and approximately 100 feet South of City Mill premises in Kaneohe.
ZONING BUSINESS KAONOHI, KALAUAO, EWA OWNER: B. P. BISHOP ESTATE DEVELOPER: AMFAC-TROUSDALE	(6) Change in zoning from existing Rural Protective to Business, in conformity with the General Plan for land situated at Kaonohi, Kalauao, Ewa.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT TO THE CIP FOR FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 1968 TO JUNE 30, 1969 (SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 3)

The Commission reconsidered Bill No. 206, "Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 3. An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 3188, as amended, relating to Capital Improvements of the City and County of Honolulu for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1968, to June 30, 1969", which was referred by the City Council to the Planning Commission for comment and recommendation.

The Director reported that this Bill was passed on second reading by the City Council on the previous Tuesday. This amendment provides for a supplementary appropriation of $200,000 for planning and engineering work for the Honolulu Municipal Stadium in Halawa which includes $100,000 for the architectural and engineering design; $75,000 for the design of stadium egress and ingress routes and $25,000 for incidental and related engineering and planning costs. The additional funds would bring the total design appropriation for the current fiscal year to $1,010,000. A recommendation from the Planning Commission is required before the Bill can be passed on third reading.

In the event that the Commission does not take any action, Mr. Ellis reported that the City Council may still act on this CIP amendment.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion of Mr. Muller, seconded by Mr. Brennan, recommended approval of Bill No. 206, Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 3.

PERSONNEL PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REMARKS

The Director expressed his appreciation for the opportunity and wonderful experience he has had to work with the Planning Commission. He hoped that the Commission would extend the same working relationship to the incoming Planning Director, Mr. Robert R. Way.

PERSONNEL COMMENDATION-- MR. FRANK SKRIVANEK

Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Muller, the Commission unanimously approved and thanked Mr. Frank Skrivanek for his outstanding efforts in the development of planning for the City and County of Honolulu during his tenure as Planning Director.

PERSONNEL MR. SHARPLESS

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Brennan, expressed its appreciation to Mr. Sharpless for his efforts during his term as chairman.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie M. Abbott
Hearings Reporter

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
January 9, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, January 9, 1969, at 1:35 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Acting Chairman Robert L. Muller presiding:

PRESENT: Robert L. Muller, Acting Chairman
Edward Brennan
Philip T. Chun
Cyril W. Lemmon
Thomas N. Yamabe, II
James Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Wallace S. W. Kim, Acting Planning Director
Albert Jeremiah, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT: Arthur A. Rutledge

MINUTES: The minutes of August 22, 1968, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Brennan.

PUBLIC HEARING SUBDIVISION RULES AND REGULATIONS DELETION OF SECTION 10-(L); AMENDMENTS TO SECTIONS 11-(C) AND 19

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515 of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider proposed amendments to the Subdivision Rules and Regulations by:

1. Deleting Section 10-(L) on rural and suburban roads;

2. Amending Section 11-(C) to require all streets and roads in subdivisions lying outside the City of Honolulu, except for roads in Agricultural Subdivisions to conform to the requirements as set forth in Section 11-(B); and

3. Amending Section 19 to require a minimum area of two acres in Agricultural Subdivisions and to improve the design standard of roads within Agricultural Subdivisions.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of December 15, 1968 was read by the Acting Planning Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the American Institute of Planners, American Society of Civil Engineers, American Institute of Architects, Home Builders Association, Real Estate Commission, Chamber of Commerce and the Outdoor Circle.

The Acting Planning Director read a letter of protest submitted by Mr. Harold Stearns, President, Waipio Land Company, Limited, who stated that the proposed two-acre minimum for agricultural subdivisions, plus the new road and other requirements would make an agricultural lot prohibitive in cost to the average suburban lot buyer.

A drawing of a Typical Agricultural Road Section prepared by the Office of the Chief Engineer was distributed to the Commission. The Acting Planning Director explained that the proposed amendment to Section 11(C) is a joint recommendation of the Department of Public Works, Traffic Department, and the Planning Department.

The previous regulations provided for a 40-foot right-of-way width with an 18-foot coral pavement and a sidewalk area graded and planted with grass. The proposal is to increase the right-of-way width to 44 feet to conform to City road standards pavement width of 20 feet, and provisions for a drainage system. The pavement must be sloped to provide for a swale or there must be a cast-in-place asphaltic concrete curb on both sides. The shoulder areas must be graded to a slope of 1/4 inch on 12 inches, and planted with grass. The pavement area must be surfaced with macadam in lieu of coral. It was determined that a macadam surface created a better situation and would avoid the added expense of constantly repairing a badly gutted coral road. When necessary, the Department of Public Works will render "first-aid" treatment with asphaltic concrete.

The higher standard is being recommended at this time because of the possibility that these agricultural areas might be changed to some other type of uses, such as residential. When that happens, it would be most difficult to improve the road to City standards because of multiplicity of ownership and cost.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. George Teramoto, a resident of Makaha Valley, spoke in favor of the proposal. He showed the Commission two photographs taken of the coral road leading to Makaha Golf Course. One photograph showed the road in good condition; while the other showed the road to be unusable as a result of heavy rain. He noted that this road was recommended by the Traffic Engineer and inquired whether the City would accept this type of road. Regarding the proposal to require a minimum area of two acres in an Agricultural Subdivision, he preferred a minimum of one acre.

Mrs. Howard Moore commented that a roadway with a "blacktop" surface was constructed in Kauai and subsequently had been damaged by heavy rain. Although this same situation may not apply to the roads on Oahu, she wondered whether the added cost is justified. Her son, who is a road construction engineer, had explained that if the road is properly graded and sloped with shoulders for proper drainage, a gravel surface should be sufficient. She was opposed to burdening the people with this additional expense of acquiring "blacktop" surface.

The public hearing was closed and the matter taken under advisement, upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

The Commission reviewed the existing and proposed regulations and the rationale behind proposing the higher standards. It had no objection to the two-acre minimum for lots in a Agricultural Subdivision.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Brennan, recommended approval of the proposed amendments to the Subdivision Rules and Regulations by (1) deleting Section 10-(L) on rural and suburban roads, (2) amending Section 11-(C) to require all streets and roads in subdivisions lying outside the City of Honolulu, except for roads in Agricultural Subdivisions to conform to the requirements as set forth in Section 11-(B), and (3) amending Section 19 to require a minimum area of two acres in Agricultural Subdivisions and to improve the design standard of roads within Agricultural Subdivisions.

PUBLIC HEARING SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 22-5.1

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposed Ordinance to amend Section 22-5.1, R.O. 1961, as amended, relating to installation of Utility Lines within Subdivisions, to allow overhead utilities within agricultural subdivision consisting of lots with a minimum area of two acres and which are exempted under Section 19 of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations of the City from the requirements applicable to the construction of street improvements and utilities.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of December 15, 1968 was read by the Acting Planning Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, Hawaiian Electric Company, American Institute of Planners, American Society of Civil Engineers, American Institute of Architects, Real Estate Board, Home Builders Association, Outdoor Circle, and to the Chamber of Commerce.

The Acting Planning Director read a letter from the Bishop Estate recommending that the subject amendment be clarified and strengthened insofar as the exception is concerned which permits overhead utility lines in a subdivision consisting of three lots or less where no other lot provided with underground utilities is situated within 500 feet. It is the contention of Bishop Estate that a developer might develop a tract of land in successive three-lot increments, thus circumventing the true intent of requiring new subdivisions to be provided with underground utilities.

The Acting Planning Director stated that a check with legal counsel revealed that although this is possible, it is not logical. Since the underground wiring requirement became effective in 1966, there have been no instances where a developer attempted to circumvent the regulations.

The present ordinance requires underground wiring within Agricultural Subdivisions also. Since the majority of lots in an Agricultural Subdivision have widths of 200 feet or more as compared to an average lot width of 60 feet to 70 feet in residential subdivisions, overhead wiring should be permitted for Agricultural Subdivisions only because of the high expense involved in installing underground wiring. Because of the high cost, the Director has granted several modifications from the regulations to permit overhead wiring in Agricultural Subdivisions only. However, variances to permit overhead wiring in residential subdivisions have been denied.

Upon the call by the Chairman, no one spoke in favor or in opposition to the proposed ordinance.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Lemmon.

In discussing the matter later, the Acting Planning Director explained that the basic criteria in allowing this exception is the high cost involved in relation to the use of the land. It is a hardship to require an individual to install underground wiring for a lot having a width of 200 feet or more. Therefore, exceptions have been made for Agricultural Subdivisions only.

The Commission inquired about the built-up areas and the requirement for underground utilities should there be a subdivision. It also inquired about the three lot or less exception mentioned by the Bishop Estate.

The Acting Planning Director believed that the exception portion should be discussed further with the legal counsel. It was his belief that for a three-lot subdivision in a large tract subdivision, exceptions will not be made to permit the installation of overhead utility lines. There are conditions to be met and the exception would apply if the actual subdivision consists of three lots or less and no other lot situated within 500 feet of such subdivision is provided with underground wiring.

<u>ACTION:</u> The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, recommended approval of the proposed Ordinance to amend Section 22-5.1, R.O. 1961, as amended, relating to installation of Utility Lines within Subdivisions,

to allow overhead utilities within agricultural subdivision consisting of lots with a minimum area of two acres and which are exempted under Section 19 of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations of the City from requirements applicable to the construction of street improvements and utilities.

PUBLIC HEARING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT MAKAHA VALLEY APPROXIMATELY 1,000 FEET MAUKA OF FARRINGTON HIGHWAY, KAENA SIDE OF MAKAHA GOLF COURSE MAKAHA VALLEY, INC.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 21-253 of Ordinance 3234, of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, a public hearing was held to consider an application made by Makaha Valley for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction and operation of a temporary oxidation pond for sewage treatment on an area of land comprising approximately 8 acres, situated approximately 1,000 feet mauka of Farrington Highway and on the Kaena side of Makaha Golf Course, Makaha Valley in Waianae, and identified by Tax Map Key 8-4-02: portion of Parcel 5.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of December 29, 1968 was read by the Acting Planning Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, Waianae Model Cities Agency, and to the various community and civic organizations in the Waianae area. No written protests or comments have been received.

The Acting Planning Director gave a basic explanation on the operation of the oxidation pond, sewage treatment plant, which is designed to service 1,080 condominium units. The oxidation pond will comprise of two units operated in series. The sewage pumped into the first pond will be treated and chlorinated and the effluent, by gravity means, will be pumped into the larger pond where there is further treatment through natural oxidation methods. The effluent will then be pumped and used to irrigate the golf course. A fence will be installed around the pond for security reasons as provided in the ordinance.

This method of sewage treatment is to be temporary for about three years after which sewage from this development together with flows from additional developments will be collected by a system of gravity sewers and connected to the City's Makaha Interceptor Line, Section III, which is included in the City's Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Year 1969-1970. The pond for the present will be privately operated and maintained, and the developer will assume all responsibility under the standards and regulations set forth by the State Department of Health. The applicant has met the requirements of Ordinance No. 2745 relating to sewage treatment plants by providing for spacing, security fencing around the plant, landscaping, access, and approval letters from the Board of Water Supply and the Department of Health.

From the map displayed, he pointed out the location of the proposed oxidation pond in relation to the area it is to serve. Approximately 18 acres have been approved to permit the construction of 200 hotel units. The applicant is also requesting a rezoning change for the adjoining 7.55 acres to permit the construction of an additional 300 units.

Replying to questions from the Commission, the Acting Planning Director cited, as an example, the oxidation pond which was located in the Hawaii-Kai area. The pond was chlorinated and the solids which settled to the bottom disintegrated and became a part of the effluent. There was hardly any odor. He stated that none of the effluent from the proposed pond will flow to the beach area but will be refined to irrigate the golf course. The pond will be gradually sloped with the deepest point at 6 feet.

Mr. Albert Tom of Sunn, Low, Tom and Hara, architects, representing the developer as consultants, gave a more detailed explanation of the oxidation pond operation. Because there are no mechanical features involved, this method of sewage treatment is most effective, but since a large amount of land is required, this method is not considered feasible. Fortunately, the applicant has sufficient land area which is fairly flat and remote from any existing habitation to preclude objectionable reactions from nearby residents. This method was also selected because it is to be an interim measure until a connection is made to the Makaha Interceptor.

He indicated that there will be a continuous flow of incoming waste and out-flow of waste water so that this is not a stagnant pond. This system has been approved by the Board of Health. The effluent will be pumped to irrigate the golf course. As an added feature, the same pump can recycle some of the effluent back into the first pond. The recirculation pattern will improve the aspect of this particular unit by: (1) seeding the first pond with some of the organisms needed in the pond; and (2) helping to dilute the incoming waste.

The effluent from the pond is not sufficient to irrigate the golf course; therefore, water from a tunnel shack located above the valley, owned by the applicant, is being used to irrigate the golf course. Since a second golf course was added, a well has been dug to supplement the water from the tunnel.

He stated that sunlight is needed to generate the algae which, in turn, furnishes oxygen needed for bacterial action. As long as there is the algae activity and oxygen in the water, the chances of an odor condition is nil. To effectively prevent mosquito and other insects from breeding, the pond will thrive with fish life.

Mr. George Teramoto, President of the Makaha Civic Association, strongly opposed the oxidation pond and commented as follows:

1. A check with Mr. Tooley, Sanitation Engineer with the State Board of Health, revealed that the State will not recommend this type of oxidation pond; but, since this pond has been considered acceptable in the area, the application will be approved upon submission.

2. To date, he has not seen the detailed plan of the proposed pond.

3. There is odor emanating from the City and County Sewage Treatment Plant located at the entrance to Waianae Town; therefore, they can conclude that odor will emanate from this pond.

4. The City's Interceptor line will be connected hopefully in three years. Because it is to end at Makaha Valley Road and Farrington Highway, he inquired when the other interceptor lines would be constructed.

5. Temporary could mean anywhere from three to ten years.

Mr. Tom mentioned that the City has let this sewer project out for bid and hopefully, it should be ready in 1971. He explained the operational difference between a treatment plant and an oxidation pond. The pond method is better because sewage going in is still fresh and treated by chemicals before there is bacteria action to produce odor.

Mr. Bill Gascon, a resident of Makaha, opposed the construction of the oxidation pond because through experience, he knows that it will produce odor. He mentioned the treatment plant near Waipahu, which is part mechanical, produces a very obnoxious odor.

From a medical standpoint, he did not believe that the applicant's proposal to irrigate the golf course with the effluent would be in the best interest of the residents of Makaha Valley.

Mr. Dean Ho, Vice President of Makaha Valley, Inc., stated that he has received assurance from his engineering firm that because of the large land area, the proposed oxidation pond is more desirable and reliable. In view of this assurance, they proceeded to locate the access road only a few feet away from the pond. Every visitor to Makaha will travel on this roadway. As the developers, they are just as concerned about the problem of odor and would not have proposed this method had they not received the assurance from their engineer.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Lemmon, closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

The Commission considered this matter later.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Lemmon, recommended the granting of a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction and operation of a temporary oxidation pond for sewage treatment on an area of land comprising approximately 8 acres situated about 1,000 feet mauka of Farrington Highway and on the Kaena Point side of Makaha Golf Course, Makaha Valley in Waianae.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING
H-1 RESORT-HOTEL DISTRICT
MAKAHA VALLEY
MAKAHA VALLEY, INCORPORATED

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing R-6 Residential to H-1 Resort-Hotel District for 7.55 acres of land situated approximately one mile mauka of Farrington Highway, adjoining the Makaha Country Club, at Makaha Valley, Waianae, and covered by Tax Map Key 8-4-2: portion of Parcels 5 and 8, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Plan of Waianae.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of December 29, 1968 was read by the Acting Planning Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, to various community and civic organizations, and to Waianae Model Cities Agency. No letters of protest or comment have been received.

The Acting Planning Director explained the rezoning proposal involving land situated immediately adjacent to 18 acres presently zoned for resort use. The applicant proposes to construct 200 units on the 18-acre site and 300 units on the 7-1/2-acre site. Makaha Valley Road, providing access to the site, has been improved with a blacktop surface 20 feet wide at the recommendation of the Traffic Engineer. For the interim, it is believed that this pavement width should be adequate to service existing traffic and the traffic emanating from the 200 units. Together with the construction of the additional 300 units, the applicant proposes to construct a roadway, in accordance with City standards, to the hotel site somewhere in the vicinity of the Makaha Beach Park. However, they will continue to use Makaha Valley Road.

Testimony was received from the audience.

Mr. George Teramoto mentioned the inadequacy of the present width of Makaha Valley Road to service the 200-unit hotel. The situation will become worse if it must also service the additional 300 units. This condition was reported to be temporary and he questioned how long that temporary period is to be. He also wanted to know who is responsible for the maintenance of that roadway.

He then mentioned the constant use of this roadway by trucks with heavy loads. Residents who work during the night shift and require sleep during the day are disturbed by these trucks.

Because of the narrow width and a curve at the entrance to the golf course, there is also a hazardous traffic condition. He believed that the pavement width should be constructed to City standards with curbs and gutters to prevent erosion.

Regarding water, Mr. Teramoto stated that the water pressure from the City's source is low and they had reported this to the Board of Water Supply. They understand from the Board of Water Supply that the applicant will be receiving water from the City's source for the 300 units. They are concerned that this would seriously affect their means of obtaining water.

The Acting Planning Director reported that the Board of Water Supply commented favorably and indicated its understanding that the applicant will construct adequate facilities to serve the proposed use.

Mr. Dean Ho, Vice President of Makaha Valley, Incorporated, stated that their proposal is to construct a 300-unit hotel addition to an existing 200-unit hotel as a one-hotel complex occupying a land area of approximately 25 acres. The major access and other improvements to the hotel site will be built to City and County standards and will connect with Farrington Highway in the vicinity of Makaha Beach Park. Completion of this road and other improvements will coincide with the completion of the proposed hotel structure. Until then Makaha Valley Road will continue to be used by the service trucks. This road is the current direct route to Honolulu; however, upon completion of the major access road, they will make it mandatory to have the taxis and buses use this main road. Makaha Valley Road is owned by them and it is their responsibility to maintain it, but he noted that in the past, before the road was improved with macadam or AC surface, the City did render "first aid" treatment.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Brennan, closed the public hearing and recommended approval to the change in zoning from R-6 Residential to H-1 Resort-Hotel District for 7.55 acres of land situated approximately one mile mauka of Farrington Highway, adjoining the Makaha Country Club, in Makaha Valley, Waianae, and covered by Tax Map Key 8-4-2: portion of Parcels 5 and 8, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Plan of Waianae.

PUBLIC HEARING
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT-HOUSING
MCCULLY
OFF KAPIOLANI BOULEVARD
REED & MARTIN INVESTMENT CORP.

Prior to holding the public hearing, Mr. Lemmon declared a conflict of interest, filled out the statement form, and left the room. He reported that he is a member of the firm of architects engaged in this project.

A public hearing was held, in accordance with Article 10, Section 21-1004 of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, to consider a request by Reed and Martin Investment Corporation for a Planned Development-Housing (PD-H) project involving the construction of a 36-story apartment structure containing 569 apartment units, together with convenience establishments which include a restaurant and commercial areas; and the construction of a parking structure providing parking facilities for 782 cars, on a 171,203 square foot parcel of land situated on Kapiolani Boulevard near University Avenue, in McCully, and identified by Tax Map Key 2-7-04: Parcel 1. The area is zoned A-4 Apartment.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of December 29, 1968 was read by the Acting Planning Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, and to interested civic and community associations. No letters of protest have been received.

The Acting Planning Director presented the following information for the Planned Development-Housing project:

1. The location is the former American Chinese Club House on Kapiolani Boulevard between Isenberg Street and University Avenue and adjacent to Ala Wai Park.

2. The zoning lot contains 171,203 square feet; the land area is 214,408 square feet and zoned for A-4 Apartment District.

80

3. The allowable floor area ratio is 643,224 square feet. The plan shows an actual floor area of 642,849 square feet.

4. For 569 units at 1-1/4 parking spaces per unit, the apartment building will require 712 spaces. The plan shows 830 parking spaces.

5. The height of the structure up to the roof level is 313 feet. The height up to the top of the fan room parapet is 343 feet, which is less than the maximum allowable height of 350 feet. The height of the garage is 68.4 feet.

6. The minimum required open space is 180,000 square feet; over 200,000 square feet is provided.

7. The minimum required living space is 122,210 square feet; over 136,000 square feet is provided.

8. The minimum required recreation space is 33,450 square feet; nearly 80,000 square feet is provided.

9. The CZC allows the development of convenience establishments which shall not occupy more than 2.5% of the land area of development. The plan indicates that the total area of the convenience establishment is 4,280 square feet which is less than 2.5% of the land area of the development which is 5,360 square feet.

10. Seven off-street loading spaces are required. Although the plan does not show the number of spaces, the developers have indicated that the necessary spaces will be provided.

11. The yard area, except for necessary access walks and drive, must be maintained in landscaping and shall not be used for parking.

12. In compliance with the CZC requirement, comments from the following agencies are on file: Fire Department, Building Department, Traffic Department, Department of Public Works, Board of Water Supply, and Department of Health.

Mr. Frank Haines, coordinating architect, introduced Mr. Mike Fox representing John Carl Warnecke and Associates, and Mr. Walter Tagawa of Walter Tagawa & Associates, who are also associated with the design of this project.

A scale model of the project was shown to the Commission. Mr. Haines presented in detail, the concept and design of the fee simple condominium project as follows:

1. The project area immediately abuts the City and County Ala Wai Park and is located about 450 feet from the Ala Wai Canal. A cyclone fence separates the Park from the subject property.

2. This is a suitable location for a development of this density because it is adjacent to Waikiki but not within the traffic congestion of Waikiki. They are aware of the possibility of an arterial highway along the mauka side of Ala Wai Canal and the extension of University Avenue across the Ala Wai Canal and into Waikiki.

3. The concept and design of this project was developed after taking into consideration the developments in the surrounding areas consisting of low density apartment structures.

4. The multi-deck parking structure for 830 cars will be located adjacent to the parking structure of the Ala Wai Plaza.

5. A single mass building was decided upon for the following reasons: (a) to retain some of the very significant trees located throughout the entire area; and (b) to provide for more open spaces around the building.

6. Vehicular access will be located opposite Isenberg Street. Right turns into the property may be made from Kapiolani Boulevard. Because of the medial strip opening, vehicles can go across Kapiolani Boulevard to Isenberg Street or make a left turn to get into a town-bound lane. The eventual installation of a traffic light at this intersection should properly control traffic to and from the property.

7. There will be three entrances to the structure: the main lobby; the garage entrance; and the service entrance leading into the basement which is located at the opposite end of the main lobby entrance.

8. Within the garage is provided a drop-off area for baggage or groceries which can be placed in a locker and later picked up and taken to the rooms.

9. There is an open drainage system running from Kapiolani Boulevard through the site and out to the Ala Wai Canal. By digging a well, they will infuse water into the drainage channel and create a pond with a waterfall for continuous flow of water into the canal. The City and County has approved this design with the provision that the developer provide an easement so that the system can be cleaned. The Board of Water Supply reports that it has no jurisdiction over wells at present.

10. The recreational area which is contiguous with Ala Wai Park will be built up on grade for proper drainage. There will be a swimming pool, wading pool, and a small pavilion for social functions. Active recreational sports, such as tennis courts, volley ball courts, paddle tennis courts, putting greens, and tables and other facilities for family picnics are provided on the top of the garage.

11. On the ground level of the building will be located the accessory uses such as a restaurant and small shops, and the recreational areas and lounges for the tenants. At present, the developer has not made any firm commitment with different entrepreneurs for these facilities. The entrance to the lobby is elevated about 3-1/2 feet above ground level. There are shutters which can be closed during inclement weather.

12. The mezzanine level will include some apartments. Some accessory uses, such as a barbershop, beauty shop, etc., within the allowable 5,000 square foot area will be provided for the tenants.

13. The building will consist of 36 stories and the height of the structure up to the top of the fan room parapet is 343 feet. There will be two-floor penthouses which would contain on the first level the living room, dining room and kitchen, and on the second level, the bedrooms. There will be 63 studios, 98 one-bedroom apartments, 391 two-bedroom apartments, and 17 penthouses consisting of three bedrooms.

14. The corridors are double walled and the building air conditioned throughout. Five elevators are provided. The apartments facing in the makai direction will have an entrance, hallway, living room, dining room and a six-foot wide lanai area for protection from the rain. No lanais are provided for the apartments located

on the mauka side because of the wind, and instead larger bedrooms are provided. About 65% of the apartments face in the makai direction.

15. The garage is designed with two continuous ramps. A portion of the garage structure is slightly below grade level. The garage will have sufficient openings and will not require any ventilation or sprinkler systems.

16. The building will be constructed of precast, prestressed concrete which permits the construction of a tall building and at the same time gives a sense of security and privacy.

Also present were Mr. Ching, representing Reed & Martin, and Mr. Walter Chuck, its attorney. Mr. Ching stated that the units will be sold in fee simple. Children will be permitted but they have not decided on the age limit.

Replying to questions from the Commission, Mr. Haines reported that the height of the proposed structure will be comparable to the Ilikai Hotel. For a Planned Unit Development, the CZC permits a deviation from the setback and other requirements of the Ordinance, but the developer is conforming to all the requirements as illustrated by the design of the project.

The Acting Planning Director explained the extent of deviation permitted for planned unit developments. He noted that the development plan as submitted together with the traffic pattern is made a part of the Planned Unit Development approval, and the developer must conform generally to that plan. Slight deviations from the plan may be approved by the Director at his discretion.

He noted another difference in procedure for planned unit developments. For a conventional zoning change, there is no time element involved for submitting a recommendation but for a planned unit development, the Commission must submit its recommendation to the City Council within 30 days after the public hearing. The Commission may recommend approval in whole or in part with or without modifications.

When asked what would happen if the time requirement is not met, Legal Counsel Jeremiah stated that this provision is not provided in the Comprehensive Zoning Code; therefore, the matter would automatically be referred to the next body which is the City Council.

There was no one to speak in opposition to the proposal.

MOTION: The public hearing was closed and the matter taken under advisement, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

The Commission later discussed the traffic pattern and the statement made by the developer that children will be permitted in this development, but the permitted ages have not been decided yet. If children are to be permitted, the Commission felt that proper recreational facilities should be provided for them.

The Acting Planning Director then read the applicable provisions of the Ordinance relating to planned unit developments. The Planning Director is responsible for checking the planned unit development plan and making the proper studies to determine that the proposal would be in the best public interest. After preparing the findings of fact and conclusions, the Director may include the conditions under which the planned unit development is to operate. This is the reason why the developer must submit plans for approval, and once approved, must adhere to that plan. The Planning Director has the authority to grant slight modifications made to the approved plan. At this time, the Commission may recommend the imposition of additional conditions relating to traffic and recreational facilities for children.

The Commission stated that the plan submitted seems acceptable, however, because this is the first request for a planned unit development, it felt that the staff should consult with the legal counsel to see that all applicable requirements of the ordinance have been complied with and that the conditions to be imposed will meet the intent of the ordinance.

MOTION: Mr. Chun withdrew his motion to close the public hearing and Mr. Yamabe withdrew his second thereto.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Brennan, the Commission decided to keep the public hearing open and to continue it at the next meeting.

MISCELLANEOUS MEETING WITH CONSULTANTS TO THE STATE LAND USE COMMISSION

The Commission scheduled a luncheon meeting on January 14, 1969, at 12:00 noon to discuss the State Land Use District Boundaries with Eckbo, Dean, Austin and Williams, consultants to the State Land Use Commission.

FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAM
STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
EXTENSION OF RUNWAY 4R22L, HONOLULU INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

In compliance with Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, the State Department of Transportation, Airports Division, had referred to the Planning Commission for review, an application for federal funds to extend existing Runway 4R22L and to strengthen culverts over Manuwai Canal at Honolulu International Airport.

The project is the extension of the existing runway from 7,000 feet to 9,000 feet. The primary reason for the extension of 4R22L and the supporting work is to upgrade this runway to permit simultaneous landings and takeoffs between Runways 4R and 8-26. This permits maximum utilization of Runway 4R, thereby retaining Runway 4L more as an emergency turnoff for takeoffs from Runway 8-26.

The proposed improvements are within the area designated for airport use on the Detailed Land Use Map of Hickam-Honolulu International Airport as adopted by Ordinance No. 3057, effective September 14, 1967.

The Acting Planning Director reported that the Kalihi Community Association and the Noise Committee on Airports questioned the purpose of this extension as they believed that the increased use of these runways will create more noise problems.

Mr. Robert Chun of the Department of Transportation, Airports Division, stated that the extension of the runway is intended to be used exclusively for landings and takeoffs on normal conditions. The original plan called for the extension of Runway 4L but because of the closeness to Runway 826, the extension of Runway 4R would provide for the added safety factor because it is further away from the simultaneous operation of aircrafts. During Kona weather, the planes would take off in the mauka direction, then turn towards the ocean. In normal conditions, the planes would take off from the end of the extended runway and the flight bar would take the planes faster over the end of the existing runway. All takeoffs and landings of planes will be controlled by the tower. The larger jets presently use Runway 4R only under emergency conditions and with restricted loads.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Lemmon, certified this project as being in consonance with the long-range proposals of the General Plan and the detailed airport development plan of the Department of Transportation.

PERSONNEL
ELECTION OF
CHAIRMAN

The Commission held an election and Mr. Muller was nominated as Chairman. Mr. Muller reported that he had submitted a letter of resignation to the Mayor because he may accept a regional assignment elsewhere.

Upon a unanimous vote cast, Mr. Muller was then elected Chairman Pro Tem until an official reply is received from the Mayor.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott
MITZIE M. ABBOTT
Hearings Reporter

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
January 23, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, January 23, 1969, at 1:45 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Acting Chairman Edward Brennan presiding:

PRESENT: Edward Brennan, Acting Chairman
Philip T. Chun
Cyril W. Lemmon
Arthur A. Rutledge
Thomas N. Yamabe II
James Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Acting Planning Director
Albert Jeremiah, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT: Robert L. Muller (on trip)

PUBLIC HEARING GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP WAIAWA-HALAWA (AMENDMENT) WIDENING OF MOANALUA ROAD BETWEEN AIEA STREAM AND KAIMAKANI STREET

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan, Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa-Halawa area by widening a portion of Moanalua Road, between Aiea Stream and Kaimakani Street, from 50-and 60-foot rights-of-way to an 80-foot right-of-way.

The public hearing notice published in the Hawaii Hochi on January 13, 1969 was read by the Acting Planning Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, the Aiea Community Association, the Aiea District Council, and to the Halawa Community Association. No written comments or protests have been received to date.

From the Detailed Land Use Map displayed, the Acting Planning Director pointed out the proposed road widening in relation to the location of the proposed Halawa Stadium, Halawa Interchange and the Inter-State Defense Highway (H-I). Approximately 750 feet will be involved in the road widening, a portion of which is the existing freeway right-of-way. Channelized changes will be recommended for access to the roadway and to control the traffic movements to Kaimakani Street. The proposed road widening should provide better access to the existing and proposed shopping centers along Moanalua Road. To make a more attractive entryway to the shopping area, the staff had also considered the possibility of a medial strip along a short portion of Moanalua Road near Kaimakani Street.

The State Department of Transportation has approved the widening of Moanalua Road from Aiea Stream to Kaimakani Street in a letter dated August 9, 1968.

Replying to questions from the Commission, the Acting Planning Director reported that a study was made by the Department of Public Works concerning the necessity, feasibility and method desirable to widen and permanently improve Moanalua Road up to the interchange, including the improvement of adjoining and connecting streets. The study was completed and approved by Resolution No. 218, adopted June 16, 1964. At that time, the proposed improvement district project was defeated by a majority of protesting owners in the area. The proposed 80-foot width of this stretch will make it conform to the 80-foot width shown on the Detailed Land Use Map for that section just beyond Aiea Stream.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposal.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposed amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa-Halawa area by widening a portion of Moanalua Road, between Aiea Stream and Kaimakani Street, from 50- and 60-foot rights-of-way to an 80-foot right-of-way.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING
B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT
KAONOHI, KALAUAO, EWA BETWEEN THE PROPOSED MOANALUA ROAD ALIGNMENT AND THE EXISTING MOANALUA ROAD
AMFAC-TROUSDALE

Prior to holding of this public hearing, Mr. Brennan reported that he does not own any interest in the project, but because he is familiar with the persons negotiating for this area, he was filing a conflict of interest declaration statement. He left the room.

Vice Chairman Chun presided over the meeting.

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from R-6 Residential District to B-2 Community Business District for parcels of land situated between the proposed Moanalua Road alignment and the existing Moanalua Road, ewa side, being all of Lot 36 and Exclusion 2 of Kaonohi Ridge Subdivision, Unit 1, Section B (File Plan 1060), containing an area of 110,053 square feet, in conformity with the Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa to Halawa.

The public hearing notice published in the Hawaii Hochi on January 11, 1969 was read by the Acting Planning Director. Copies of the hearing notice

were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, and to interested civic and community organizations. No letters of protest have been received.

The Acting Planning Director presented the proposal to construct a regional shopping center. A drainage channel borders the property and the adjoining lot for which a Conditional Use Permit was approved for parking purposes in conjunction with the shopping center. A roadway is proposed across the drainage channel from the shopping center to the parking area. There is an improvement district program for sewers, water, and drainage, and the developer is to coordinate the project with the improvement district program.

Replying to questions from the Commission, the Acting Planning Director was not aware of any flooding occurring in this area. He noted that the design of the drainage channel conforms to the City standards and requirements for an adequate drainage system.

Mr. Lincoln Ishida, attorney representing the applicant, stated that the area adjoining the drainage channel was once declared a flood plain. However, the channel is now owned by the City and County, and is to be improved under the Moanalua Improvement District Program.

No one spoke in opposition to this rezoning change.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Lemmon, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, recommended approval of the change in zoning from R-6 Residential to B-2 Community Business for parcels of land situated between the proposed Moanalua Road alignment and the existing Moanalua Road, ewa side, being all of Lot 36 and Exclusion 2 of Kaonohi Ridge Subdivision, Unit 1, Section B (File Plan 1060), containing an area of 110,053 square feet in Kaonohi, Kalauao, Ewa.

PUBLIC HEARING ZONING I-1 LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT KANEOHE 45-558 to 45-580 KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY THOMAS T. KOZUMA, RICHARD AZAMA, ET AL	A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from R-4 Residential District to I-1 Light Industrial District for parcels of land situated mauka of Kamehameha Highway from 45-558 to 45-580 Kamehameha Highway across Duncan Tract and approximately 100 feet south of City Mill premises in Kaneohe, and identified as Tax Map Key 4-5-76: portions of Parcels 42 and 43, and Parcels 48 and 49, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map of the Kaneohe area.

The public hearing notice published in the Hawaii Hochi on January 11, 1969 was read by the Acting Planning Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicants, applicable governmental agencies, Standard Oil Company of California, Hawaii Tax and Audit, and to interested civic and community organizations. No letters of protest or comment have been received.

The Acting Planning Director reported that the front portions of Parcels 42 and 43, located at the corner of Luluku Road and Kamehameha Highway, were included in this rezoning proposal since the change would be a logical extension of the existing Limited Industrial District.

From the development plan submitted, he explained the property owner's proposal to construct two open shed buildings, one measuring 40 feet x 75 feet, and the other 40 feet x 70 feet, with asphalt paved floors on Parcels 48 and 49 comprising a total area of 13,152 square feet. It was his understanding that these buildings will be used for storage of building materials. The plan does not show the number of parking spaces set aside, but parking is to be in the front.

The Board of Water Supply indicated that its facilities are adequate to serve the proposed use. The Division of Sewers reported that public sewerage facilities are presently not available for the proposed development and a cesspool is located on each lot; however, sewer lines are anticipated to be installed within two or three years. The access is off a 20-foot private roadway with a pavement width of 12-1/2 feet in poor condition. There are no curbs, gutters, or sidewalks. The CZC requires a five-foot front yard setback. No setback is required for side and rear yards except when the property abuts a non-industrial use district.

Replying to questions from the Commission, Mr. Ralph Ajifu, owner of the back lot, indicated that the proposed use is compatible with the existing industrial uses in the surrounding area. The properties are located on high ground with good drainage and no difficulty has been encountered using cesspools. They propose to rent the building for a woodworking manufacturing operation. No retailing will be done on the premises. He did not visualize any traffic problems resulting from the use of the 20-foot roadway and noted that basically only trucks delivering equipment will be using the premises. They will conform to the parking requirement.

Mr. Lemmon felt that the owner should be made to submit a more detailed development plan showing the proposed use of the site including the number of parking spaces.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning change.

MOTION: Mr. Lemmon moved to close the public hearing and to defer the application until the submission of a more detailed development plan showing the proposed use of the site including the number of parking spaces. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rutledge.

In the discussion that followed, the Commission considered whether or not it should require the applicant to submit a more detailed plan showing the size, location and use of the buildings together with the required setback, landscaping and parking areas. The Acting Planning Director noted that the plan submitted shows the measurement of the area involved, the required setback, and the location of the structure except the access to the parking area and the landscaping areas.

After a brief discussion with legal counsel, the Acting Planning Director reported that the CZC does not mention the requirement to submit development plans in a rezoning application. It is at the time of submission of a building permit that proper check is made to see that the development complies with all the requirements of the I-1 Industrial District.

MOTION: Mr. Lemmon withdrew his motion and Mr. Rutledge his second thereto.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Chun, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from R-4 Residential District to I-1 Light Industrial District for parcels of land situated on the mauka side of Kamehameha Highway from 45-558 to 45-580 Kamehameha Highway in Kaneohe. Mr. Lemmon refrained from voting.

PUBLIC HEARING
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT-HOUSING
McCULLY
OFF KAPIOLANI BOULEVARD
REED & MARTIN INVESTMENT CORPORATION

Prior to holding this public hearing, Mr. Lemmon declared a conflict of interest and left the room. A declaration statement was filed at the previous meeting.

A public hearing, continued from January 9, 1969, was held to consider a request for a Planned Development-Housing (PD-H) project, in accordance with Article 10, Section 21-1004 of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, to construct a 36-story

apartment structure containing 569 apartment units, together with convenience establishments including a restaurant and commercial areas; and to construct a parking structure providing parking facilities for 782 cars, on land situated off Kapiolani Boulevard in McCully and identified by Tax Map Key 2-7-04: Parcel 1. The area is zoned A-4 Apartment District.

The Commission had continued the hearing pending further studies on the traffic pattern and to determine the type of control which may be imposed for a planned unit development.

The Acting Planning Director referred to the staff's memorandum submitted to the Planning Commission containing specific findings of fact relating to the proposed development and the general conclusion reached that the proposed plan conforms to the requirements of the Comprehensive Zoning Code and the Subdivision Rules and Regulations with reference to height and density of the structure. He noted that a revised site plan has been submitted showing the following changes:

1. The access to the property has been moved to a point opposite Isenberg Street as recommended by the Traffic Department.

2. A second entryway is provided for right turn movements only.

3. A slight change in the location of the turning circle and the central area.

4. General redesign of the garden area and the swimming pool.

5. Off-street loading areas.

6. Instead of two tennis courts, one court and a lawn area surrounded by a trellis;

7. Substantial retention of existing trees and plants.

For the maintenance of the open space areas, no specific commitment has been made by the developer. It is assumed that provisions for maintenance will be included in the Homeowners' Association By-Laws. The proposed plan meets the requirement of the Fire Department, Board of Water Supply, Board of Health, and the Building Department.

He then read a letter from the Traffic Department stating as follows:

> "In lieu of the driveway for the development being located midway between Hoawa Street and Isenberg Street, we recommend a direct alignment opposite Isenberg Street provided:

1. The original driveway alignment be realigned to a 90° intersection instead of an undesirable skew.

2. The developer be required to investigate the feasibility of providing a left turn storage lane on the median for town bound traffic and assume its construction cost.

3. The developer be apprised that left turn prohibition for exiting traffic from the development may be imposed in the future depending upon the traffic situation.

We feel that because the predominant movement is to and from the downtown direction, a greater problem might be created if a mid-block driveway were to be located at a point where there is no median opening in this particular instance."

The Commission studied the revised traffic plan and asked where the left turn storage lane is to be provided since there already exists a storage lane for traffic going in the kokohead direction and turning left onto Isenberg Street. The medial strip is quite narrow at this point.

Mr. Ernest Kagawa from the Traffic Department clarified that their reference was to a left turn storage lane for traffic going in the town direction and turning left into the subject property. For traffic coming out of the property and turning left onto Kapiolani Boulevard, they would merge into the three-lanes of traffic heading in the town direction. Depending on the design of this intersection, they could eliminate entirely all left turn movements from the property and permit only straight ahead and right turn movements. They cannot eliminate the left turn storage lane for traffic turning into Isenberg Street.

The Commission agreed that all pertinent issues relating to traffic and the various conditions to be imposed with the adoption of the ordinance creating a planned unit development for this property should be resolved before the Commission submits its recommendation to the Council. In this respect, the Commission suggested that the staff meet with the Traffic Department to study the traffic situation and at the same time give some consideration to the proposal made for an overpass or underpass at the intersection of Kapiolani Boulevard and Kalakaua Avenue and how it would relate to this project.

Relative to the authority of the Director to impose additional conditions, the Acting Planning Director reported that one issue raised by the Commission related to the ages of children to be permitted in this development and the kinds of recreational facilities that should be provided for them. Based on similar types of density development, the average is 1.7 persons per unit with an anticipated count of 175 school age children. The staff will be meeting with the developer and the Traffic Department to provide more specific answers to questions brought out by the Commission.

Mr. Frank Haines, architect for the project, reported that the only major change to the original plan is the access point directly opposite Isenberg Street as recommended by the Traffic Department. This plan has been approved by the Traffic Department, just this morning.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Haines stated that:

1. The Traffic Department's referral to a left turn storage lane relates to traffic turning left from Kapiolani Boulevard into the project site. The Traffic Department will permit them to make this movement and had requested the developer to make the alteration.

2. Left turn traffic out of the property is expected to enter the third lane of Kapiolani Boulevard. The Traffic Department will allow them to make this movement, but later if this movement proves to be hazardous or delays traffic, traffic must either go straight ahead or turn right.

3. The Traffic Department has taken no position on the necessity for traffic lights at this intersection. This need will be discussed later after the project is completed and they can evaluate the situation better. He personally felt that there should be traffic lights at this intersection.

   Mr. Kagawa remarked that traffic lights will be installed when deemed necessary. The developer will be requested to share the cost or to bear the entire cost of the traffic lights.

4. The Traffic Department was furnished with statistics on the proposed development relating to the number of apartment units and the number of parking stalls. During the rush hours, they estimated between 400 to 500 vehicles entering on Kapiolani Boulevard.

5. Regarding the maintenance of the open space areas, the developer intends to place this requirement in the condominium documents. At this time, the developer can only state his intent to place the requirement for maintenance in the documents.

6. There are no facilities for large gatherings or parties. The only facilities provided are convenience services, such as barber shops, beauty shops, etc. for the owners of the units.

7. Recreational facilities for the children include a swimming pool, wading pool, and a play area. Recreational facilities for the adults and teenagers include volley ball and tennis courts, golf area, etc. Picnic tables will be provided for family recreation. Inside recreational facilities for the teenagers will be provided on the fourth and sixth floors comprising 4,000 square feet each and will include such facilities as a ping pong table, billiards, etc.

8. The area on the top of the seven-story garage will be an open lawn area where plants and benches will be placed in the walkway areas. The nine-foot trellis will be covered with vine to provide shade for those sitting on the benches and observing people at play on the putting green.

9. Adequate setback is provided on the makai side. The setback dimension includes the trellis and the fencing to be provided to keep the tennis balls from going out of the area.

The Commission decided to keep the public hearing open for another two weeks in order to give the Director sufficient time to meet with the Traffic Department and the developer in consultation with the legal counsel to check on the traffic situation and the types of restrictions and conditions that may be imposed on this planned unit development.

ACTION: The motion to keep the public hearing open and to defer this matter for two weeks was made by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, and carried.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Lemmon, authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director:

ZONING R-6 RESIDENTIAL KANEOHE OFF KOKOKAHI PLACE FRANCIS HUGHES, ET AL

1. Changes in zoning from R-3 and R-4 Residential Districts to R-6 Residential District, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 34,364 square foot parcel of land situated off Kokokahi Place in Kaneohe.

COMPREHENSIVE ZONING CODE AMENDMENT TO PART C RELATING TO SIGN REGULATIONS, AND OFF-STREET LOADING REQUIREMENTS

2. Amendment to the Comprehensive Zoning Code by amending Part C of Article 2 relating to Sign Regulations, and to repeal Article 26 entitled "Sign Regulations"; and amendments relating to Off-Street Loading Requirements; Use Regulations in the A-4 Apartment District; Minimum Yard Spacing in the H-2 Hotel District; Maximum Density Regulations in the B-2 Community Business District; and Transition Redistricting of Hotel-Apartment Districts.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

MITZIE M. ABBOTT
Hearings Reporter

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
February 6, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, February 6, 1969, at 1:30 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Acting Chairman Edward Brennan presiding:

PRESENT:

Edward Brennan, Chairman Pro tem
Philip T. Chun
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Arthur A. Rutledge
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Edgar Hamasu, Planner V
Albert Jeremiah, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Cyril W. Lemmon
Robert L. Muller
James K. Sakai, ex-officio

MINUTES:

The minutes of the meeting of November 27, 1968, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING R-6 RESIDENTIAL
KANEOHE
OFF KOKOKAHI PLACE
FRANCIS HUGHES, ET AL

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515 (2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a change in zoning from existing R-3 and R-4 Residential Districts (7,500 square foot and 10,000 square foot minimum) to R-6 Residential District (5,000 square foot minimum) for a 25-foot strip of land, totalling an area of 34,364 square feet, situated at the rear of existing residential lots fronting Kokokahi Place, adjoining the Bay View Estates Subdivision in Kaneohe, and identified as Tax Map Key 4-5-31: portion of 113, Lots A-1 through A-11, in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Plan of the Kaneohe area.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of January 26, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicants, to the applicable governmental agencies, to different community organizations and to seven adjoining property owners. No written protests have been received to date.

Mr. Edgar Hamasu, staff member, oriented the Commission as to the location of the property and reported that the 25-foot strip includes 11 separate parcels which were approved for Urban use by the State Land Use Commission on August 30, 1968. Mr. and Mrs. Francis Hughes had made the rezoning application for their two parcels but the staff had recommended the inclusion of the entire strip in this rezoning proposal.

Mr. Marshall Wright, representing Mr. and Mrs. Hughes, indicated that the proposed zoning will be in conformity with adjacent lots and felt

that the proposal should be approved.

There were no questions from the Commission and no one spoke in opposition to the proposed zoning.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the change in zoning from existing R-3 and R-4 Residential Districts to R-6 Residential District for the subject parcels of land situated at the rear of existing residential lots fronting Kokokahi Place, adjoining the Bay View Estates Subdivision in Kaneohe.

PUBLIC HEARING AMENDMENT TO THE CZC RELATING TO SIGN REGULATIONS; OFF-STREET LOADING REQUIREMENTS; USE REGULATIONS IN THE A-4 APT. DIST.; MINIMUM YARD SPACING IN THE H-2 HOTEL DISTRICT; B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS DIST.; AND TRANSITION REDISTRICTING OF HOTEL-APT. DISTRICTS

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider an Ordinance to amend Chapter 21, R.O. 1961, as amended, as set forth in Ordinance No. 3234 (Comprehensive Zoning Code) by amending:

a. Section 21-205 relating to off-street loading requirements;

b. Section 21-631, subsection (a) relating to use regulations in the A-4 Apartment District;

c. Section 21-712 relating to minimum yard spacing in the H-2 Hotel District;

d. Subsection (d) of Section 21-812 relating to maximum density regulations in the B-2 Community Business Districts;

e. Item "k" of Section 21-1401(c)(3) relating to transition redistricting of Hotel-Apartment Districts;

f. By adding subsection (b) of Section 21-221 relating to non-conforming signs;

g. Section 21-226 relating to permits and fees; and

h. Section 21-227 relating to abatement and removal of unlawful signs;

and by repealing Article 26 of Chapter 13, R.O. of Honolulu 1961, as amended, entitled "Sign Regulations".

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of January 26, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies and to different community organizations. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

The Director acknowledged receipt and read the following letters which were placed on file:

1. Douglas A. Hughes, Executive-Secretary, Hawaii Trucking Association indicating their support of such legislation and commenting that the proposed changes will further clarify the intent of the Code.

2. William Hogarty, Vice-Chairman, Developer/Builder Committee, Home Builders Association of Hawaii, indicating that the proposals are acceptable to their Association.

3. Mrs. Jack Marnie, Sign Committee Chairman, The Outdoor Circle, indicating that a provision for an amortization period for non-conforming signs be provided. "...such a provision would not only make enforcement easier, but would make the code more equitable for all."

4. Richard R. Lowe, Victoria Ward, Limited, indicated that the clearance requirement for access to a street should be made consistent with the height clearance requirement for loading spaces.

Each amendment was considered separately.

The Director read Amendment "a" which amends the last paragraph of Section 21-205 relating to Off-Street Loading Requirements to read as follows:

"No loading space required under the provisions of this Chapter shall be in any street or alley, but shall be provided within the building or on the lot. No less than half of the required number of off-street loading spaces, but in all cases at least one space shall have a vertical clearance of at least 14 feet, and the balance of required spaces shall have a vertical clearance of at least 10 feet. Each loading space shall have minimum horizontal dimensions of 12 x 35 feet. Each space shall be unobstructed and shall be so arranged that any using vehicle may be moved without moving another. Adequate maneuvering areas and access to a street shall be provided and shall have a vertical clearance of at least 14 feet. All spaces shall be provided and maintained with an all-weather surface. Where loading areas are illuminated, all sources of illumination shall be so shielded as to prevent any direct reflection toward adjacent premises in residential, apartment or hotel districts. In addition, loading spaces for three or more vehicles shall have individual spaces marked, and spaces shall be so arranged that no maneuvering directly incidental to entering or leaving a loading space shall be on any public street, alley, or walkway." In other words, the present requirement that all off-street loading spaces have a 14-foot height clearance was made less stringent by permitting one-half of the required number of spaces to have a 14-foot clearance and the remainder reduced to 10 feet.

Responding to the Chairman's call for testimony either for or against this amendment, Mr. Ernest K. H. Park of Park Associates-Surveyors; and Mr. Don C. W. Dumlao of Phillips and Dumlao Architects, Ltd., spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Park asked whether a study was made of the various condominium and apartment buildings in Honolulu to determine the need for this loading area by pointing out that its use, in many instances, might never occur. He could understand this need for commercial establishments or hotels but not for condominiums and apartments which are equipped with built-in appliances and furnishings at the time of construction. The few other furnishings that must be brought in would not require a 14-foot van. He felt that this additional requirement was placing an unnecessary burden on owners and developers who must also comply with other requirements of the ordinance to provide for a 10-foot planting strip and to set aside 1-1/4 parking spaces for each unit, thus decreasing their buildable space. He felt that the extra parking spaces could be used as the loading area.

The Commission advised Mr. Park that the 14-foot height requirement is contained in the CZC which was finally adopted after considerable review and discussion with the public.

Mr. Dumlao felt that an arbitrary figure of one-half was taken and asked for the reason for proposing the change. He agreed with Mr. Park that there would be instances where the 14-foot height would not be required. However, to provide for those instances where a 14-foot height would be required, he felt that the law should be made flexible enough to relate to the particular use rather than to specify an arbitrary figure of one-half.

Replying to questions by Messrs Park and Dumlao, the Director stated that the staff did not make a survey of all existing apartments but consulted with representatives of the various trucking firms and it was determined that the 14-foot height would be desirable for certain delivery vans. Recognizing the fact that not all service vans are this high, the staff recommended the reduction to 10 feet to accommodate the normal commercial service vans. One-half was considered an equitable figure. He stated that for smaller apartments or multiple family dwellings having a floor area of less than 20,000 square feet, there is no requirement for a loading space.

Contrary to Mr. Park's statement that utilization of the larger loading areas are infrequent, the Chairman pointed out that people living in apartments continuously change their furniture and appliances or leave to buy condominiums, homes, etc., necessitating the use of moving vans.

He agreed that excess parking spaces could be used for a loading zone as long as it meets the requirement. He stated that an attempt is being made to set a standard for the good of all concerned.

Commissioner Rutledge informed Mr. Park that owners and developers have a preference of providing the loading facilities inside or outside of a building. Although there would be no problem for such facilities outside a structure, he felt that there might be an occasion where such facilities must be provided within the building to accommodate the need of the tenants.

No other person spoke either for or against amendment "a."

The next item considered was amendment "b." which reads as follows:

"b. By amending subsection (a) of Section 21-631 thereof to read:

'(a) All of the uses and structures permitted in the A-3 Apartment district shall be permitted in an A-4 Apartment district. In addition, private clubs, lodges, social centers, eleemosynary institutions and athletic clubs shall be permitted as principal uses and structures, rather than as conditional uses; provided that no club or other organization conducting commercial affairs as a principal activity shall be allowed.'"

The Director reported that the proposed change is the inclusion of "eleemosynary institutions" as one of the permitted principal uses in the A-4 Apartment District. Presently, private clubs, lodges, social centers and athletic clubs are listed as principal uses.

Commissioner Yamabe felt that use of the term "eleemosynary institutions" is ambiguous because it is too general and varied and does not indicate specifically what constitutes "eleemosynary institutions."

No one spoke either in support of or in opposition to this amendment.

Amendment "c." was considered next:

c. By amending Section 21-712 thereof to read:

"Sec. 21-712. Minimum Lot Area, Lot Width and Yard Spacing.

Within a H-2 Hotel District, the following shall constitute the lot, yard and open space requirements:

(a) The minimum lot area shall be not less than 15,000 square feet; provided that

no minimum lot area shall be required of any off-street parking facility, located on a zoning lot other than the zoning lot on which the principal use is situated, to meet zoning requirements of a permitted use.

(b) The minimum lot width shall be not less than 70 feet; provided that no minimum lot width shall be required of any off-street parking facility, located on a zoning lot other than the zoning lot on which the principal use is situated, to meet zoning requirements of a permitted use.

(c) Front, side and rear yards shall have a minimum depth of 10 feet; provided that all of the front yard and the nearest 5 feet of side and rear yards to lot lines shall be maintained in landscaping and, except for access to an adjacent street, no yard area shall be used for parking.

(d) In addition to (a) hereinabove, for any portion of a structure above 40 feet in height, additional side and rear setbacks equal to one foot for each 10 feet in height or fraction thereof shall be provided; said additional setback shall be a continuous vertical plane from the top of the structure to the height of 40 feet above ground elevation.

(e) Notwithstanding the requirements of subsection (a) hereinabove for side and rear yards, upon the option of the owner or developer, the yard regulations as contained in Section 21-202 of Article 2 may be substituted in lieu thereof."

The Director reported that Paragraphs A and B are being added to this section to provide for the minimum lot area requirement and the minimum lot width in the H-2 Hotel District. In the final preparation of the zoning document, these otherwise routine provisions were inadvertently left out.

There were no questions of the Director and no persons appeared to speak either for or against Amendment "c."

The Commission continued on to Amendment "d."

d. By amending subsection (d) of Section 21-812 thereof to read:

"(d) The floor area of all buildings and structures situated on a zoning lot shall not exceed a floor area ratio of

2.5; provided that in addition to such maximum, 5 square feet of floor area may be added for each square foot of public open space at ground level and 3 square feet of floor area may be added for each square foot of arcade area, with the 5-foot setback along the street frontage included as arcade area where provided."

The Director explained that this amendment relates to the density regulations in the B-2 Community Business District by changing the word "density" to "floor area" to be consistent throughout the zoning ordinance. It refers to the floor area ratio and also the setback and other dimensional requirements. The proposed change will clarify this section.

There were no questions of the Director and no persons appeared to speak either for or against this proposal.

Amendment "e." was considered next:

e. By amending item "k" of Section 21-1401 (c)(3) thereof to read:

"k. Hotel-Apartment districts located makai of H-1 (Lunalilo) Freeway between Alapai Street extended to the ocean and Kapahulu Avenue extended to the ocean, excluding any Hotel-Apartment district situated in the area bounded by Kapahulu Avenue extended to the ocean, the ocean and the Ala Wai Canal, are redesignated as A-4 Apartment Districts."

The Director reported that in the original draft of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, "Ward Street" was inadvertently typed instead of "Alapai Street". The change does not affect the Detailed Land Use Map.

There were no further questions of the Director, and no one appeared to speak either in opposition to or in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Junji Higa of the Building Department was called upon to present the proposed amendments concerning the sign regulations which were prepared by the Building and Planning Departments with the aid of the Corporation Counsel's office. He explained that the changes are primarily in the procedural or technical requirement of the sign regulations to eliminate conflicts between the CZC and the present sign regulations contained in Article 26, Chapter 13 of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu, 1961. The technical provisions contained in the CZC supersede Article 26 aforementioned; and therefore, automatically repeal any conflicting ordinances but there are omissions. For instance, the CZC does not contain provisions for (1) obtaining sign permits; (2) checking sign permit applications; and (3) follow-up on any

violations of the sign provision. These provisions must be included. Other changes are:

(1) To include an additional fee of $25 for sign work started without a permit.

(2) To change the time allotted to correct a violation from a minimum period of 20 days and a maximum of 60 days to 5 days minimum and 30 days maximum. It was felt that the 20-60 day period was too long.

(3) To renumber the various paragraphs and sub-paragraphs. Since the renumbering proposal is not included in today's presentation, the Corporation Counsel's aid will be sought to settle this issue.

To the Chairman's call for testimony either for or against this proposal, Mr. James F. Kamo, Attorney for the Sign Manufacturer's Association; and Mr. Richard Botti, employed and representing the National Federation of Independent Business, spoke in opposition.

Both men objected to the following amendment:

f. By adding subsection (h) to Section 21-221 thereof to read:

"(h) Nonconforming Signs. Any sign for which a permit was issued prior to January 2, 1969, shall be permitted to be erected and maintained as a nonconforming sign, subject to the following conditions:

(1) Safe Condition. Nonconforming signs shall be maintained in a safe condition and shall not in any respect be dangerous to persons or property.

(2) Alteration or Relocation. Upon the alteration or relocation of any nonconforming sign or the discontinuance or removal from the premises of the activity to which such sign relates, such sign shall cease to be a nonconforming sign under this Chapter and shall thereafter be permitted to be maintained only upon compliance with all requirements of this Chapter. The term "alteration" shall not be construed to mean repairs and maintenance for the purpose of keeping the sign in a clean and safe condition."

Mr. Kamo considered this amendment to be unreasonable because it prevents a merchant already in a nonconforming building from altering his existing sign to suit his new method of operation should

he desire such a change. The same applies to a new owner who simply wishes to assume A's Shoe Store and change its name to B's Shoe Store. All of the existing merchants in the building will have protruding signs but his, in order to conform, must now be printed on the glass which is a disadvantage to him. Most existing buildings are constructed on the boundary line; therefore, any new signs, regardless of the size, cannot meet the 5-foot setback requirement. This is a hardship to the merchant who is unable to advertise his business properly. It also becomes a tremendous burden to merchant sign makers who derive income from constructing such signs. Mr. Kamo felt that there should be a grandfather clause to permit the maintenance of a protruding sign even though an existing business use is changed to another type of business use.

Replying to various questions of the Commissioners, Mr. Kamo stated that if there is no structural change but merely a name change, a nonconforming sign should be permitted to remain as long as the building is in existence. However, if there is to be a structural change of the sign or a new building constructed, the sign and building must conform to existing regulations. He was opposed to the date restriction of January 2, 1969, mentioned. He believed that the particular language should read either for the life of the building or whatever reasonable date that can be determined. He has considered appealing to the Zoning Board but this would only add to the financial burden of his client who must then reimburse him for attorney's fees. He realized that his objections relate to present regulations and he will continue working with the staff to find a reasonable solution.

Commissioner Rutledge commented that Mr. Kamo is attempting to perpetuate alteration of nonconforming signs on nonconforming buildings, an issue over which the Commission has no jurisdiction, and suggested that he present this issue to the City Council for action.

Mr. Hamasu gave the following definition of a wall sign for the benefit of the Commission: "A sign affixed to the exterior wall of any building projecting no more than 15 inches from the building wall and does not extend above the exterior wall of said building." Relative to the above situation, a painted window sign is the only type that could qualify.

Mr. Richard C. Botti, Division Manager of the National Federation of Independent Business, agreed with Mr. Kamo's comments.

There was no further testimony from the public.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Chun.

In later discussion, the Commission had no objection to any of the proposed amendments except Amendment "b". Commissioner Yamabe felt that eleemosynary institutions should be clarified and identified by use because many different types of operations can qualify under this classification. If no definition by use can be made, then eleemosynary institutions should be left under conditional uses. The Commission's understanding of an eleemosynary institution was a non-profit charitable or educational organization falling within the scope of the Internal Revenue Code as a tax exempt organization. However, because of questionable uses, such as a business office of a church or the headquarters of a labor union, the Commission suggested that this amendment be referred back to the Director for further study.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, the Commission recommended approval of all the proposed amendments except Amendment "b", and suggested to the Director that he conduct further studies by considering:

(1) Whether it would suffice to keep eleemosynary institutions under conditional uses; or

(2) whether to identify specific uses in the list of principal permitted uses.

PUBLIC HEARING
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT-HOUSING
McCULLY
OFF KAPIOLANI BLVD.
REED & MARTIN
INVESTMENT CORP.

The public hearing held on January 9 and 23, 1969 to consider a proposal to initiate a planned development project for land situated off Kapiolani Boulevard at McCully, was kept open for further study.

The Director recommended that the public hearing be kept open for continued study with the Traffic Department concerning a proposed roadway to be located on the applicant's rear property line. This proposal might prove advantageous to them and to adjoining property owners as well. It might also alleviate the left-turn situation onto Kapiolani Blvd. by introducing traffic into other streets in the vicinity. Details concerning its overall feasibility are being worked on. Installation of traffic lights at the Kapiolani-University Avenue Extension intersection is also being considered.

Questioned by Mr. Chun, the Director stated that parcels in the area contain relatively low-rise structures which could conceivably be converted to high-density developments later on.

Mr. Walter Chuck, attorney for the applicant, objected to the Director's recommendation for continuation of the hearing. He stated that this is the third request for delay. He contended that this delay is causing major problems with their interim financing as well as their construction schedule. This application has been

with the department for eight months and the traffic situation held it up originally. They have worked with the Traffic Department and conceded to all of its wishes and they were of the understanding that the traffic situation was resolved. The Traffic Department had proposed that all movements from the property to Kapiolani Boulevard be right turns only with no left turn or straight across movements to Isenberg Street. They were also of the understanding that the Traffic Department had rejected the idea of the proposed road mentioned by the Director because it was not a feasible plan. To mention the proposed roadway plan now brings about further problems and delays, such as additional survey work, an amendment to the General Plan to show the proposed roadway, financing methods to construct the road, and deletion of a section of the park area, all of which jeopardizes the project to the extent that it might not be economically feasible for them to proceed with the planned development project.

The Commission appreciated the developer's position in this matter but stated that the traffic problem must be resolved first because of the anticipated increase in traffic generated from the proposed development. The Traffic Department should be given an opportunity to comment on the matter and make a recommendation.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission kept the public hearing open and instructed the Director to expedite the study with the Traffic Department and be ready to present a recommendation to the Commission at the next meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT)
WAHIAWA
WITHIN THE GRANDVIEW TRACT SUBDIVISION

The public hearing held on December 12, 1968, was kept open. The staff was instructed to meet with property owners to determine whether or not some solution to the problems could be found. This was done and there is still no final resolution to these problems. The Director recommended that the hearing be kept open.

ACTION: Mr. Rutledge's motion to keep the hearing open was seconded by Mr. Chun and carried.

FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAMS
NANAKULI INTERCEPTOR SEWER, SECTIONS 1A AND 1B
CITY & COUNTY DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS

In compliance with Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, the City and County of Honolulu, Department of Public Works, had referred to the Planning Commission for review, an application for Federal funds to construct the Nanakuli Interceptor Sewer, Sections 1A and 1B.

Mr. Hamasu explained that the project is a part of the Waianae Sewerage System. Section 1A is the first section of the major interceptor from the Sewage Treatment Plant to Molina Street along Farrington Highway and the other easements parallel

to the highway and consists of 6,700 feet of 36-inch pipe. Construction is scheduled for fiscal 1969 with an appropriation of $1,531,000 of which about $540,000 is budgeted with reimbursable Federal fund. Section 1B extends the system from Molina Street toward Meaulu Road along the Maile Drainage Canal and the other easements parallel to Farrington Highway and consists of 3,100 feet of 36-inch pipe. Construction for this section is scheduled for fiscal 1970. Seven hundred twenty-six thousand dollars is appropriated of which $210,000 is reimbursable Federal fund.

The construction of both sections of the interceptor system will provide sewerage services for a beach park and a development of low-income housing (Turnkey) recently completed. This project is also necessary to prevent, abate, and control the current pollution by cesspool seepages of the coastal waters in this area. It will provide for the improvement of the nearshore waters for swimming, boating, fishing, and other recreational uses of this coastal area.

This project conforms to and will help achieve the intent of the Oahu General Plan which is "to develop a wholesome, convenient, and attractive living environment by....achieving an adequate system of utilities including drainage and other community facilities...."

<u>ACTION</u>: The Commission, on motion of Mr. Chun and second of Mr. Rutledge, certified this project as being consistent and in consonance with existing planning programs of the City and County of Honolulu.

STREET NAMES HEEIA, CROWN TERRACE, TRACT 2, UNIT 2, SUBDIVISION

The Commission, on motion of Mr. Rutledge and second of Mr. Chun, recommended approval of the following street names:

a) Roadways within the Crown Terrace, Tract 2, Unit 2, at Heeia, Koolaupoko, Oahu

HALAULANI STREET	-	Roadway off Kamehameha Highway running in a mauka direction between Heeia Street and Ipuka Street.
Meaning		Name of a star
HINALANI STREET	-	Roadway off Halaulani Street to a deadend past Hinapu Street and being mauka of Kohina Street.
Meaning:		Name of a star
HINALANI PLACE	-	Deadend roadway off Hinalani Street between Halaulani Street and Hinapu Street.

HINAPU STREET - Roadway off Hinalani Street running in a makai direction to a deadend past Kohina Street.

Meaning: A rare variety of upland taro

KOHINA STREET Roadway from Halaulani Street to Hinapu Street and being between Hinalani Street and Kamehameha Highway.

Meaning: Part of a taro

STREET NAMES
LANAKILA
"ALANEO STREET"

b) Delete ALANEO PLACE and substitute thereto:

ALANEO STREET Roadway running from off 812 North School Street to Kuakini Street between Lanakila Street and Liliha Street.

STREET NAMES
EWA
MAKAKILO CITY
DELETION OF
"NOHOUKA STREET"

c) Deletion of NOHOUKA STREET, situated within Makakilo City, Unit 14, from Resolution No. 244, June 25, 1968.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Chun, authorized the calling of public hearings on February 20, 1969, to consider the following proposals initiated by the Planning Director:

GENERAL PLAN
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
(AMENDMENT)
ST. LOUIS HTS.-PALOLO
EXTENSION OF 5TH AVE.
IN THE MAUKA DIRECTION
BEYOND WAIALAE AVENUE
TO MEET PALOLO AVENUE

(1) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and Development Plan of St. Louis Heights-Palolo by extending 5th Avenue in the mauka direction beyond Waialae Avenue to meet Palolo Avenue.

GENERAL PLAN
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
(AMENDMENT)
KAIMUKI-KAPAHULU
DELETION OF A PORTION
OF 15TH AVE. BETWEEN
HARDING AVENUE AND
THE FREEWAY

(2) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and Development Plan of Kaimuki-Kapahulu by deleting a portion of 15th Avenue between Harding Avenue and the Freeway.

MISC.
1969 HAWAII
CONGRESS OF
PLANNING
COMMISSIONERS
AND DIRECTORS

The Director reported that a letter was received from Mr. Brian Nishimoto, Planning Director of the County of Kauai, requesting information on the dates of this year's Planning Conference in order that he might project his 1969 budget. The Director said that he would submit an appropriate reply to Mr. Nishimoto.

MISCELLANEOUS RESOLUTION KANEOHE KEAPUKA FLOOD DISASTER AREA

The Planning Director introduced for discussion purposes the draft of a Resolution stating the support of the Planning Commission in any and all endeavors toward resolving the flooding problem in the Keapuka area.

He explained that as a result of the serious flood this past Saturday, the administration is considering several alternate methods toward alleviating this condition. The staff made a preliminary analysis of the environmental conditions existing in the Keapuka subdivision area following the flood and the result of the findings was submitted in a report to the Commission. Briefly, the findings are as follows:

1. The study area covered the section known as the Keapuka subdivision situated off Likelike Highway and adjacent to Kaneohe Stream drainage channel and containing about 15 acres.

2. Out of a total of 56 homes situated in the study area, 8 homes were found to have major structural damages, 20 had minor structural damages considered repairable and 28 had interior damages only.

3. Flood hazard was found to be the single most environmental deficiency in the area. Early estimates placed damages at over $700,000 for the current disaster. Four years ago there was a similar disastrous flood which took two lives.

4. Other deficiencies relate to the lack of recreational facilities. Existing playgrounds and playfields situated in the adjacent neighborhoods are not adequately serving the study area.

5. Based upon the preliminary findings, the appraisal of which followed the previously designated survey method used to determine environmental deficiencies, the total block penalty score was rated at 42. Such a rating generally places the area in the poor environmental category.

The Director oriented the Commission on the location of the Keapuka area and pointed out the damaged homes and the extent of damages as depicted in various color schemes.

As a result of this preliminary survey and in discussions with other departments, he reported that two proposals have been advanced to alleviate the condition. One method is to have the area declared as a disaster area to qualify under a disaster urban renewal project, and the other is the conventional method of

proceeding with a Title I, urban renewal type of project. Mr. David Kaapu, the Urban Renewal Coordinator, is presently in San Francisco consulting with the Federal representatives. In a phone conversation this morning, Mr. Kaapu reported that, based upon evidence presented, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) would favorably consider an urban renewal project for the Keapuka area. The indication was to proceed through the conventional method of urban renewal to upgrade the area.

When asked to elaborate on the alternatives under study for alleviating the flooding condition should urban renewal be unsuccessful, the Director reported that the Department of Public Works is presently undertaking studies to determine the effects of widening or deepening the drainage channel as well as the possibility of improving the bridge to facilitate the stream flow through the area. At present, no definite cost figure is available if this method is used. Another method discussed was the development of an upstream reservoir as a retention basin for the mountain runoff water, but problems brought out related to the time required to facilitate and initiate such a program. For instance, indications are that the Corps of Engineers would take at least 18 months to undertake and complete engineering studies. More time would be involved in obtaining the appropriation to proceed with the construction so that a number of years will lapse before such a project can be completed.

Should the Administration be successful in proceeding through the urban renewal method, it is possible to provide immediate relocation relief by rehousing the families whose houses were totally destroyed and providing financial assistance on a grant basis. The precise details as to how this is to be done is unknown at this time, but the possibility is present through exchange of properties or money values, to assist the people in purchasing new homes. Another course discussed was to have the Small Business Administration approve the granting of low-interest, long-term mortgage loans for the refinancing of homes and other real property destroyed by the flood.

Commissioner Rutledge commented that thought should be given to asking Blackfield and AmFac, the original developers of this subdivision, to locate another site with the same type of homes for these families at cost, plus a few percentage more, rather than having the entire community bear the cost of improving the existing condition in the area.

The Director further informed the Commission that the staff's findings of the Keapuka area and its conclusion that the area might qualify for renewal assistance as a disaster project area were forwarded to Mr. Kaapu to support his request for assistance to the Federal agency representatives.

The Director read the draft Resolution which states as follows:

"WHEREAS, the area of Keapuka, Kaneohe, Oahu, Hawaii, has just endured a disastrous flood which caused extensive damage to many homes and has previously experienced a serious flood with lost of life; and

"WHEREAS, the imminent danger to life and property from a recurrence of the flood is ever present; and

"WHEREAS, we consider this an emergency situation deserving of our maximum attention; and

"WHEREAS, the Urban Renewal Coordinator and other City agencies are personally seeking federal assistance; and

"WHEREAS, federal assistance can contribute to permanent benefits to the Keapuka area;

"NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Planning Commission of the City and County of Honolulu that this Commission supports any and all endeavors and actions toward resolving the problems of the Keapuka area;

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution be submitted to the Mayor of the City and County of Honolulu in support of public efforts toward solving the serious problems of the Keapuka area."

<u>MOTION</u>: Mr. Rutledge made a motion to adopt the Resolution with an amendment to send a copy of the Resolution to the City Council and also to the Urban Renewal agencies. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

In the discussion that followed, the Commission referred to an article appearing in the daily newspaper indicating that the Mayor and the City Council are initiating action to help the flood victims of the Keapuka area so that the Commission stated that it can only take action to support their efforts without extending beyond its jurisdiction in matters of this nature. However, the Commission felt that its support should be worded stronger and it discussed whether or not it should recommend a definite program of action through the urban renewal method. The fact was brought out that the Commission's jurisdiction on urban renewal merely extended to declaring an area blighted only upon this finding based upon preliminary studies made by the Planning Department staff. It is the Honolulu Redevelopment Agency that makes the detailed studies to determine whether or not an area is ready for urban renewal and the Agency holds the public hearing before initiating the urban renewal program.

In this particular case, the Commission did not believe that the Keapuka area can be called blighted or that urban renewal is the only method by which the present flooding condition can be alleviated. It recalled the statement made by the Director that other means are being explored to resolve the problems of the area; therefore, the Commission was not ready to declare the area blighted. It agreed that the Resolution should contain what is found on the premises and based upon that finding, the Keapuka area is considered to be a flood hazard area deserving urgent attention, that the Commission would support the Administration and the City Council in their endeavors toward resolving the problems of the area, and should urban renewal be found to be the most appropriate method, that the Commission would heartily endorse and agree to such a program.

ACTION: Mr. Rutledge withdrew his motion and made a new motion to have the Planning Director and Mr. Sharpless redraft the Resolution to reflect the sentiments expressed by the Commission and to adopt the Resolution. The motion was seconded by Mr. Chun and carried.

The Resolution adopted by the Commission reads as follows:

"WHEREAS, the area Keapuka, Kaneohe, Oahu, Hawaii, has just endured a disastrous flood which caused extensive damage to many homes; and

"WHEREAS, the area has previously experienced a serious flood with loss of life; and

"WHEREAS, the imminent danger to life and property from a recurrence of the flood is ever present; and

"WHEREAS, based upon preliminary findings, the area is a hazard to life and property; and

"WHEREAS, we consider this emergency situation deserving of our urgent attention; and

"WHEREAS, the Urban Renewal Coordinator and other City representatives are personally seeking federal and other assistance; and

"WHEREAS, federal assistance can contribute to permanent benefits to the Keapuka area;

"NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission of the City and County of Honolulu, that this Commission, based upon the preliminary findings indicating that the area is eligible for urban renewal, supports any and all endeavors and actions toward the implementation of an urban renewal project and such other efforts as may be appropriate to resolve the problems of the Keapuka area; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be transmitted to the Mayor and the City Council of the City and County of Honolulu in support of their efforts toward solving the serious problems of the Keapuka area, and the seeking of federal urban renewal assistance and such other aid programs as may be appropriate to alleviate the conditions in the area."

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henrietta B. Lyman

Henrietta B. Lyman
Secretary-Reporter II

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
February 20, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, February 20, 1969, at 1:55 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Acting Chairman Edward Brennan presiding:

PRESENT:

Edward Brennan, Chairman pro tem
Philip T. Chun
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Arthur A. Rutledge
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio
James Sakai, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Jacob Pyo, Planner V
Albert Jeremiah, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Cyril W. Lemmon (resigned)
Robert L. Muller (resigned)

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN DETAILED
LAND USE MAP
(AMENDMENT)
ST. LOUIS HTS.-PALOLO
EXTENSION OF 5TH AVE.
TO MEET PALOLO AVE.

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515 of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan of St. Louis Heights-Palolo by extending 5th Avenue in the mauka direction beyond Waialae Avenue to meet Palolo Avenue.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of February 9, 1969, was read by the Director.

Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to different community organizations, and to the Waialae Aina Corporation.

The Director pointed out the proposed extension and the areas required for the widening: the portion owned by the City and County Parks Department (approximately 2,000 sq. ft.), and the areas owned by the Waialae Aina Corporation doing business as MacDonald's Drive-In, a hamburger and soft drink operation.

The Director reported that the Department of Traffic had made this proposal to realign 5th Avenue in 1962 when the Interstate Highway was being planned. The Department of Traffic had urged the State Department of Transportation to extend 5th Avenue from Waialae Avenue to Palolo Avenue to give the Valley residents a direct connection to the on-ramp leading to Lunalilo Freeway. This recommendation was rejected by the State Agency.

All that is necessary for this proposed realignment is the rounding of the two corners of Parcel 28, Tax Map Key 3-3-03, which belongs to Waialae Aina Corporation. Parcel 29, Tax May Key 3-3-03, is already owned by the City. The Traffic Department's recommendation is to provide for a 150-foot radius at the northeast corner of Palolo and 5th Avenues, and a 25-foot radius at the southeast corner of Waialae and 5th Avenues.

Replying to various questions from the Commissioners, the Director stated that a development plan is presently not available but very likely there will be access to MacDonald's on Waialae Avenue and on the proposed radius of Palolo Avenue. Condemnation proceedings will be necessary to acquire that portion of the radius which is owned by the Waialae Aina Corporation.

Mr. Jacob Pyo, staff planner, who assisted the Director, indicated that the ingress and egress points to the subject property are dependent upon the traffic situation. The Traffic Department, in making that determination, must consider whether or not a traffic hazard might be created at this intersection.

Deputy Corporation Counsel Jeremiah informed the Commission that the City and County Parks Department and Waialae Aina Corporation, owners of MacDonald's Drive-In, are presently working with him on an agreement to beautify the adjacent park and bus stop area and to permit an egress point for the benefit of MacDonald patrons. In this connection, there may be some objection from these two parties.

Mr. Delos Seeley, representing the City and County Parks Department, stated that he is presently consulting with the Waialae Aina Corporation on possible environmental planning of their respective properties and requested additional time to study the matter.

There were no further questions from the Commission and no one spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

In later discussion, Mr. Edward Y. C. Chun, Counsel for Maurice J. Sullivan, Lessees of the property owned in fee by the Waialae Aina Corporation; and Mr. B. N. Jow, President of the Waialae Aina Corporation were present. Mr. Chun apologized for his lateness because he was misinformed on the time of the public hearing. Speaking in opposition to the proposal,

he expressed concern over the adjacent park area which is used by their patrons and which will be condemned if the proposal is approved.

Questioned by the Commission, Mr. Seeley stated that he was not in a position to advise the Commission on the development of the 3,000 sq. ft. park area, about its value, loss or potential use, but he requested additional time in which to present the Parks Department's recommendation in connection with the adjoining MacDonald operation.

In view of the above circumstances, the Chairman suggested that the public hearing be kept open and that the staff conduct further studies with both the Parks and the Traffic Departments to determine the eventual use and development plans of the subject park area. The Traffic Department is also to apprise the Commission of the anticipated locations of the accesses affecting the MacDonald's Drive-In as well as traffic movement in the surrounding area.

ACTION: The Commission voted to reopen the public hearing and to continue it at the next meeting. The motion was made by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun and carried.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN DETAILED
LAND USE MAP
(AMENDMENT)
KAIMUKI-KAPAHULU
DELETION OF 15TH
AVE. BET. HARDING
AVE. AND THE FREEWAY

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515 of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan of Kaimuki-Kapahulu by deleting a portion of 15th Avenue between Harding Avenue and the Freeway.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of February 9, 1969, was read by the Director.

Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to different community organizations, to Mr. George K. H. Lee who is involved in this transaction, and to Mr. Herbert McInerny, an adjoining property owner.

The Director pointed out the location of the subject area which is a deadend road between Harding Avenue and the Interstate Highway. Accesses for the abutting lots are provided on Harding Avenue thus eliminating the need for the proposed deletion. He recommended approval of the proposed deletion subject to the following condition:

"Upon deletion of this roadway and after the City abandons this roadway, subject to an easement in favor of the City for the 6-inch water main and the retention of the 3-foot

setback along Harding, the owners will submit a subdivision plan to the Planning Department. The subdivision will constitute partitioning of the roadway, excluding the 3-foot setback along Harding Avenue along the entire length of the original residential properties and its consolidation with the adjacent lots.

"The consolidation map will reflect an easement in favor of the City and County of Honolulu for utility purposes."

Replying to various questions of Commissioner Chun, Mr. Jacob Pyo, staff member, stated that the street is presently owned by the City. If the proposed amendment is approved and the City relinquishes its title to the street, conveyance of that land to the adjoining property owners will be determined by the City Council.

There were no further questions, and no person spoke in opposition to this proposal.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposal to delete a portion of 15th Avenue between Harding Avenue and the Freeway.

PUBLIC HEARING
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT-HOUSING
MCCULLY
OFF KAPIOLANI BLVD.
REED & MARTIN INVESTMENT CORP.

A public hearing, continued from January 9, 23, and February 6, 1969, was held to consider a proposal to initiate a planned development project for land situated off Kapiolani Boulevard at McCully. The hearing had been kept open for further study by the Traffic Department.

The Director reported that the staff did conduct further studies with the Traffic Department concerning the feasibility of a roadway at the applicant's rear property line and the installation of traffic lights at the Kapiolani-University Avenue intersection.

He submitted the staff's report covering proposed developments on seven parcels of land fronting on Kapiolani Boulevard, and the traffic situation.

The Director recommended approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. Traffic movement shall be restricted to right turns in and out of Kapiolani Boulevard from the subject site.

2. The developer shall pay for the cost of constructing a two-lane roadway measuring not more than 28 feet wide from University Avenue to the Ewa boundary of the subject site, a distance of approximately 750 feet.

3. The developer shall pay for the replacement of park facilities which have been removed by the construction of the two-lane roadway.

4. Off-street parking for commercial uses shall conform to Section 21-246(i) of the Comprehensive Zoning Code.

5. Signs and conduct of operations shall conform to the requirements as indicated under Section 21-246(k) and (m) of the Comprehensive Zoning Code.

In the ensuing discussion, Commissioner Yamabe saw no traffic relief resulting from the proposed roadway since adjoining properties already have direct access to Kapiolani Boulevard. He contended that traffic with a Honolulu destination from the proposed site could exit onto Kapiolani Boulevard by making a right turn, then cross over two lanes of traffic since morning Kokohead-bound traffic is relatively light, effect left turns into Hausten Street or University Avenue, and head towards town. He felt that there should be better justification for this roadway which actually benefits only a few at the expense of eliminating desirable park land.

Assuming that through some legal technicality the City is prevented from taking park land to develop the back road, the Commission asked whether the Director had considered other alternatives beside right turns only for dispersing traffic from the project site.

The Director's reply was that he had considered and exhausted all reasonable alternatives and, at this point, he had no other alternatives to recommend. He further stated that the entire length of the proposed road is about 1,100 feet. The developer will be required to construct, at his expense, that portion of the road extending from his property boundary to University Avenue Extension or about 750 feet. The other property owners are not expected to participate in this construction but might be required to share the cost of construction for the remaining portion.

Mr. Clifford Nohara from the Traffic Department stated that their study was based on the assumption that majority of the people who will be residing

in the proposed development are employed in the town area, and, therefore, the bulk of the traffic movement will be in the westerly direction.

The proposed roadway in the back will help to disperse traffic at three points: One would be directly off Kapiolani Boulevard; the second, through the proposed roadway and onto University Avenue Extension then left turn onto Kapiolani Boulevard or straight ahead to King Street or the Freeway; and the third, through the proposed roadway headed in the town direction, right turn onto Kapiolani Boulevard near Paani Street then execute left turn movements onto other side streets to head towards town.

Without the roadway in the back, all traffic would be concentrated at the Kapiolani Boulevard entrance of the property causing a tremendous traffic congestion especially during peak traffic periods.

With the signalized Kapiolani-University Avenue intersection, motorists using the back road can execute left turn movements onto Kapiolani Boulevard and thus minimize much of the right-turn traffic from the property which must then weave across several lanes to get to the left lane to turn left at University Avenue. They are not planning to create any more major intersections at this section of Kapiolani Boulevard.

Mr. Yamabe concluded that the only advantage of the back road was the left turns that can be made directly off University Avenue onto Kapiolani Boulevard. By dispersing traffic at three exit points, he did not believe that the traffic problem would be minimized because the volume would still be there and the congestion on Kapiolani Boulevard and at the intersection of University Avenue would still exist.

Acknowledging the fact that there is talk of a bridge across the Ala Wai Canal by extending University Avenue into the Waikiki area and a proposed freeway on the mauka side of the Canal, thus increasing traffic on University Avenue, the Commission questioned the usefulness of the back road to carry traffic away from the area.

Since no traffic flow projections were made under the two proposals, Mr. Nohara could not say how the back road would be affected. However, he believed that the situation would be similar to the condition now existing on McCully Street.

Mr. Delos Seeley, from the Parks Department, could not state the Department's official position on the road proposal although they were consulted. They were hopeful that a solution could have been found without taking of park land but they would be inclined to relinquish it if the road proved beneficial to all concerned. Because the roadway will infringe upon park property, a fence will have to be constructed to safeguard children against traffic flow in the area.

Mr. Walter Chuck, Attorney for the developers, and Mr. Frank Haines, Architect, were present.

Mr. Haines stated that Mr. Martin, the developer, purchased the property fully aware that the park would be included in the development and that they designed the area to include the park. Additions of the roadway, fence, street lighting, and curb parking would destroy part of the development concept to the point where he would advise his client to withdraw his application and proceed with 93% of their construction under existing A-4 regulations of the CZC realizing a minimal 7% loss amounting to approximately 30 apartments and without the roadway.

Mr. Chuck agreed with comments made by Commissioners Yamabe and Sharpless that the roadway is no solution to the traffic problem. He emphasized that its relief of the traffic problem would be, at best, of a temporary nature considering the fact that an arterial is proposed on the mauka side of Ala Wai Canal as well as an overpass on the University Avenue Extension over the canal leading to the Waikiki area. He felt it unfair to require the developer solely to pay for the road construction and to fence the boundary since the road's usage to them is limited only to that portion needed for access to the site while adjoining property owners benefit by its entire availability. He pointed out that a planned unit development must be definite in all respects to qualify for adequate financing. Additional time needed to obtain clearances from the Governor's office to take park land for construction of the roadway, and from other State and City agencies involved who have not yet been apprised of this issue would delay their project and jeopardize their financial position over a road which might never materialize. He disagreed with the Director's recommendations and asked that the Commission approve their proposal of right turns in and out of the site area with the condition that should the road be constructed, the developer assume only his fair share of the costs.

Commissioner Rutledge stated that recommendations of the Director are not binding and do not compel the developer to construct; however, in the interest of time, it might be well for them to do it. Considering the fact that various governmental agencies are involved and must consent to its construction and that there is the possibility of disagreement among them, the road may not become an actuality eliminating their obligation to construct.

Mr. Chuck contended that although this might be true, it consumes considerable time. He stated that since communication between government agencies is relatively faster than between individuals outside of government service, the Director who can justify this issue should contact the related agencies.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

In later discussion, the Commission recapitulated the several points brought out at the hearing. Regarding traffic, it noted that the volume of traffic on Kapiolani Boulevard will not be lessened noticeably should the developer proceed with his development based on the existing A-4 Apartment zoning regulations. Under the planned unit development concept, he can have about 1,100 apartment units while under the A-4 Apartment regulations, the decrease in units would be only 30. He is still permitted some accessory commercial uses. The back road will not alleviate the traffic problem because traffic will still enter Kapiolani Boulevard whether it is from one entrance or from several entrances.

The Commission felt that the concept of a planned unit development was good because it permitted more areas, flexibility of development, and the attachment of conditions which, under the existing zoning, cannot be placed with the granting of approval. Knowingly, the developer has subjected himself to the restrictions and conditions of the planned development ordinance to proceed with his project. The proposed roadway will separate the development from the park and defeat the objective to create vast open areas. The proposed plan also introduces certain features of architectural and planning normally not found in a conventional apartment development. This development is deserving of consideration as an example for future planned unit developments.

Knowing the lag in the road construction program to keep up with demand, the Commission was hopeful that the road systems can be completed so

that much of the traffic can be kept off Kapiolani Boulevard and diverted to other major highways.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Director's proposal to zone the subject property to Planned Development-Housing District, with the modification that Conditions 2 and 3 be deleted from the Ordinance creating this District.

STREET NAMES
WAHIAWA - OFF
CALIFORNIA AVENUE
BILL AGENA
SUBDIVISION

The Commission, on motion of Mr. Rutledge and seconded of Mr. Chun, recommended approval of the following street names:

a) Roadway within the Bill Agena Subdivision, Wahiawa - off California Avenue

EKOLU PLACE - Deadend roadway off 1881 California Avenue and being between Kalie Street and Leilehua Road.

Meaning: The number, three

STREET NAMES
MAUNALUA
HAHAI KAI MARINA
UNIT 5

b) Roadways within the Hahai Kai Marina Unit 5, at Maunalua, Oahu, Hawaii

AINAHOU STREET - Roadway off Hawaii-Kai Drive in a makai direction between Hapuna Place and the proposed aligned State Freeway.

Meaning: Name of a large crab

STREET NAMES
KAILUA
KAILUA HEIGHTS
SUBDIVISION
UNIT 5-B

c) Roadways within the Kaulua Heights Subdivision Unit 5-B, at Kailua, Oahu, Hawaii

NANIALII STREET - Extension of an existing roadway to its terminus between Mapuana Street and Onioni Street.

ONIONI STREET - Extension of an existing roadway parallel to Kina Street.

KINA STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a mauka direction.

AUWAIKU STREET - Extension of an existing roadway to terminate in a deadend parallel to Kina Street.

MAPUANA STREET		- Extension of an existing roadway to terminate at its intersection with Kina Street.
NONINUI PLACE	(A)	- Deadend roadway off Kina Street between Mapuana Street and Hele Street.
Meaning:		Soft, pinkish porous stone, as used in polishing
ONAONA PLACE	(B)	- Deadend roadway off Kina Street between Mapuana Street and Hele Street.
Meaning:		Softly fragrant
KALULI STREET	(C)	- Roadway off Kina Street between Kina Street and Auwaiku Street.
Meaning:		To sway, bend

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN DETAILED
LAND USE MAP
(AMENDMENT)
WAHIAWA
WITHIN THE GRANDVIEW
TRACT SUBDIVISION

The public hearing held on December 12, 1968 to consider a proposal to amend the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Wahiawa by changing the land use designation from Residential use to Public Facilities use (Sewage Pump Station), for a parcel of land situated within the Grandview Tract Subdivision, identified by Tax Map Key 7-5-25: 98, was kept open for review and discussion by the staff with property owners in the area.

Proceeding with the hearing, the Director acknowledged receipt of a letter dated February 19, 1969, signed by Mr. Herbert M. Segawa, President of the Wahiawa Community and Businessmen's Association. The Association stated that: "The residents immediately affected agreed to the proposed site on condition that: a. odor be minimized; b. sound be kept to the minimum; c. the structure be as unobtrusive as possible with proper landscaping. The Wahiawa Community and Businessmen's Association would like to see all measures be taken on all three conditions. Mr. Lau agreed to take every precaution and measure to minimize odor. If conditions are met the WCBA have no objections for the proposed site."

Mr. Jacob Pyo who met with affected property owners reiterated their three basic objections. As a remedial measure, it was suggested that a low-type facility be constructed, possibly 8'10" in height with a floor area of 10' x 10', properly landscaped, and with security service provided since it will be a public facility.

There was no further discussion and no other person appeared to speak either for or against the proposal.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposed amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Wahiawa.

PERSONNEL
ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Chun, unanimously elected Mr. Edward Brennan as Chairman of the Planning Commission until the end of this fiscal year. Mr. Philip Chun was elected Vice-Chairman upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Henrietta B. Lyman

Henrietta B. Lyman
Secretary-Reporter II

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
March 6, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, March 6, 1969, at 1:53 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Edward Brennan presiding:

PRESENT:

Edward Brennan, Chairman
Philip T. Chun
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Arthur A. Rutledge
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio
James K. Sakai, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Albert Jeremiah, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT: None

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DLUM & DP (AMENDMENT)
ST. LOUIS HEIGHTS-PALOLO
EXTENSION OF FIFTH AVENUE

A public hearing, continued from February 20, 1969, was held to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan of St. Louis Heights-Palolo by extending 5th Avenue in the mauka direction beyond Waialae Avenue to meet Palolo Avenue.

The hearing was kept open for receipt of comments from the Parks Department.

The Director reported that the Traffic Department by letter dated March 5, 1969, has withdrawn its initial request to extend 5th Avenue. Mr. Clifford Y. Nohara, Acting Traffic Engineer, reported his discovery that the developer of the property identified as Tax Map Key 3-3-03: 28 has been negotiating with the Department of Parks and Recreation to improve the contiguous City property identified as Tax Map Key 3-3-03: 29 into an esthetic park, to blend with the proposed MacDonald structure. Moreover, the developer has offered to donate the improvement of the above City property.

From the standpoint of traffic, the Traffic Department finds the extension of 5th Avenue very desirable, but in view of the recent and concurrent developments, and in the best interest of the public, the Department is withdrawing its request for the proposal.

The Director concurred that the proposed extension not be made at this time.

The Commission asked for further explanation for the withdrawal, but because representatives from both the Traffic and the Parks Departments whose interests were affected by this proposal were not present as requested by the Commission, the question remained unanswered.

Mr. Edward Y. C. Chun, Attorney for Maurice J. Sullivan lessee of the subject property doing business as MacDonald's Drive-In and who is involved

in the transaction between the Traffic and the Parks Departments, offered to explain the issue. However, the Chairman felt that, as a matter of courtesy to the Commission, a direct representation should be made by members of the Traffic and the Parks Departments.

The Chairman directed the Planning Director to inform both departments that in future meetings where any matters concerning them are before the Commission, they have a personal representative on hand prepared to discuss the matter with the Commission.

The public hearing was kept open for representation from the Traffic and the Parks Departments.

In discussing this matter later, the Director stated his concurrence with the recommendation of the Traffic Department that the proposed extension not be made at this time.

The Chairman suggested to the Director that he, together with the Traffic Department, give serious consideration to evaluating the traffic situation at this intersection of Palolo and Waialae Avenues with the thought toward alleviating any serious traffic problems from occurring at this intersection.

ACTION: Mr. Yamabe moved to close the public hearing and to accept the withdrawal of the proposed amendment to the General Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, authorized the calling of public hearings on March 20, 1969, to consider the following proposals initiated by the Planning Director:

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT KALAUAO, EWA OFF STREET PARKING MIYASATO FAMILY BY: OKUMURA AND TAKUSHI, ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW	(1) Conditional Use Permit to use a portion of a parcel of land as an off-street parking site in conjunction with an adjacent proposed business building on 16,526 square feet of land, located off Kamehameha Highway in Kalauao, Ewa.
GENERAL PLAN (AMENDMENT) KALIHI-UKA DELETION OF KILOHI STREET EXTENSION	(2) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu by the deletion of the proposed extension of Kilohi Street, mauka of Kam IV Road, in Kalihi-Uka.
STREET NAMES KAMANANUI, WAIALUA, SUBDIVISION	The Commission, on motion of Mr. Rutledge and second of Mr. Yamabe, recommended approval of the following street name for a roadway within a Subdivision at Kamananui, Waialua:

KAIMANU PLACE - Deadend roadway off Waialua Beach Road between Kahaone Loop and Apuhihi Street.
Meaning: Bird (of the) sea.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT TO THE C.I.P. FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968-1969 (SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 4)

The City Council had referred to the Planning Commission for its review and comments, Bill No. 10 (Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 4), an Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 3188, as amended, relating to Capital Improvement Programs of the City and County of Honolulu for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969.

Mr. Jacob Pyo, staff member, reviewed with the Commission, the staff's report explaining the amendment to provide for an appropriation of $30,000 for architectural and engineering work on a 600-seat Youth Theatre to be located on the grounds of Foster Gardens next to Nuuanu Stream. This amount will supplement the $70,000 appropriated by the State for planning and engineering work.

This project is listed under the Department of Parks and Recreation's CIP request for Fiscal Years 1970-1975 as "Youth Theater - Nuuanu" at a total estimated cost of $1,335,000 which will require City funds of $885,000.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission voted to recommend approval of Bill No. 10 (Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 4).

MISCELLANEOUS
ASPO 1969 NATIONAL PLANNING CONFERENCE

The Director reported that the ASPO 1969 National Planning Conference will be held in Cincinnati from April 20 to 24, 1969. Commissioners interested in attending should submit their names to the department as soon as possible so that arrangements with the administration may be made for their attendance.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henrietta B. Lyman

Henrietta B. Lyman
Secretary-Reporter II

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
March 20, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, March 20, 1969, at 2:10 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Edward Brennan presiding:

PRESENT:

Edward Brennan
Philip T. Chun
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Arthur A. Rutledge
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio
James K. Sakai, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Albert Jeremiah, Deputy Corporation Counsel

MINUTES:

The minutes of the meeting of December 12 and 26, 1968, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

PUBLIC HEARING GENERAL PLAN (AMENDMENT) KALIHI-UKA DELETION OF KILOHI STREET EXTENSION NEAR KAM IV ROAD

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend the Master Plan of Kalihi-uka, Section 8 (1943) and a portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu, by deleting the proposed Kilohi Street extension for that portion mauka of the present terminus, situated at Kalihi-uka, Honolulu, Hawaii, and more particularly affecting those lands identified by Tax Map Key 1-3-30: Parcels 3 and 7.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of March 9, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicants, to the applicable governmental agencies, and to different community organizations. No written protests have been received to date.

The Director pointed out the location of the project area. He submitted a staff's report in this connection and stated that the deletion will permit the construction of a convalescent hospital by the Campbell Estate. Briefly, the background indicates that there was a request made to the previous planning director for construction on this property and at that time indications were that it would be appropriate for this construction with a further recommendation that Kilohi Street extension could be deleted from the General Plan at the appropriate time. The reasons given were that there was a need to consolidate the involved lots and that the proposal was in accordance with the general concept for development of land use in the area.

The recommendation is to make the deletion and provide for an appropriate turnaround at the end of Kilohi Street by utilizing a part of the 20-foot setback area. This will avoid the necessity to alter the proposed building plan of the hospital.

To the Chairman's call for testimony, Mr. Oswald Stender, a representative of the Campbell Estate owners of the subject property, stated that the hospital is a needed facility in the vicinity and it will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood. He stated that the various conditions set by the Planning Department have been complied with. These involve (a) the consolidation of the lots; (b) clearance from the State Department of Transportation for the driveway construction; and (c) compliance with the sign regulations for the proposed sign. He asked that the Commission act favorably upon this application inasmuch as considerable time and effort have gone into its preparation.

There was no further discussion, and no other person appeared to speak either in favor of or in opposition to this proposal.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposed amendment to the General Plan.

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
KALAUAO, EWA
MAUKA OF KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY, APPROXIMATELY 150 FEET EASTERLY FROM KIHALE STREET (OFF-STREET PARKING USE)
MIYASATO FAMILY
BY: OKUMURA AND TAKUSHI, ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

A public hearing was scheduled to consider an application for a Conditional Use Permit to allow off-street parking use in conjunction with an adjoining Business District fronting Kamehameha Highway, for a 16,526 square feet parcel of land situated 80 feet mauka of Kamehameha Highway, approximately 150 feet easterly from Kihale Street in Kalauao, Ewa, and identified as Tax Map Key 9-8-25: portion of Parcel 11.

Due to an error in the publication notice which identified the subject area as "Parcel 11" instead of "Parcel 1", the Director stated that the hearing notice must be republished in conformance with the City Charter.

Mr. Suyeki Okumura, attorney for the applicant, felt that the hearing should be held because the misprint was a minor error.

Deputy Corporation Counsel Jeremiah advised the Commission that in accordance with the City Charter, the public hearing notice must be republished and a new hearing held.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Chun and carried, the Commission directed that the public hearing notice be republished and the hearing rescheduled for April 3, 1969.

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION
WAIPAHU-OFF WAIAWA ROAD
BISHOP ESTATE
(URBAN USE)

The State Land Use Commission had referred to the Planning Commission for its comments and recommendation, a petition submitted by the Bishop Estate for an amendment to the Land Use Commission District Boundary by changing the district classification from Agricultural to Urban for land situated off Waiawa Road in Waipahu and identified by Tax Map Key 9-6-03: 39 and 40.

The Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the subject parcel designated on the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map as agriculture. Land uses in the vicinity include military, watercress farms, and the community college. Utilities are available to the site with the exception of sewers. According to the Department of Health, the use of cesspools for new dwelling units would pose a definite contamination danger to the fresh water springs used for watercress farming. Therefore, it stressed that no cesspools or disposal of sewage into the ground be permitted for any proposed development. Since the subject property is contiguous to urban development and is adjacent to the Leeward Community College, the Director recommended approval of the boundary change. Regarding sewage disposal, he indicated that the City plans to extend the sewer line to service the College; therefore, the applicant can connect to that line.

In the discussion that followed, Mr. Sharpless felt that a soil study should be made of the parcel inasmuch as there are artesian wells in the vicinity and the land is somewhat spongy.

Commissioner Yamabe recalled that negotiations were in progress with the Bishop Estate to permit the farmers to continue their watercress farming in the lower area and to construct their homes on higher ground. He questioned the outcome of that issue.

The Commission was not ready to make a decision today. Since the time element for reporting to the Land Use Commission will expire before the next meeting, the Director was instructed to request for an extension of time from the Land Use Commission. In the meantime, the staff is to obtain information on the soil condition of the area and to contact Bishop Estate for answers to questions raised by Mr. Yamabe.

<u>ACTION</u>: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission deferred action for further information from the staff.

The Commission, upon the motion by Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, authorized the Planning Director to schedule the public hearing dates to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director:

GENERAL PLAN DLUM AMENDMENT MAPUNAPUNA-FT. SHAFTER DELETING PORTION OF KILIHAU & KAKOI STREET EXTENSIONS

(1) A proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and Development Plan of Mapunapuna-Ft. Shafter by deleting a portion of Kilihau and Kakoi Street Extensions.

CONDITIONAL
USE PERMIT
MAUNALUA
LUNA KAI MARINA 8
PRIVATE RECREATIONAL
CENTER
ROBERT H. GRANT & CO.

(2) An application for a Conditional Use Permit to construct and maintain a private recreational center including swimming pool, wading pool, recreation pavilion, parking area, boat launching ramp and boat storage area within Luna Kai Marina 8 development in Maunalua.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henrietta B. Lyman

Henrietta B. Lyman
Secretary-Reporter II

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
April 3, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, April 3, 1969, at 1:50 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Edward Brennan presiding:

PRESENT:

Edward Brennan, Chairman
Philip T. Chun
Arthur A. Rutledge
Thomas N. Yamabe II
James K. Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
George S. Moriguchi, Deputy Planning Director
Albert Jeremiah, Deputy Corporation Counsel

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT
KALAUAO, EWA
MAUKA OF KAMEHAMEHA
HIGHWAY, APPROXIMATELY
150 FEET EASTERLY
FROM KIHALE STREET
(OFF-STREET
PARKING USE)
MIYASATO FAMILY
BY: OKUMURA AND
TAKUSHI, ATTORNEYS-
AT-LAW

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515 of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider an application for a Conditional Use Permit to allow off-street parking use in conjunction with an adjoining Business District fronting Kamehameha Highway, for a 16,526 square foot parcel of land situated 80 feet mauka of Kamehameha Highway, approximately 150 feet easterly from Kihale Street in Kalauao, Ewa, and identified as Tax Map Key 9-8-25: portion of Parcel 1.

In compliance with the Charter provisions, the public hearing notice was published in a daily newspaper of general circulation in the city. Copies of the hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of March 23, 1969, were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, Aiea Community Association, and to nine adjoining property owners. No written comments or protests have been received to date.

The public hearing originally scheduled on March 20, 1969, had to be rescheduled because of an error in the publication notice.

The Deputy Director explained the proposal by reporting that the subject property contains a total area of 105,981 square feet. The portion fronting Kamehameha Highway containing 9,693 square feet is zoned B-2 Business District while the remaining back portion containing 96,288 square feet is zoned R-6 Residential District of which 16,526 square feet are to be used for off-street parking purpose in conjunction with a proposed business building.

The parking requirement for the business use is one space per 300 square feet of floor area depending on the type of operation. If clientele parking is to be provided, the requirement is one space per 100 square feet of floor area.

Mr. Suyeki Okumura of Okumura and Takushi, attorneys representing the applicants, stated that the area proposed for off-street parking use was recommended by the Planning Department. His clients are presently utilizing the remainder of the property for residential use, and may subsequently apply for a subdivision development; however, this would be dependent on the rental to be generated. They are aware of the conditions to be imposed by the Commission.

No one spoke in opposition to this application. The public hearing was closed and the matter was taken under advisement, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun.

In later discussion, the Director presented the following reasons for recommending the allocation of 16,526 square feet for off-street parking:

1) The distance from the farthest parking space to the main entrance of the business building is 175 feet. The CZC requires that when a parcel is located outside of the business zone, off-street parking uses must be within 200 feet from the farthest parking space to the main entrance of the commercial establishment.

2) The boundary would be squared off by becoming a rectangular shaped lot. This lends itself to a better subdivision development for the remaining portion of the lot.

3) Some allowance was given to provide for additional parking if required. This is based on one space per 300 square feet of commercial floor area.

The Commission expressed concern that granting of this Conditional Use Permit may set a precedent for granting similar requests.

The Director explained that due to the shallow depth of the Business District, the conditional use method to permit the use of the rear portion of the lot for off-street parking for a business development is preferred than to zone that area as business. This method can also be applied to adjoining commercial zoned lots which have the business zone cutting through the property.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Chun, recommended approval to grant the Conditional Use Permit with the imposition of conditions to allow the use of 16,526 square feet of a parcel of land situated 80 feet mauka of Kamehameha Highway, approximately 150 feet easterly from Kihale Street in Kalauao, Ewa, as an off-street parking area.

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT —
MAUNALUA
LUNA-KAI MARINA 8
LUNALILO HOME ROAD
AND HAWAII-KAI DRIVE
(PRIVATE RECREATIONAL
CENTER)
ROBERT H. GRANT & CO.
BY: HONG AND IWAI,
ATTORNEYS

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515 of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider an application for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a private recreational center in conjunction with the "Mariner's Cove" development which consist of Luna-Kai Marina Units #8 and #9, situated at Lunalilo Home Road and Hawaii-Kai Drive in Hawaii Kai and identified by Tax Map Keys 3-9-05, 08, 14, and 20, within an R-4 Residential District.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of March 23, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant and to the applicable governmental agencies. No written comments or protests have been received.

The staff's report explaining the proposed development and recommendation for approval with the attachment of several conditions and an addendum containing additional findings of fact were distributed to the Commission.

The Director reported on the proposal as follows:

1. The proposed recreational center will cover an area of 1.620 acres and is to be an integral part of the development known as "Mariner's Cove".

2. As shown on the plan submitted, the center will consist of a swimming pool, wading pool, recreation pavilion, parking area, boat launching ramp, and boat storage area.

3. Asphaltic concrete parking area is provided to accommodate 34 cars and storage area for 27 boats.

4. The Detailed Land Use Map for Hawaii-Kai designates the area for Residential use and zoned R-4 Residential District. The parcel is unused vacant land.

5. Water and sewer facilities are adequate. The Department of Public Works requested the review of the construction plans upon approval of the Conditional Use Permit.

6. The primary access is through Lunalilo Home Road which has an 80-foot right-of-way, and Hawaii-Kai Drive which has a 60-foot right-of-way.

7. The center will be privately owned by all of the lessees within Luna-Kai Marina Units #8, #9-A, and #9-B, and the responsibility and maintenance thereof will rest in a nonprofit corporation to be known as Mariner's Cove Association.

The proposed recreational center including the launching ramp and recreation pavilion is an appropriate use for the area, and the Director recommended approval with the imposition of the following conditions:

1. The proposed recreation pavilion shall comply with Section 21-503 Height Regulations under Residential District of the Comprehensive Zoning Code.

2. The proposed launching ramp, recreation pavilion, and parking areas for boat storage shall not be used between the hours of 9 p.m. and 7 a.m.

3. The area for boat storage shall be enclosed by solid masonry wall at least 6 feet in height along Lunalilo Home Road and Hawaii-Kai Drive.

4. The automobile parking area shall be enclosed by a solid wall at least 4 feet in height or equivalent vegetative screening along Lunalilo Home Road.

5. The recreation center site shall be adequately buffered from adjoining residential lots with at least 6 feet high solid wall or vegetative screening.

6. The swimming and wading pools shall be adequately fenced for protective purposes.

7. The recreational center including the swimming pool, wading pool, recreation pavilion, parking area, boat launching ramp, and boat storage area shall be kept in a good state of repair and maintenance.

8. The development shall conform substantially as shown on the General Plot Plan with 34 off-street parking spaces and 27 boat storage spaces.

9. The recreational center shall be for the use and enjoyment of lessees and friends of Luna-Kai Marina Units #8, #9-A, and #9-B and shall not be used for commercial purposes.

10. The Department of Public Works shall review the construction plan.

11. Upon finding that any of the conditions imposed are not being complied with, the City Council may authorize the Planning Director or the Planning Commission to revoke the permit or to suspend such operation until compliance with said conditions is obtained.

Additional findings indicate that:

1. Mariner's Cove consists of Luna-Kai Marina, Units #8, #9-A, #9-B and #9-C. There are 113 residential lots in Unit #8, and 297 residential lots in Units #9-A, #9-B and #9-C. In all there will be 410 residential lots.

2. Bishop Estate's lease to Robert H. Grant and Company will be assigned to the Mariner's Cove Association, a nonprofit corporation. Membership in the Association will be limited to and compulsory for all owners and lessees of the Mariner's Cove subdivision. Ownership and maintenance responsibility of the recreational center are placed upon the Association under the By-Laws. Maintenance funds are to be raised by the membership. Dues are assessed upon the members. The duration of the Association is perpetual.

3. The recreation building will have toilet, kitchen, and storage facilities. There will also be a small building alongside the pavilion to serve as storage for swimming pool equipment. There will be no shower or dressing rooms.

In reply to questions from the Commission, the Director stated that the number of off-street parking facilities provided should be adequate since the Center is located within walking distance of the subdivision development and and overflow of parking along the roadway is not anticipated.

In addition to the conditions to be imposed on the developer, he stated that the additional findings of fact should also be included as part of the conditions. A copy of the Association's By-Laws has not been submitted to the Planning Department and this should also be made a part of the conditions.

Testimony was received from the public.

Mr. Herbert Tom, representing the applicant Robert H. Grant and Co., and Mr. Tom Lacaille, project engineer, were present.

Mr. Tom stated that the farthest distance of a residential unit from the recreational center will be about half a mile.

Questioned by the Commission, Mr. Tom and Mr. Lacaille gave the following information:

1. Kitchen facilities for the use of the members and their guests will be provided. No commercial enterprise is proposed.

2. About 25 percent of the homes fronting on the Marina will have their own moorings and floating docks. The required number of parking spaces and boat stalls was determined by the number of homes which do not front on the Marina and also on the land area available to accommodate the cars and boats.

3. Regarding the boat storage area, the Association could establish some procedure for accommodating the trailers that are used to transport the boats to the launching area. However, he did not believe that the storage area can accommodate both vehicles and boats. The storage stalls are 12 feet wide and 25 feet long.

4. There will be boat launching ramps for those who do not have a docking area. There is a 100-foot mooring dock where ten boats can be accommodated on each side for a total of 20 boats. The Association will establish some rules for giving the residents a fair use of the mooring dock.

5. Upon purchase of the units, all owners and lessees within the Mariner's Cove Subdivision will automatically become a member of the Association. The By-Laws have been prepared. There is no restriction as to the number of guests a member is allowed.

In response to Mr. Tom's request that vegetation be allowed as a substitute for a solid wall around the boat storage area, the Director stated that the purpose of the solid wall is not only for esthetic reason but for protection of the stored boats.

When informed by the Director that a copy of the Association's By-Laws has not been received, the Commission stated that a copy should be received for incorporation with the granting of the Conditional Use Permit. Since the Commission has questions that require some answers, it advised the applicants to submit a copy of the By-Laws. Any later changes in the By-Laws will be a violation of the Conditional Use Permit; therefore, a thorough review must be made before accepting it.

No one spoke in opposition to this application.

The public hearing was closed and the matter taken under advisement, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Rutledge.

In later discussion, the Commission stated that it required further information relating to metes and bounds description of the area, the adequacy of the parking facilities to accommodate the boats, trailers and cars, and other questions relating to the actual operation of the recreational center.

The Commission asked the Director to conduct a study to determine whether or not the facilities at the Center can adequately service the number of people they are intended to serve. With plans for 410 units involving about 1,600 residents plus their guests, the Commission believed that the Center is too small to adequately accommodate them. They did not believe that the residents should be inconvenienced by an over-crowded condition.

The Director stated that there is a standard for determining capacity through the size of the pool and the deck area immediately around it. Regarding the boat storage area, he believed that the dimension of the stalls should be 12 feet x 40 feet. He will make a further check to verify this.

<u>ACTION</u>: The Commission deferred action on this application upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Rutledge.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP AND DEVELOPMENT
PLAN FOR MAPUNAPUNA-
FORT SHAFTER
(AMENDMENT)
DELETION OF KILIHAU
STREET EXTENSION AND
KAKOI STREET EXTENSION
INTO MOKUMOA STREET
STATE DEPARTMENT OF
LAND AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and Development Plan for Mapunapuna-Fort Shafter, Planning Area No. 4, by deleting (1) the extension of Kilihau Street across the Moanalua Drainage Canal, and (2) the extension of Kakoi Street into Mokumoa Street, and identified by Tax Map Key 1-1-06: Parcel 11.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of March 23, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant and to applicable governmental agencies. No written comments or protests have been received to date.

The staff's report explaining the proposals was submitted to the Commission.

In reply to an inquiry whether the deletion of the streets would pose a hardship to other property owners in the vicinity, the Director reported that the land is owned by the State. The land will be subdivided and used by the various State departments. Due to the realignment of the H-1 Freeway, the extension of Kilihau Street as a frontage road system has been unnecessary.

Mr. Bob Chuck, Chief Engineer for the Department of Land and Natural Resources, explained that this land was returned to the State several years ago. During that period, the area had been developed, the roads constructed, and the parcels leased to various owners, not foreseeing the extension of the H-1 Freeway. Instead of the two road extensions, they propose to construct a cul-de-sac at the end of Kilihau Street to provide access to the subdivided lots.

As far as the internal road system is concerned, they do not intend to further subdivide these parcels. The State will maintain the roads. The plans for the warehouses and other buildings have progressed to the stage where they are being advertised for bids. Fences will separate the different lots.

The Director noted that presently there is one access to Kamehameha Highway from this industrial area. This access will be terminated when the Highway is widened.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposal.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposed amendments to the GP DLUM and DP for Mapunapuna-Fort Shafter Planning Area No. 4.

LAND USE
COMMISSION
PETITION
WAIPAHU
OFF WAIAWA ROAD
URBAN DISTRICT
(BISHOP ESTATE)

The Commission again reviewed a petition submitted by the Bishop Estate for an amendment to the Land Use Commission District boundary by changing the district classification from Agricultural to Urban for 6.2 acres of land situated off Waiawa Road in Waipahu, and identified by Tax Map Key 9-6-03: Parcels 39 and 40. The Commission had deferred action for further information about the soil conditions and whether there were any plans by Bishop Estate to use the area for housing for the watercress farmers.

The Director reported that the Land Study Bureau records show that the site had been used as a borrow pit by the military and Oahu Sugar Company, and much of the top soil had been removed. Only a portion of the site along Waiawa Road is shown as suitable for Agricultural use and the remainder of the site is shown as a quarry with topography in excess of 30 percent gradient.

A representative from the Bishop Estate's Land Department indicated that the subject parcel was not given serious consideration for housing for the farmers in the vicinity, since the farmers objected to building their homes outside their farm lots; however, the farmers will be permitted to construct their homes on their own parcels. The land makai of the subject site is Bishop Estate's agricultural subdivision.

The site will be isolated from other agricultural uses on all four sides by the H-1 Freeway, Leeward Community College, and house lots on two sides.

Mr. George Houghtailing, planning consultant and civil engineer, representing the applicant, stated that subdivision plans have been submitted which will provide for the farmers to construct their homes above the watercress area. In other words, the farmers in the two-acre parcel will be located on high lands where they will be able to construct their homes. The sewer line is planned to be located on high grounds. Up to now, the farmers have been tenants from time to time because of the sewer problem and inadequate street improvements. These problems have been resolved and Bishop Estate is preparing a 55-year lease with the farmers.

The Commission recalled that an application submitted by Mr. Herbert Horita to construct apartments below the subject site was acted on recently and inquired on the number of apartments proposed by the applicant.

Mr. Houghtailing reported that a representative of the University of Hawaii indicated that both proposals are desirable from the standpoint of providing housing for the students and faculty of the Leeward Community College which is anticipated to have an enrollment of 4,000 to 5,000 students within the next five years. Low density apartment use is proposed.

In a meeting held with representatives of Bishop Estate and the Leeward Community College, the Director reported that most of the expense of constructing or improving the roadway along the boundary line to 60 feet will be borne by the Leeward Community College. The total cost is expected to be about $800,000. Approximately $300,000 is expected to be expended from the budget and a request for additional funds will be made. The proposed sewer trunk line will intercept the sewage from the individual residential properties.

ACTION: Mr. Yamabe moved to recommend to the State Land Use Commission that the petitioner's request be approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director:

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP FOR NANAKULI, LUALUALEI, MAILI, WAIANAE, AND MAKAHA PLANNING AREA NO. 27 (AMENDMENT) COMMERCIAL USE	(1) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Nanakuli, Lualualei, Maili, Waianae, and Makaha, Planning Area No. 27, by changing the land use designation from Residential use to Commercial use for a parcel of land containing 15,949 square feet situated in Nanakuli.
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT KANEOHE WESTERLY SIDE OF LIKELIKE HIGHWAY APPROXIMATELY 1,800 FEET MAUKA OF KAHEKILI HIGHWAY FATHERS OF THE SACRED HEARTS (MONASTERY AND SEMINARY USE)	(2) Conditional use approval to construct a monastery and seminary on a portion of the premises located at Bethany, Kaneohe, to provide the necessary facilities to house and educate seminary students, within an R-6 Residential District and AG-1, Restricted Agricultural District.

STREET NAMES
MILILANI TOWN

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Chun, recommended approval to reserve the following additional Street Names for roadways within Mililani Town:

HIKIANALIA
HOKUIWA
HOKULEA
HOKULEI
HOKULOA
HOKUULA
KAALOLO
KAHIKUNUI
KAUAMEA
KAUANOMEHA
KAUKAMALAMA
KEOEA
LANIKUHANA
MAHAPILI
MAIAO
MAKAIHUWAA
MAKAUNULAU
MAKOHILANI
NA HUIHUI
NAPEHE
NUUAAU
PAAO
PILILUA
POLAPOLA
ULIULI
WELEHU

The Commission recommended approval of the following Street Names. The motion was made by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Chun, and carried;

STREET NAMES
MAUNALUA
TRANSMARINA ROAD,
SECTIONS 1 AND 2

1) Street Names for Transmarina Road, Sections 1 and 2, Maunalua:

HAWAII-KAI DRIVE - Extension of an existing roadway in a mauka direction.

WAILUA STREET - Roadway extending from Hawaii-Kai Drive to Lunalilo Home Road and being between Kaleo Road and Kapaia Street.

Meaning: - Land division and river, Ka-wai-hau, Kauai

STREET NAMES
KAPAHULU
LUAKAHA SUBDIVISION

2) Roadways in the Luakaha Subdivision at Kapahulu, Honolulu, Oahu:

LUAKAHA STREET - Extension of existing roadway to terminate at Maunaloa Avenue.

LUAKAHA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Luakaha Street.

Meaning: - Enjoyable, pleasant, as a place to which one is attached

STREET NAMES
MAUNALUA
LUNA-KAI MARINA,
UNIT NO. 9

3) Roadways within the Luna-Kai Marina Subdivision, Unit No. 9, at Maunalua, Oahu, Hawaii:

KAMILO STREET - Roadway off Hawaii-Kai Drive running in a circular direction.

NIUMALU LOOP	- Looped roadway off Kamilo Street.
PAOO STREET	- Roadway running from Niumalu Loop and being between Niumalu Loop and Opoi Street.
OPOI STREET	- Roadway running from Niumalu Loop and Kamilo Street and being between Paoo and Halaula Place.
KOKOMO PLACE	- Deadend roadway running off Kamilo Street and being between Opoi Street and Halaula Place.
HALAULA PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Kamilo Street and being between Kokomo Place and Olohena Street.
OLOHENA STREET	- Roadway running from Niumalu Loop to Kamilo Street and being between Kokomo Place and Naakea Street.
HOOPII PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Niumalu Loop.
NAAKEA STREET	- Roadway running from Kamilo Street to Niumalu Loop.
NAAKEA PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Naakea Street and being between Kamilo Street and Olohena Street.
KUKII STREET	- Roadway running from Kamilo Street to Niumalu Loop.
Meaning:	- These are all land and geographical locations on the Island of Kauai.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT TO THE CIP FOR FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 1968 TO JUNE 30, 1969 (SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 5)

The City Council referred to the Planning Commission for its review and recommendation, Bill No. 46 entitled: "Capital Improvements Supplementary No. 5. An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 3188, as amended, relating to Capital Improvements of the City and County of Honolulu for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969."

The amendment involves additional appropriations for the following projects:

1) Land Acquisition of Hans L'Orange Park in Waipahu. The funds are needed to settle a court award for the park land . . . . . $ 18,000

2) Demolition of 13 single-story apartment buildings on the site of the new Makalapa Neighborhood Recreation Park . . . . . $ 20,000

New capital improvement project involves the following:

1) Improvements to Moanalua Road from Waimano Home Road, Pearl City, to the vicinity of Pono Street in Waimalu $2,333,000

The methods of financing these projects are from the sale of general obligation bonds, the general fund unexpended balance, and transfers of appropriations from other projects which will be replaced in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Chun who is the Commission's Subcommittee Chairman of the Capital Improvement Program had reviewed the amendments with the staff and he recommended approval.

ACTION: Mr. Chun's motion to recommend approval of Bill No. 46, Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 5, was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie M. Abbott
Hearings Reporter

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
April 17, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, April 17, 1969, at 1:50 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Acting Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT:

Philip T. Chun, Acting Chairman
Arthur A. Rutledge
Ed Sheehan
Thomas N. Yamabe, II
James Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
George Moriguchi, Deputy Planning Director
Albert Jeremiah, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Edward Brennan

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP OF NANAKULI, LUALUALEI, MAILI, WAIANAE, AND MAKAHA
(AMENDMENT)
[COMMERCIAL USE]
MR. & MRS. DAVID T. OKIMOTO
BY: SIDNEY I. HASHIMOTO, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW

A public hearing was held, under the provision of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Nanakuli, Lualualei, Maili, Waianae, and Makaha by changing the land use designation from Residential use to Commercial use for a 15,949 square foot parcel of land situated on the mauka side of Farrington Highway, between Nakatani Super Market and Leeward Union Service Station, in Nanakuli, Waianae, and identified by Tax Map Key 8-7-08: 62.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of April 6, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, Waianae Model Cities Agency, and to interested community organizations. No written comments or protests have been received to date.

The Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the subject property which is situated between two areas zoned for commercial purposes. The land is presently vacant and is zoned as R-6 Residential District. There are many other existing Business Districts along the mauka frontage of Farrington Highway. He recommended approval since the proposal will result in a compatible use with the surrounding areas.

The Planning/Urban Design Task Force of the Waianae Model Cities Agency has recommended approval of this proposed amendment.

No one spoke in opposition to this proposal.

Mr. Sidney Hashimoto, attorney representing the applicants, had no testimony to present.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposed amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Nanakuli, Lualualei, Maili, Waianae, and Makaha by changing the land use designation from Residential use to Commercial use for the subject property.

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT
KANEOHE
WESTERLY SIDE OF
LIKELIKE HIGHWAY
APPROXIMATELY 1,800
FEET MAUKA OF
KAHEKILI HIGHWAY
FATHERS OF THE
SACRED HEARTS
(MONASTERY AND
SEMINARY USE)

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Sections 21-241, 21-401(c)(10) and 21-501(c)(7) of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, relating to Conditional Use Permit within an AG-1 Restricted Agricultural District and R-6 Residential District, to consider a proposal to construct and operate a monastery and seminary by the Fathers of the Sacred Hearts to provide necessary facilities to house and educate seminary students, on a parcel of land containing 6.263 acres, situated on the westerly side of Likelike Highway, approximately 1,800 feet mauka of Kahekili Highway in Kaneohe, more particularly identified by Tax Map Key 4-5-25: Parcel 1.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of April 6, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, and to interested civic and community organizations. No letters of protest or comment have been received.

The staff's report explaining the proposal was submitted to the Commission. The Director recommended approval subject to the imposition of the following conditions:

1. The proposed buildings shall comply with Section 21-403, height regulation within AG-1 District under the Comprehensive Zoning Code;

2. Maximum lot coverage of all buildings shall be in accordance with Section 21-402(f) of the CZC;

3. The developer shall extend adequate water line in accordance with the requirements of the Board of Water Supply at no cost to the City;

4. The developer shall extend adequate sewer line in accordance with the requirements of the Department of Public Works at no cost to the City;

5. The development plan shall conform to the drainage requirements of the Department of Public Works;

6. Parking spaces shall be provided based on 1 space per 3 occupants of the seminary and monastery;

7. Cuts along the hillside shall be restricted primarily to areas for driveway, seminary building and recreation and garage building. Said cut areas shall be replanted with ground cover acceptable to the Planning Department within three months upon completion of the proposed buildings and shall be properly maintained;

8. The buildings and driveway shall be kept and maintained in good order and shall be so designed and painted to blend in with the natural foliage and terrain of the area;

9. Access to Likelike Highway shall be restricted to one. Said access shall be at a location acceptable to the Division of Highways, State Department of Transportation; and

10. Upon finding that any of the conditions imposed are not being complied with, the City Council may authorize the Planning Director or the Planning Commission to revoke the permit or to suspend such operation until compliance with said conditions is obtained.

Mr. George Houghtailing, planning consultant and civil engineer, representing the applicant, reported that the existing monastery and seminary will be demolished and replaced with new structures. On the topographic map displayed, he pointed out the new location of the monastery and seminary on the Honolulu side of a gulch. He did not foresee any drainage problems.

No one spoke in opposition to this proposal.

<u>ACTION</u>: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, closed the public hearing and recommended approval to grant the Conditional Use Permit requested with the attachment of the ten (10) conditions mentioned by the Director.

CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT
MAUNALUA
LUNA-KAI MARINA 8
LUNALILO HOME ROAD AND
HAWAII-KAI DRIVE
(PRIVATE RECREATIONAL
CENTER)
ROBERT H. GRANT & CO.
BY: HONG AND IWAI,
ATTORNEYS

The Commission again considered a request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a private recreational center in conjunction with the proposed development "Mariner's Cove" within Luna-Kai Marina Units 8 and 9, situated at Lunalilo Home Road and Hawaii-Drive in Hawaii-Kai and identified by Tax Map Keys 3-9-05, 08, 14 and 20, within an R-4 Residential District.

The public hearing held on April 3, 1969, was closed and action was deferred for further study by the staff.

The Director presented additional information as follows:

1. The dimension of the boat storage space should be 12 feet by 40 feet instead of 12 feet by 25 feet as shown on the plan, with a minimum of ten boat storage areas in connection with the launching ramp. The present number is insufficient and the applicant was advised to amend his plan.

2. Based on the standard of 20 square feet per person used by the Department of Parks and Recreation, the swimming pool and deck area can accommodate 255 persons during the peak periods.

3. A proposal was made to the developer to increase the length of the main swimming pool from 28 feet by 60 feet to 28 feet by 75 feet for a standard 25-yard pool. The increased size would accommodate four swimming lanes of seven feet each. Competitive meets could be held at the pool.

4. An additional condition will be imposed to have lights installed within the recreational center and that such lights to be directed away from the adjoining residences.

5. For the area to be served, the maximum walking distance to the Center was measured to be 3,200 feet.

6. The parking proposal would remain the same since most of the users are expected to walk. The parking area can accommodate about 20 percent of the users.

7. The developer has agreed to close the Center at 9:00 p.m. and to open no earlier than 7:00 a.m.

Mr. Donald Iwai, attorney, and Mr. Don Maddox, President of Robert H. Grant Company, gave additional testimony and replied to questions asked by the Commission as follows:

1. The Plan shows a boat storage area with 27 spaces measuring 12 feet by 25 feet because they did not anticipate the residents to have boats in excess of 18 feet. There is a height limitation for boats going out to the ocean so boats will be predominantly small and not 25-to 35-foot cruise crafts.

   The boat storage spaces can be revised to meet the minimum requirement of 10 spaces measuring 12 feet by 40 feet although they feel that this size is not necessary.

   The boat storage area will be for boats only and no cars will be permitted for security reason and for maximum use of the area. Boats would be placed and lifted from the area by a launcher similar to a forklift. These spaces are to be rented to those residents who do not have a water frontage unit. Automobiles are expected to be parked in the automobile parking area.

   Since it is a requirement of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, they are willing to provide for a minimum of 10 boat storage spaces measuring 12 feet by 40 feet.

2. The applicant purchased the development rights to Luna-Kai Marina Units 8 and 9 composed of subdivided residential lots including Lot 114 designated as the recreational center. Lot 114 contains 1.6 acres and they cannot expand the facilities beyond that size.

   It was not intended to have a recreational center of such capacity or the improvements thereon to be of such extent as to totally satisfy every resident within the entire Marina Units 8 and 9 subdivision. To do so would make the cost prohibitive to the purchasers of the units.

   This Center is not the sole recreation area for the residents. There are private and public parks within the Hawaii Kai development to provide supplemental recreational areas for the residents.

3. Sales representations made to purchasers have mentioned this recreational center. The developer has sold about 80 homes to date.

4. The design of the 60-foot swimming pool was done on the mainland according to FHA recommended design standards. The size was determined by following a formula on expected use.

   It was their understanding that a 60-foot pool which is 20 yards can be used for official recordkeeping of competitive swimming although a 25-yard pool is the standard used by the YMCA.

   If it is to be made a condition of the permit to have a 75-foot pool, they are willing to do so, but, because of space limitation, the additional 15 feet might violate the setback requirement for a swimming pool. They may be able to go 10 feet only.

Mrs. Howard Moore from the Outdoor Circle inquired whether areas around the automobile parking and boat storage areas will be landscaped and planted with trees. She was concerned that a great deal of heat might be generated from the parking areas to adjoining residences.

The Director assured her that provisions for adequate landscaping around the two parking areas have been made although no specific types of plants or trees to be used are indicated.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission, by unanimous vote, recommended the granting of a Conditional Use Permit to the applicant for the use stated with the imposition of the conditions mentioned by the Director, but with the understanding that these conditions can be met without violating other provisions of the Comprehensive Zoning Code.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, authorized the calling of a public hearing on May 1, 1969, to consider the following proposal initiated by the Planning Director:

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) KAHUKU, KAWELA BAY, PUPUKEA (PLANNING AREA NO. 27) RESORT USE	Amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Kahuku, Kawela Bay, Pupukea (Planning Area No. 27) by changing the land use designation from Agriculture to Resort use for an area of land containing 43.5 acres situated in Kahuku and identified by Tax Map Key 5-7-01.

LAND USE COMMISSION
PETITION
KAHUKU
BETWEEN KUILIMA AND
KAHUKU POINTS
INSCON DEVELOPMENT
COMPANY
(URBAN DISTRICT)

The Commission reviewed a petition filed by Inscon Development Company requesting an amendment to the State Land Use Commission District Boundary Map by changing the land use designation from Agricultural District to Urban District for 220 acres of land situated between Kuilima and Kahuku Points in Kahuku.

The Deputy Director read the staff's report explaining the request. Copies were distributed to the Commissioners.

Replying to questions from the Commission, the Deputy Director stated that a study prepared by the State several years ago indicated that the entire coastline of the North Shore area is a major tourist destination area.

Mr. Yamabe recalled that there was much discussion on economics as well as the social aspects of this whole area at the time the General Plan for this planning area was adopted. He was concerned that placing more land in the Urban District without further in depth study might be detrimental to the proper development of the area. He further recalled that development of the two adjoining urban areas was to be done first because this was supposed to be the most economical way to develop in order to benefit both the developer and the government.

Although no detailed study was made by the staff, the Deputy Director reported the staff's findings that the shoreline portions of the area are not used for cane production because the soil is not suitable for agricultural pursuits. For the remainder of the area, Kahuku Plantation will be phasing out its cane production shortly.

The Campbell Estate, owner of the land, has prepared a master plan for development of the area as a resort complex composed of a 500-unit hotel, apartment units, and a golf course. Golf course is a permitted use in an Agricultural District and it is estimated that 50 percent of the subject area will be devoted to this use. The applicants have indicated that they would be able to present more detailed information of their development if they have some indication as to what they might be allowed to do in the areas not designated for urban uses.

Mr. Robert Jones of Donald Wolbrink and Associates introduced Messrs. Fred Kuentz and Dale Snyder of Del Webb Corporation.

Replying to questions from the Commission, Mr. Jones reported that the first phase of development which includes the 500-unit hotel and the 18-hole championship golf course is proposed to be started this year and scheduled for completion in May, 1971. The golf course will comprise about 70 percent of the land area under consideration. Eight acres will be designated for resort development and the remainder for apartment units.

The applicants are aware that the Planning Commission and the State Land Use Commission will be reviewing the Land Use Commission district boundaries within a short period of time; however, they are requesting this change in district classification to permit them to refine their planning in this specific area. They feel that it is necessary to have an urban designation to allow them a reasonable length of time to include the two adjoining urban areas in the overall planning for development of the area.

This proposed general plan for development of the area extends from Kawela Bay to an area beyond Kahuku Point involving about 932 acres. Since the boundary of the proposed development has not been established, they did not feel it proper at this time to submit the entire development plans.

Kawela Bay was originally planned to be the first phase of development; however, since there are 13 homes with 8-year leases still remaining with Campbell Estate, Kuilima Point was selected.

The applicant will provide the public facilities and utilities. Consultants have been retained to prepare a master plan for water, drainage and sewage disposal so that the City and County is not expected to construct these facilities. Tentative plans have been submitted for review by the various City and State agencies. The water system for the first phase of the development will consist of an extension of the Board of Water Supply's system from the existing Waialee source. The drainage master plan is under review by the City.

When asked whether the apartment units will be available for the employees of the hotel, Mr. Kuentz reported that recommendations have been submitted by Mr. Snyder, General Manager of the complex, and a progress report should be available in about a month. It is anticipated that when the Kahuku Plantation Company operation is phased out, some of the employees would be employed at this resort complex.

Since this land use petition is closely related to another item on the agenda which is a proposal to amend the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Kahuku, Kawela Bay, and Pupukea and for which a public hearing has been authorized, the Commission stated that these two items should be considered and acted on simultaneously.

Since the time limit for reporting to the Land Use Commission will expire, the Director was instructed to request for an extension from the State Land Use Commission.

The Deputy Director, who had spoken to the Executive Director of the Land Use Commission, reported that an extension has been granted.

The Commission requested further staff study to determine the extent of utilities required for this development.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, deferred action on this application and requested the Director to submit a letter to the Land Use Commission requesting the extension.

The Commission noted that it has 45 days to act on a boundary change petition from the date of receipt from the Land Use Commission. Therefore, it asked why it has taken 45 days for the petition to reach the Commission. It requires more time to study such a significant change as this.

The Deputy Director agreed to expedite the staff study and to explore ways of relaying information to the Commission soon after such petitions are received.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

MITZIE M. ABBOTT
Hearings Reporter

Special Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
April 17, 1969

The Planning Commission held a special meeting to discuss the Capital Improvement Program of the City and County of Honolulu for Fiscal Years 1970-1975 on Thursday, April 17, 1969, at 9:15 a.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Acting Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT:

Philip T. Chun, Acting Chairman
Arthur A. Rutledge
Ed Sheehan
Thomas N. Yamabe II
James Sakai, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Albert Jeremiah, Deputy Corporation Counsel

Jacob Pyo, staff member
Victor Givan, staff member
Mrs. Loretta Chee, staff member
Harris Murabayashi, staff member

ABSENT:

Edward Brennan
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

PERSONNEL
NEW MEMBER

The Commission welcomed Mr. Ed Sheehan as a member of the Planning Commission.

SIX-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM 1970-1975

The Commission reviewed the proposed Six-Year Capital Improvement Program for the City and County of Honolulu for fiscal years 1970 to 1975 as prepared for the C.I.P. Subcommittee of the Planning Commission by the Planning Department staff. Also submitted to the Commission was a summary sheet listing the departmental capital project requirements for 1970.

The Director reported that the requests for fiscal year 1970 totalled $101.8 million of which $73.5 million represented City funds. The recommended program for fiscal year 1970 for all funds is $64,095,000 which is a reduction of $37,672,000. The City funded portion totals $40,622,000 which represents a reduction of $32,886,000 due primarily to funding limits. Mr. Sakai indicated that the $40,622,000 is essentially a combination of debt financing of bonds and cash, and based on 15 percent of the assessed valuation.

The Director reported that the C.I.P. requests of the various City departments for the six-year period totalled $455.9 million of which $312.5 million or an average of $52.1 million per year represented cash or general obligation bonds (City funds). The total cost of

all these projects including prior years and beyond Fiscal Year 1975 costs is $874.2 million of which the City financing of $531.2 million is involved. The recommended program for all funds totals $400.2 million. The recommended program financed out of City funds totals $274.2 million. The reductions were made to conform to fiscal limits recommended by the Budget Director. Basically, all the projects met the criteria of need and is in conformity with the General Plan.

As a member of the C.I.P. Subcommittee, Mr. Chun reported that the deferrals for some projects were based on the ability to perform within the next fiscal year.

A slide presentation was made on the various projects of the six-year Capital Improvement Program. The Commission commended the staff on the excellent presentation and preparation of the Capital Improvement Program.

The Director briefly summarized the major projects involving deferments or reductions:

1) Under general government, the deferral of $4.7 million to Fiscal Year 1971 for the construction of a new administration building; and the elimination of over $1 million for the stadium site preparation and access roadways.

2) Under Public Safety, deferral of $1.9 million to Fiscal Year 1971 for further study and possible consolidation of the Police Department Training Center with the Fire Department Training Center at Waipio.

3) Under Highways and Streets, deferral of $10 million for multipurpose parking structures pending the settlement of a lawsuit relating to the issue of whether or not counties can construct a public off-street parking structure with portions of it being used for commercial purposes. The Downtown Improvement Association will enter into a "friendly" lawsuit with the City within a few weeks to have this question answered.

Adding to this delay was the fact that land acquisition for the King-Bethel parking structure was slow. It is now being acquired and construction could commence in 1971.

The land acquisition of Block G is expected to be completed in 1970 and ticket dispensers will be installed rather than parking meters to produce more revenue. Ticket dispensers will also be installed for the King-Bethel structure.

Other deferrals involved improvement district projects because of priority and the question on actual construction within 1970.

4) Under Sanitation, reduction of $2 million in funds for sewers, sewer improvement districts, and sewage collection and disposal because all projects cannot be programmed in one fiscal year.

5) Under Recreation, reduction of $6.3 million for special recreational facilities requested by the Building Department and the Department of Parks and Recreation. This includes the stadium.

   The Administration felt that emphasis should be placed on acquisition rather than construction. Land should be purchased while the price is reasonable rather than later when the cost is higher.

The Commission expressed concern about the complete elimination of funds for a stadium. Since this is an item reflected on prior year programs, the Commission stated that it should be included in this proposed program.

The Director reported the Administration's approach to seek a private entrepreneur to develop the stadium and the cost of site preparation and access road construction could be included in the total package.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, unanimously voted to inform the Mayor and the City Council of the Commission's desire to have the appropriation for the stadium project reflected in the Six-Year Capital Improvement Program.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, recommended approval of the proposed Six-Year Capital Improvement Program of the City and County of Honolulu for Fiscal Years 1970-1975, including the action taken on the stadium project, and to transmit the proposed Program to the Mayor.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

MITZIE M. ABBOTT
Hearings Reporter

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
May 1, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, May 1, 1969, at 1:45 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Acting Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT:

Philip T. Chun, Acting Chairman
Arthur A. Rutledge
Ed Sheehan
Thomas N. Yamabe II
James Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
George S. Moriguchi, Deputy Planning Director
Albert Jeremiah, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Edward Brennan

MINUTES:

The minutes of January 9, 23, and February 6, 1969, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Rutledge.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
KAHUKU-KAWELA BAY-
PUPUKEA

RESORT USE
DEL E. WEBB CORP.
BY: ROBERT JONES OF
DONALD WOLBRINK &
ASSOCIATES, INC.

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Kahuku-Kawela Bay-Pupukea, Planning Area No. 27, by changing the land use designation from Agriculture to Resort use for 43.5 acres of land situated at Kuilima Point at Kahuku, and identified by Tax Map Key 5-7-01.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of April 20, 1969, was read by the Deputy Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, to several community associations, Windward Citizens Planning Conference, Chamber of Commerce of Windward Oahu, and to the Estate of James Campbell.

The Deputy Director read letters of support from the following organizations:

1) Alliance of North Shore Organizations, by Mrs. Edith Robinson, President;

2) Sunset Beach Community Association, by Mrs. Muriel K. Perry, President, et al; and

3) Kahuku Supervisors' Club, by Mr. Seiko Shiroma, President.

The proposal was explained to the Commission and the area under consideration was pointed out on the Detailed Land Use Map displayed on the wall.

Mr. Robert Jones of Wolbrink and Associates, and Mr. Fred Kuentz and other representatives from the Del E. Webb Corporation presented the following information in response to questions from the Commission:

1) The regional parks shown on the schematic land use plan submitted by the applicant are the same as shown on the Detailed Land Use Map.

2) The record shows that there was a tsunami occurrence in this area in 1946. Dr. William Adams, Director of Tsunami Research, who has been retained to prepare a study concerning the effects of tsunamis on this site, has developed several studies showing what could occur and what might be done concerning the construction of the hotel. This particular aspect has been given careful consideration and the hotel structure will be designed to meet tsunami conditions.

3) Feasibility reports, prepared in 1954 and 1964, indicating the projection of hotel units in this area dealing primarily with the tourist aspect and resort development, revealed a demand for 10,000 units by 1985. The basis for these estimates are much lower than the current projections for Oahu.

4) The first increment of apartment units to be developed is not intended as low cost housing for the employees. These units will be placed on the open market and available to the local residents.

5) Right-of-way access from the apartment area to the bay area would be oriented to the guests of the hotel. Tentative plans provide for a private road which may be used by the public as access to the beach area.

6) Approximately 500 persons are expected to be employed at the hotel complex with the majority residing in the immediate neighborhood along with the utilization of some of the personnel of the Polynesian Cultural Center to enhance the Polynesian atmosphere of the hotel.

7) They were not aware that the Church College of Hawaii is contemplating entering into the hotel business but rather to utilize the land that will be phased out of sugar cane production for expansion of the school. The Assistant Administrator has expressed interest in finding employment for some of the students.

8) Because of the type of clientele expected, some means of transportation to the hotel may be through helicopter service directly from the airport. Two local helicopter firms were consulted on the possibility. Other means of transportation would probably be through bus service.

9) Based on the time required for the various changes, construction is expected to begin in October, 1969, with completion of the hotel scheduled in May, 1971.

10) The employees will be trained within a three-to-six month period to be scheduled simultaneously with the construction of the hotel. This was successfully done for their Sahara-Tahoe Hotel project at Lake Tahoe. In the event it becomes necessary to provide housing for their employees, this will be done concurrently with the construction of the hotel complex.

11) It is not their intention to request for more than 20 units per acre and they intend to build within a reasonable height limit. He did not visualize that this hotel complex will have any effect on the school situation because it is expected that this hotel complex will be used for vacation purposes or as a second home.

12) Under option from the Campbell Estate is another 300 acres, which is not shown on the map but located on the south side of Kamehameha Highway, which is intended for lower cost housing.

13) They were informed that requests for land use changes should be done in increments.

14) The proposed temporary sewage treatment plant is designed to take care of the hotel complex. The City's sewer system is expected to be completed in time to service the apartment areas.

15) The construction of the golf course and the hotel complex will commence simultaneously to allow for proper grading, installation of utilities and construction of entrance roads to serve the hotel complex. About 25% of the initial development will be for the future development.

Mr. Rutledge believed that further consideration should be given to this proposal because of the lack of housing facilities and the lack of facilities to train the employees. Speaking from his own experience, he felt that no hotels should be permitted

in the outlying areas unless it can be shown from where the employees will come because there is insufficient help today to meet the immediate needs of hotels even in Waikiki.

Since such a large acreage is involved, Mr. Rutledge continued that the value of the land will be enhanced resulting in a situation where the City must later buy back land needed for public facilities at a higher cost. He felt that Campbell Estate, owner of the land, should deed a portion of the property to the City for public use. In this manner, the City, as well as the developer, would benefit from the higher zoning and the resulting higher valuation of the land. As an example of how zoning can benefit the developer and not the people, he cited the resort complex at Makaha wherein the people are now having a difficult time buying land for public use which could have been purchased before at a very reasonable price. He believed that serious consideration should be given to the proposal of having a developer deed a portion of the land to the City for public purposes.

Since the proposed development area covered a much larger area than represented, the Commission stated that it should receive the total development complex for the entire area to better evaluate the general plan for this area.

Mr. Wade McVay, representing the Campbell Estate, stated that at a subsequent rezoning proposal, they would be prepared to appear before the Commission with a proposed development plan for the entire 932 acres.

He reported that residents in the Sunset Beach and surrounding areas felt that the public should have the use of a substantial part of Kawela Bay. Campbell Estate's proposal was for a smaller area because the beach area cannot accommodate a large number of people. Therefore, an investigation was made of the State land at Wailee consisting of 4,300 feet of beach frontage located adjacent to the University of Hawaii's experimental station. Although several hundred acres of land are devoted mainly to the raising of poultry, swine and cattle, this area appeared to be adaptable as a beach area with a regional park without interfering with the University's experimental station. They did propose that the State, instead of condemning the various kuleana lands along the shoreline, consolidate and make an exchange. The plans were submitted to Mr. Johnston, former Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation, and other agencies. Mr. Jim Ferry, formerly with the State Department of Land and Natural Resources, indicated his belief that if the City approached the State, the State might agree to give the land to the City for a park. Unfortunately, this proposal was not carried through by the past administration. He pointed out that Campbell Estate owns 27 acres of beach frontage land stretching from Kawela Bay to Wailee.

He then stressed the need to create job opportunities for the people in Kahuku by citing Kahuku Plantation which is being phased out in December, 1971. This will eliminate approximately 200 jobs. The residents in Kahuku have expressed concern and are interested in having the resort development started as soon as possible so that they can be gainfully employed. Although the Plantation has offered employment on Kauai or Maui, approximately 60% of the residents prefer to remain at Kahuku. Kahuku has about $2 million in public improvements, such as the hospital, libraries, and school facilities. If the town becomes uninhabited, he contended that these facilities cannot be maintained at the present level.

Replying to Mr. Rutledge's statement about the possibility of the City avoiding the purchase of land back in the future at a higher cost, Mr. McVay pointed out that the City, at the present time, is receiving very little real property tax revenue from the land. Instead, the City will benefit from this project through increased taxes. The applicant is sincere about the plan and has committed approximately $20 million for installation of utilities, such as water and sewer lines, storm drainage facilities, and construction of roads.

Mr. Rutledge remarked that if people are needed to operate the hotel, then they should have a place to live near their employment.

No one spoke against the proposal. The public hearing was closed and the matter taken under advisement, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Rutledge.

The Commission discussed this matter later and agreed to defer any action until legal counsel can advise the Commission whether or not it is properly within the jurisdiction of the Commission to have developers voluntarily deed to the City land necessary for public purposes before any change in land uses which would greatly enhance the value of the land is granted.

The Commission noted that:

1) The majority of the land to be developed is still in the Agricultural District of the Land Use Commission. A petition to have the district classification changed from Agriculture to Urban is pending before the Land Use Commission and the Planning Commission; therefore, it might be premature for the Commission to discuss changes to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Plan of the area until the land is designated as Urban.

2) Should the land be changed to Urban, the developer had indicated that they will submit a Detailed Land Use Plan amendment application at which time they will submit the overall development plan for the area. At that time, the Commission can discuss the need for public facilities and utilities to service the area.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission deferred action and instructed the Director to meet with legal counsel for advice on the legality question posed by the Commission.

LAND USE COMMISSION
PETITION
KAHUKU
BETWEEN KUILIMA AND
KAHUKU POINTS
INSCON DEVELOPMENT
COMPANY
(URBAN DISTRICT)

The Commission again reviewed a petition filed by Inscon Development Company requesting an amendment to the State Land Use Commission District Boundary Map by changing the district classification from Agricultural to Urban District for 220 acres of land situated between Kuilima and Kahuku Points in Kahuku.

The Commission had deferred action to discuss this petition with a General Plan land use change involving the same general area.

The Deputy Director reported that the State Land Use Commission has granted an extension of time for receipt of the Planning Commission's recommendation.

The area under consideration was pointed out on the map. The Department recommended approval on the following basis:

1) The area no longer appears to be needed for agricultural purposes. Coastal portions of the area requested for change are not used for agricultural purposes. The remainder is expected to be withdrawn from cane production shortly. All soils in the subject area are rated from very poor to marginal suitability for agriculture.

2) Placing the subject property in an Urban classification would constitute a logical expansion between two existing Urban districts located at Kuilima and Kahuku Points respectively. The Urban classification would increase the probability of urban development in the area. It is believed that the change is timely in relation to the destination resort complex planned for Kahuku.

Since golf courses are permitted in an Agricultural District, Mr. Yamabe inquired whether the applicant would be willing to leave the areas in an Agricultural District and to designate only the area shaded in pink for urban purposes until such time as the plans for the entire development are submitted.

Mr. Fred Kuentz, representing Del E. Webb Corporation, stated his understanding that before an amendment to the Detailed Land Use Map can be made, the area must be designated for urban purposes; otherwise, there

is no basis on which their request can be made. Furthermore, a petition for a land use boundary change before the Land Use Commission later could result in a long delay. They would like to start on their development as soon as possible. The total development plans should be completed within 60 days at which time they will be presented to the Commission.

The matter was taken under advisement, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

In later discussion, the Commission stated that since this petition is closely related to another item on the agenda for which action has been deferred, these two items should be considered and acted on simultaneously.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Sheehan, deferred action on this application and instructed the Director to so notify the Land Use Commission.

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION
EWA
OFF FARRINGTON HIGHWAY
WILSON LAU
(URBAN DISTRICT)

The Commission reviewed a petition submitted by Wilson Lau for an amendment to the Land Use Commission District Boundary by changing the district classification from Agricultural to Urban for 12.232 acres of land situated off Kamehameha Highway in Ewa, and identified by Tax Map Key 9-1-16: Parcel 21.

The Director reported as follows:

1) The site has been used as a coast artillery installation by the military.

2) The soil has been classified as unsuitable for Agricultural use by the Land Study Bureau.

3) The only employment source in the adjacent area is the Campbell Industrial Park which had 806 employees in 1968.

4) The developer of closeby Makakilo City has constructed and sold a total of 220 homes during 1967 and 1968. Another 150 to 175 units are scheduled for construction in 1969; therefore, the City will accommodate a total of 900 families by the end of 1969.

5) During 1962 to 1968, 230 homes were sold in the Ewa area.

6) Despite this sizable amount of housing construction, there has been almost no development of public or commercial facilities with the exception of the Makakilo Elementary School. The other schools or stores are in the Waipahu and Ewa Beach areas.

7) No sewer system is available to this site; however, water can be provided.

If this site is to be reconsidered for urban development, the Director felt it desirable to prepare a development plan for a larger area in order to provide for adequate public facilities. At present, the H-1 Interstate Highway delimits the Makakilo urban district; therefore, crossing the H-1 Highway will bring pressures to urbanize the entire agricultural district between the H-1 Highway and Barber's Point Naval Air Station. The Director recommended denial of this petition for a change in land use district boundary.

Noting that the staff's report did not indicate the reason why the soil was rated as unsuitable, Mr. Yamabe requested that this information be provided hereafter.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, recommended denial of this petition and instructed the Director to so inform the Land Use Commission.

FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAMS CITY AND COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS SALT LAKE BOULEVARD, COUNTY FEDERAL AID SECONDARY ROUTE NO. 670

In compliance with Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-754), the City and County Department of Public Works has referred to the Planning Commission for review and project certification, an application for Federal grant to construct Salt Lake Boulevard, County Federal Aid Secondary Route No. 670.

The Director reported that the project area begins from a connection with Federal Aid Primary Route 66 (Puuloa Road) southeast of Salt Lake moving southwesterly to Camp Catlin, then northwesterly via Makalapa Crater to a connection with FAS Route 710 (proposed relocation at Halawa Heights Road). In a subsequent project, this roadway will be extended to meet Kamehameha Highway at Halawa. This project will improve Salt Lake Boulevard for approximately 2.9 miles.

Salt Lake Boulevard is currently a substandard major roadway and is inadequate to service the traffic requirements from the Aliamanu and Foster housing areas and the three public schools situated on Salt Lake Boulevard. It also lacks an essential connection to Puuloa Road to be an effective collector roadway. Salt Lake Boulevard serves additional traffic from the Navy installations and the housing projects in the Pearl Harbor and Camp Catlin areas, and it also serves as an alternate route between Puuloa Road and Kamehameha Highway.

The Oahu Transportation Study notes that Salt Lake Boulevard, improved to a four-lane facility and extended to meet Puuloa Road, will have a roadway capacity of 16,000 vehicles and an average 1985 traffic volume of 13,700 vehicles.

The improvements will consist of grading, paving, widening a bridge, drainage structures, curbs, street lighting, relocation of utilities and landscaping. The total estimated cost is $1,845,500. An amount of $50,000 is budgeted in Fiscal Year 1969 for planning and engineering for this project.

This project conforms to and will help achieve the overall objective of the transportation plan of the Oahu General Plan which is to provide a set of facilities for convenient, safe, quick, and economical movement of people and goods between various points within the area in harmony with the various land use patterns it services.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, certified this project as being consistent and in consonance with existing planning programs within the City and County of Honolulu.

STREET NAMES
WAIKIKI
DELETION OF
"COCOANUT AVENUE"

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Sheehan, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, recommended the deletion of the street name COCOANUT AVENUE and to substitute thereto COCONUT AVENUE for an existing roadway off Hibiscus Drive, running in a makai direction to Kalakaua Avenue.

The Director had explained that the name Cocoanut Avenue was enacted by Board of Supervisors' Resolution No. 1515, at its meeting of November 14, 1922, and approved by the Mayor on February 10, 1923. The present spelling of Coconut Avenue was adopted by common consent of concerned City agencies in 1958. Research has failed to reveal that a formal name change had been enacted. Therefore, it is assumed that the change of street name has not been submitted to the Board of Supervisors in 1958 for approval. There is no change in meaning and the vernacular of the word is being used.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT TO THE CIP FOR FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 1968 TO JUNE 30, 1969 (SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 6)

The City Council referred to the Planning Commission for its review and recommendation, Bill No. 57, entitled: "Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 6. An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 3188, as amended, relating to Capital Improvements of the City and County of Honolulu for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969."

The Director reported that this amendment is for an appropriation of $320,000 for the construction of the South Street Drain Realignment as part of the new Federal Building project construction contract. This realignment is necessary since the existing drain line runs through Federal property and will interfere with the siting of the new Federal building. The Chief Engineer has reviewed the project and found it to be acceptable and in the best interest of the City. Since it was not known when the Federal Government would be ready to proceed with this project, this item was not included in the Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 1969-1974. The funds to finance this project are available through a transfer from the Ala Moana Park Drainage project which funds will not be encumbered by June 30, 1969.

Mr. Chun, Subcommittee Chairman of the Capital Improvement Program, had reviewed this amendment with the staff. He indicated that the funds for the Ala Moana Park Drainage project will be included in the C.I.P. for Fiscal Year 1970-71. He recommended approval of this amendment.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, recommended approval of Bill No. 57, Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 6.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) RESIDENTIAL USE EWA BEACH BETWEEN FORT WEAVER ROAD AND KIMOPELE-KANE ROAD (NORTH ROAD)

The Director initiated an amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Ewa Beach by changing the land use designation from Apartment to Residential use for land situated between Fort Weaver Road and Kimopele-kane Road (North Road), comprising approximately 22 acres and identified by Tax Map Key 9-1-1: portion of Parcel 7, and recommended that the Commission authorize and set the date of the public hearing.

Staff planner Jack Gilliam explained that this amendment was initiated at the request of the Ewa Beach Community Association. He submitted to the Commission a 16-page report listing in chronological order, the background information leading to the present zoning of the property to A-1 and A-3 Apartment Districts. He also submitted and read a portion of the staff's report citing the reasons why it felt that the present zoning was premature.

Due to the complexity of the problem, Deputy Corporation Counsel Jeremiah requested time to research the matter.

Since the Commission is legally bound to call a public hearing for any changes initiated by the Director, the Commission decided to withhold setting the date of the public hearing until the legal questions raised have been answered.

ACTION: The motion to defer this matter until receipt of a legal opinion was made by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, and carried.

COMPREHENSIVE ZONING CODE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 21-202(f) RELATING TO WAIVER OF REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLIC USES OR UTILITY INSTALLATIONS

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, authorized the calling of a public hearing to consider a proposed ordinance initiated by the Planning Director to the Comprehensive Zoning Code by amending Section 21-202(f) relating to Waiver of Requirements for Public Uses or Utility Installations.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie M. Abbott
Hearings Reporter

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
MAY 7, 1969

The Planning Commission held a special meeting at noon on May 7, 1969 in the Planning Commission Conference Room of the City Hall Annex Building with Commission Chairman Edward Brennan presiding.

The following were present at this meeting:

COMMISSIONERS:	Edward Brennan, Chairman Thomas Yamabe II Ed Sheehan Arthur Rutledge Richard Sharpless, ex-officio James Sakai, ex-officio
STAFF:	Robert R. Way, Planning Director George S. Moriguchi, Deputy Planning Director William Wanket Verne Winquist Jack Gilliam Leonard Moffitt
OTHERS:	Alexander Napier, Land Use Commission Wilbert Choi, Land Use Commission Sunao Kido, ex-officio, Land Use Commission Edward Williams, Consultant Howard Altman, Consultant Chris Degenhardt, Consultant
ABSENT:	Philip Chun

The Chairman called the meeting to order, then turned the meeting over to Mr. Ramon Duran, Executive Officer of the State Land Use Commission.

Mr. Duran stated that since last meeting with the Planning Commission, the Land Use Commission has been able to prepare a 15-minute colored documentary movie on the State Land Use Law and its operation. The movie will be followed by the presentation of the proposed changes to the State Land Use District Boundaries and Regulations as recommended by the firm of Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams, consultants, retained by the State to make this review.

Following the movie, Mr. Duran introduced Mr. Edward Williams of Eckbo, Dean, Austin & Williams.

Mr. Williams highlighted those proposed changes to the regulations that were significant and outstanding. The Regulations have been divided into two documents: (1) Rules of Practice and Procedure; and (2) State Land Use District Regulations.

Rules of Practice and Procedure

The significant changes proposed are as follows:

1. Deletion of Section 1.22 relating to Emergency Rulemaking.

2. Addition of two new sections: Section 1.24, Reconsideration of Petitions; and Section 1.25, Reapplication by Petitioner.

a. Section 1.24 prohibits the Commission to reconsider its action on any petition after a period set by Law.

b. Section 1.25 limits the Commission from reconsidering any petition which had been previously denied by the Commission within one year of the date of denial unless the petitioner submits new and additional data which strengthens his petition, and provided that such re-petition is not within six months of the date of denial of such petition.

State Land Use District Regulations

The changes proposed are as follows:

1. Under the Rural District standards, a minor change was made to the residential lot sizes. All uses as described are permitted within the Rural District, except when the county ordinances or regulations are more restrictive.

2. Under the Urban District, additional standards were added as follows:

   a. In order to recognize new towns and to make provisions for sufficient urban growth, the existing regulations and boundaries were drawn and applied to existing situations rather than to proposed situations.

   b. In determining the redistricting of boundaries, substantiation of the economic feasibility studies as supplied by the petitioner will be determined by the Department of Planning and Economic Development.

   c. Consider the goals and objectives of the State and the County.

   d. Provide provisions for basic services, utilities and facilities.

   e. Include lands with a general slope of 20% or more which do not provide open space amenities and/or scenic values if such lands are suitable and desirable for urban purposes.

3. Under the Agricultural District standards and permitted uses, those modified areas which were deleted were done primarily to strengthen the protection of the prime agricultural lands. Those uses which are permissible in the Agricultural District are primarily related to agricultural uses.

4. Under the Special Permit Procedures section, the County Planning Commission was given the power to establish a time limitation on the development of the particular use permitted. If the use is not established within the specified time, the special permit may be revoked or the time limitation extended as determined by the County Planning Commission with the concurrence of the Land Use Commission.

5. The addition of Section 2.32, Zoning in Increments; and Section 2.33, Performance of Time.

a. Section 2.32, Zoning in Increments, provides for the protection of the limited land areas of the State from wasteful subdivision practices; and protection of the interests and rights of petitioners who must make large investments in land and improvements in the early stages of development.

A petitioner requesting an amendment to the district boundary for urban purposes and involving over one hundred acres must submit an approved schedule for the development of the total project in increments, and must complete the development of the project by increments within a specified time not to exceed five years. The Commission may approve a boundary change petition for any increment of the project, without approving the boundary change for the remaining increments of the project.

The petitioner has the right to have the balance of the increments of his project approved if the initial increment of the boundary change has been approved by the Commission, and provided that the petitioner has complied with all conditions imposed by the Commission on the petitioner's previously approved increments.

b. Section 2.33, Performance Time, provides for the protection of the developer and the public. It protects the public by requiring that substantial development of land be completed within 5 years, and it protects the developer by discouraging vacant urban lands owned by others from not being used. If the petitioner fails to perform according to representations made within five years, the Commission is empowered to reclassify the land to another or appropriate classification.

6. Section 2.39 renumbered to Section 2.42, Dedicated Lands. For lands dedicated by the landowner for specific ranching or agricultural use with the approval of the Director of Taxation, this section permits the Land Use Commission to change the land use district classification according to the dedicated use.

In summary, Mr. Williams stated that a slight change was made to the original intent of the regulations.

Mr. Howard Altman of Eckbo, Dean, Austin, & Williams stated that his task was to forecast the expansion of progress between 1968 and 1978, and to provide adequate reserve urban areas for that expansion.

Charted on the wall was the population figures for 1968, the forecast figures for 1978, and the percentage increase. The island total for Oahu showed 624,000 people in 1968, and a foreseeable expansion to 808,010 people by 1978 or an increase of approximately 30 percent. At the same time, the best figures available indicate that after this expansion has been accommodated in 1978, there still will be available approximately 18,000 acres of suitable vacant and buildable lands within the existing Urban District without adding new urban areas.

On the map displayed, the urban areas as shown on the existing City and County General Plan map for the year 1968 were shown in orange and the military lands that are in the existing urban areas were shown in gray.

For purposes of comparison, also shown was the expanded Urban zone proposal from 1968 through 1973 and the existing County General Plan which is a forecast to 1980.

Mr. Altman stated that the Urban Districts are generally the same; that is, the Districts that were set up in 1963 seem to indicate the capability for accepting the expansion that the County felt could occur to 1980. This is important because of the feeling from various areas and agencies that the existing urban areas can in effect support the expansion of this forecast without adding any more sizeable urban zones.

Areas formally requested by petition to the Land Use Commission for change to an urban zone were shown in red. These requests total approximately 12,000 acres as compared with the existing urban zones within the County of about 74,000 acres. The breakdown of these requests is as follows:

1. The Holt Estate is asking for 300 acres;
2. Ewa Resort approximately 300 acres;
3. Campbell Estate about 700 acres for first phase development;
4. Amfac-Trousdale about 4500 acres;
5. Oceanic request in Waipio about 3500 acres;
6. Kahuku area about 200 acres;
7. Robinson Estate about 800 acres on the northern part of the island;
8. Kualoa Ranch about 700 acres;
9. Some minor areas including Bishop Estate for approximately 50 acres, Mr. Medeiros of about 50 acres, and a proposal for Urban zoning of about 38 acres of existing agricultural area; and
10. Bishop-Oceanic proposal of about 600 acres.

The proposals as shown in red are not being accepted for urban zoning until after the incremental zoning provision has been adopted. Each developer is then expected to submit a formal request for the first increment of his plan at which time his total proposal will be examined.

Mr. Chris Degenhardt of Eckbo, Dean, Austin and Williams spoke on the Agricultural and Conservation Districts. In examining the criteria set for determining the district boundaries, they found that the criteria did not match the existing boundaries. For such areas, adjustments are being proposed as follows:

1. Change from an Agricultural District to a Conservation District for the following four major areas:

   a. Makua Valley which is virtually a scenic area and where only marginal agricultural activity exists. Agriculture is not the highest and best use for the area, therefore, the area is being considered by the State as a State park.

   b. Waimano Valley which is an extension from the Forest Reserve.

   c. Kailua Valley (Olomana Ridges) which is an extension from the Waimanalo Forest Reserve.

   d. Portions of the Kawailoa area extending from the Forest Reserve area.

2. Change from an Urban to a Conservation District for areas, such as Paiko Peninsula and small areas in Heeia.

3. The fish pond and bird refuge areas along the Kailua-Kaneohe shoreline are generally classified as Conservation.

4. The Kualoa area which is being proposed for a park is classified as Conservation and Agricultural Districts.

5. Those areas that are presently classified as Agriculture but not used for agriculture and are contiguous to urban areas are being proposed for an Urban classification. Such areas include the Kaalaea District, military lands, Waikane District, etc.

6. Small areas that are classified as Agriculture and presently being used for agricultural activity, but are surrounded by urban areas, are being proposed for an Urban District classification. These proposals are generally for the adjustment of the boundaries of the Urban District. One such area which is affected is in the Waipahu District. Presently, this area is being used for raising watercress and taro.

DISCUSSION

In reply to Mr. Yamabe's question relating to Makua Valley being proposed for conservation and for a park use, Mr. Degenhardt and Mr. Altman explained that the type of park being proposed was more of a roadway, scenic-view type of park. The economic considerations given to this area were reviewed by others who have decided to acquire this area for a State park and which appropriations have been included in the State Capital Improvements Program. Any pressures of sorts that may arise may be exposed or expressed in public hearings.

Mr. Williams explained that Hawaii is faced with a basic pressure. This is the pressure of population. There will be approximately 180,000 people moving to this island in the next 10 years. How will we accommodate this population? We must first determine where they should not live. These are places of beauty, watersheds, prime agricultural areas, etc. We must next determine how to accommodate them. This is through a well-developed and designed plan which considers a good place where people may live. Therefore,

development and zoning controls must be developed by public agencies, and a review of the type of development being proposed must be made to see that the developer provides high quality development.

In reply to Mr. Sharpless' question, Mr. Degenhardt stated that there are just four areas recommended as adjustments to the boundaries that will be going into the Urban District. Mr. Altman added that any expansion should be in the existing Urban areas. Mr. Williams stated that the changes in the Urban District that are being proposed are generally outside the areas shown as Urban on the City and County General Plan.

In reply to Mr. Way's question, Mr. Altman gave the following comparison of the proposed Urban Districts as shown on the City and County General Plan (areas not recommended by the consultants but rather formal applications received by the Land Use Commission for an Urban classification), with that of the City and County Detailed Land Use Map.

1. The Amfac-Trousdale request of about 4500 acres is outside of any existing DLUM and outside of the General Plan.

2. The Kahuku area request is in a public hearing process now.

3. The Robinson Estate request of about 800 acres is outside of any existing Plan.

4. The Holt Estate request is outside of the existing DLUM.

5. The Ewa Resort request conforms with the residential area that shows up on the existing General Plan.

6. The Campbell Estate request does not show up on any Plan.

7. The Mililani Town or Oceanic request in Waipio with approximately 3,000 acres includes only 740 acres at present in the Urban zoning.

In reply to Mr. Yamabe's questions, Mr. Altman stated that according to present figures, the existing vacant Urban Districts could absorb those areas being requested for an Urban expansion (proposed areas shown on the City & County General Plan). Consideration was given to their uses for resort-type of development as well as residential development. Generally, the factors that can offset those problems of frozen areas in an Urban District are areas that are owned in a single ownership and large developments that must come in under the incremental zoning to assure a certain performance, that is, the availability of the land.

Mr. Altman stated that they were not proposing downzoning. The feeling is that if these areas are not developing than probably a downzoning would be recommended. The presentation here is based on the potential of the owner and the land. If a development is being proposed in an area foreseen for future agricultural production or preserved for some other facility, the proposal should be refused as such and considered as an alternative for Urban expansion.

In reply to Mr. Sharpless' questions, Mr. Williams stated that the general problem is that there is land available to build on. When the district boundaries were originally drawn and general plans were made, the limits of Urban growth were foreseen to be in certain places. The problem is to steer development into these

predetermined and predefined areas and at the same time, allow some flexibility for the large developer who is geared to build cities and sometimes provide housing at a better cost for people, as well as the small developer. One way to keep this figure of vacant urban lands at a minimum is through the incremental zoning request. All projects over 100 acres should be looked at from this standpoint. The Land Use Commission, by giving its first increment zoning to a developer, permits itself and future Land Use Commissions to be aware of the development of the whole proposal (4,000 acres or whatever). However, should the proposal become uneconomical and building is stopped, the total development is discontinued. This is one protection to the public.

Mr. Williams stated that the Rules and Regulations simply require that the applicant provide a time schedule for development, an economic feasibility schedule, and preliminary plans geared to the proposal. The Land Use Commission does not go into the details of the development. This is done by the County. All the Land Use Commission is trying to judge is the feasibility of the proposal in terms of the amount of area it should provide in a five-year period. Although a plan designed primarily for a residential district does not cover only a residential development, the Land Use Commission does not cover these details.

Mr. Napier added that the Land Use Commission would not go into all of these details; this would be primarily the function of the County. However, in the presentation of the proposed request, the developer will present all of these details to the Land Use Commission.

Mr. Choi stated that the Land Use Commission is primarily established to protect agricultural lands. An urban request for 8,000 acres under an incremental zoning procedures does not necessarily mean that the Land Use Commission will consider all 8,000 acres. The Land Use Commission might feel that 1,000 acres is all that should be allowed under the incremental zoning for five years.

In reply to Mr. Brennan's question, Mr. Duran stated that the incremental zoning procedure can be applied to a 15-year projection program in three-year incremental steps.

Mr. Rutledge asked, since the City must provide public services for the people, why haven't studies been made to give the City the right to have developers deed certain percentage of their lands to the City whenever a developer comes in for a zoning change or boundary request. A coordinating committee established to work closely with the Land Use Commission and the County would keep the City informed when a contemplated land use change would occur. The City could plan ahead and be in a better position to provide future servicesto the people, and sell land to the people at a reasonable cost.

Mr. Williams agreed that some planning needs to be done, and that this planning should be done at the county level. If a change is going to take place, the City should be in a better planning position to know where buildings should be, where circulation should be, where open spaces should be, etc.

Mr. Napier added that generally many of these proposed developments with their detailed plans are known to the City before a boundary change request comes in to the Land Use Commission.

Mr. Brennan agreed that there is a lot of merit to Mr. Rutledge's proposal; however, he believed that this responsibility is primarily with the Planning Commission rather than the Land Use Commission.

Mr. Winquist questioned the incremental zoning procedure as it related to the Amfac-Trousdale request for a boundary change of 4500 acres from Agriculture to Urban. Once this request is granted, he believed that this would be the first step toward urbanizing the prime agricultural lands extending from Wahiawa to Waialua. He believed that these lands should be preserved for agricultural uses. Perhaps the City Council would take into consideration the preservation of strips or green open spaces for agriculture, golf courses, etc. without structures on them.

The Chairman stated that this is a good point. He asked what guarantee is there that the developer will provide open spaces once given an Urban boundary change.

Mr. Choi stated that there was no guarantee that they would get a boundary change. Mr. Winquist was not completely agreeable to this statement. He stated that past experiences have shown that the demand and pressures for housing have prevailed instead of the preservation of agricultural lands.

In reply to Mr. Yamabe's question on the economics of Hawaii's land use, Mr. Williams stated that there are three things greatly increasing the economics of Hawaii: (1) government spending; (2) military population; (3) sugar export and tourist industry.

The tourist industry is bringing in new money into the islands and helping to raise the general supply of money in the islands. If any three of these general supply of money are lost, a vital part of our economy is lost. This is what the Legislature meant when it said: "We are going to preserve agricultural lands". The Department of Planning and Economic Development has just started a master agricultural plan which is to be completed within two or three years. There are indications showing that pineapple and sugar are being phased out by housing construction.

Mr. Choi proposed that the City help the Land Use Commission diminish the pressures of urban sprawl.

Mr. Sharpless asked whether the proposed Rules and Regulations require an applicant to show proof for his request; and asked how does one go about proving the need for 1,000 dwelling units.

Mr. Duran stated that the answer to this question does not depend only on one thing. It depends on the circumstances in the area. If the demand is for low-cost housing and the applicant can prove this need, the Land Use Commission may accept this. The Land Use Commission may want to know what income level of people are needing housing, what price the developer intends to sell his product, etc.

Mr. Sunao Kido added that the Land Use Commission would also consider the cost of the housing and the construction cost of the housing when examining the applicant's request for a boundary change.

Mr. Rutledge stated that the cost of housing is no problem. Amfac-Trousdale is going to make agriculture land available for housing development which is what the State government should do. These lots will be made available in fee simple and arrangements have been made for prefabricated homes to be built on these lots. Mr. Kido stated that he realized that the cost of a houselot is really a part of the cost for housing.

Mr. Rutledge asked why should private ownership make their lands available for low-cost housing? Why doesn't the State put to use some of their lands for housing?

Mr. Yamabe asked whether an agricultural area being used for some agricultural pursuits but found to be of no need for this purpose can be used for the expansion of an Urban District. The Chairman asked whether the Land Use Commission, in making a decision to take lands out of agriculture, had prepared a breakdown on what the economic loss would be to the community. Mr. Yamabe asked whether there is knowledge as to how much land is needed and whether there is such a market available. He proposed that a study on these questions be explored jointly with the University of Hawaii.

The Chairman asked whether lands adjacent to the Urban areas on the Detailed Land Use Map should be taken out of Agriculture and put in Urban. He also asked how would the golf course area be zoned? Should good planning incorporate that golf course as Urban or Agriculture? How do you control this buildable area?

Mr. Williams replied that unless it is an open area, it should be considered Urban. On the need for controls, this is a good question. The Chairman stated that once the area is urbanized, the need for control becomes important.

Mr. Duran stated that the incremental approach can be applied. If the development is not progressing according to schedule, then the second increment would be jeopardized.

Mr. Way stated that a land use district boundary change and a Detailed Land Use change simultaneously can be controlled through the City's zoning procedure. The City has the tools to work with. The incremental approach which permits the developer a piece by piece development, in many ways, provides the County with a greater control on developments. This test begins in the first phase of the development.

Mr. Sharpless asked how does the Land Use Commission test the applicant on the feasibility phase? The Chairman stated that at the last meeting when land exchanges were discussed, the question was raised whether people taken out of Agriculture could be placed somewhere else? Is there a rule of thumb? Do you believe in downzoning?

Mr. Williams replied that the boundaries are evaluated every five years. They have done some changes according to the definition of the Law and Regulations.

Mr. Gilliam asked whether any consideration was given to a mass transit system and the proposed developments by the Bishop Estate, Robinson Estate, Amfac-Trousdale, and others. He proposed that the study by the consultants should be oriented to the mass transit concept, if this is a definite policy on the City level.

Mr. Altman stated that this problem falls within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. Any existing policy in the plan is not coordinated to a rapid transit system. They are charged to work with the existing land use plan as such, and to provide a course for the next five years.

Mr. Gilliam stated that once the incremental law goes through, Amfac-Trousdale's 4500 acres might be given the change, and traffic should be one of the vital problems of concern.

Mr. Way explained that the public policy statement on mass transit is part of the City's policy. Although the study will comprise all of these plans, the public policy statement does not reflect on the General Plan map at this time.

Mr. Sharpless asked whether the proposed land use district boundaries relate to public transportation, public facilities and the like. Mr. Williams replied in the affirmative.

In reply to Mr. Yamabe's question, Mr. Duran stated that the Land Use Law does not require that there be periodic meetings with the County. All it requires is that public hearings be held in various counties.

Mr. Duran informed the Commission that these proposed district boundaries will be considered at a public hearing on May 23, 1969, at 7:00 p.m., in the lower level hearing room at the State Capitol. The maps of the proposed district boundaries for Oahu and the proposed regulations will be delivered to the Planning Department by Monday, May 12, 1969.

The Chairman thanked the Consultants and staff members of the Land Use Commission for a very enlighten presentation which generated a great amount of thinking. Perhaps in the future this would provide better liaison and a closer working relationship.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alberta L. Kai

Alberta L. Kai
Secretary I

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
May 15, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, May 15, 1969, at 2:17 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Edward Brennan presiding:

PRESENT:

Edward Brennan, Chairman
Philip T. Chun
Arthur A Rutledge
Ed Sheehan
Thomas N. Yamabe II
James Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
George Moriguchi, Deputy Planning Director
Albert Jeremiah, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Jack Gilliam, Staff Planner

PUBLIC HEARING COMPREHENSIVE ZONING CODE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 21-202(f) RELATING TO WAIVER OF REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLIC USES OR UTILITY INSTALLATIONS

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend Section 21-202(f) of the Comprehensive Zoning Code to read:

> "Waiver of Requirements for Public Uses or Utility Installations. Minimum requirements for public uses and utility installations may be waived if the Planning Director finds that the proposal will have no more adverse effect on the health, safety or comfort of persons living or working in the area, and will be no more injurious economically or otherwise to property or improvements in the surrounding area than would any use generally permitted in the district. Prior to granting approval, plans shall be submitted to the Planning Director for his review, subject to such conditions as he may determine necessary to insure compliance with the intent of this provision."

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of May 4, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, Outdoor Circle, American Institute of Planners, American Institute of Architects, American Society of Landscape Architects, and to the American Society of Civil Engineers. No letters of protest have been received.

The Director explained that this matter came about in the course of enforcing the Comprehensive Zoning Code that while there were exceptions allowed for utility installations for their facilities in residential districts specifically, such exceptions did not include public facilities. More particularly it has been found that in the case of fire stations and public schools, they have not been able to meet the 25-foot height limitation. Fire stations, for example, are typically designed with a hose drying tower which exceeds this maximum height limitation. Similarly, in the Honolulu District particularly,

EDDIE TANGEN, REPRESENTING THE ILWU, SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL:

Apparently no one is opposed to this petition so I will not go into a detailed presentation in terms of our feelings on it, except to make a few points in that we're directly interested because of some 500 people who will be involved directly or indirectly with Kahuku Plantation and are extremely concerned of what will happen to them and their community. We have been in discussions with Kahuku Plantation and Campbell Estate for three years knowing what was going to happen to the plantation and also knowing that the Campbell Estate was intending to have a developer come in and create a resort complex there. The result of these discussions have been that many things have been accomplished and agreed to by the plantation and Campbell Estate in terms of the public interest and particularly the immediate residents of that community -- the plans for public recreational areas, long range plans for extension of educational facilities and many other things. The commitments that have been made so far have been kept by both the Estate and the plantation and we're satisfied at this point, at least that present commitments and future ones will also be kept.

Regarding the matter of long range planning for the community which was raised a few moments ago, some of these matters will be taken up by the Land Use Commission and in further hearings before this Commission and also the City Council. I'm not so certain that all that we're talking about is 43 acres. We're really talking about the 900-acre development. I share the concern of this Commission that whatever happens in this community should be in the public interest.

I think, however, there is an important thing that was called to my attention; that is, the lending institution that has committed itself to finance the Del E Webb Corp. in developing this area is extremely concerned because the money is sitting and not working, and that there is a possibility that unless there is some indication of an affirmative action by this Commission, the financing might be withdrawn. I know that it took almost four years to get any developer interested at all who could get financing to go into this venture -- this is extremely important.

I think we have here a situation that is sort of made to order -- many of us are devoting a lot of time and energy in other areas on this island and throughout the State where we have a situation where people are being displaced for one reason or another and if it were not for some substitute or other form of occupation that we would have that type of situation

schools are being proposed by the Department of Education which may be three stories high. In view of the extreme land value costs, the Department of Education has been experiencing the need to maximize the development of school buildings. Again, they have found it difficult to stay within the 25-foot height limitation.

The Director felt that since the intent of the ordinance is that certain requirements may be waived for utility installations, public facilities such as those described above should also be included.

Since there were a number of similar variance requests before the Zoning Board of Appeals relating to schools and fire stations, the Director felt that to avoid continued appearances, it was more appropriate to amend the ordinance. By allowing the Planning Director some discretion in reviewing these matters there would be some assurance that they would be in conformity and harmony with the neighborhood and surrounding properties.

Mr. Yamabe assumed that the Director will have the authority under the proposed ordinance to use his discretion in the enforcement of minimum requirements; however, he noted that there is a stipulation where if someone is in dispute with the Director's decision, he may go to the Zoning Board of Appeals and further to other higher appellant courts, if necessary. He questioned whether we have these appeal objectives, and if the Zoning Board of Appeals is one of them.

The Director gave an affirmative reply and explained that the Zoning Board of Appeals is set up so that anyone who feels aggrieved by the decision of the Administrator may take his case to the Zoning Board of Appeals. This is the first court of appeals and subsequently it could go to higher courts.

No one spoke against the proposal.

Mr. Hideshi Iwamoto, Public Works Engineer for the Department of Accounting and General Services, appeared in favor of the proposal. He believed that this proposed amendment will provide a workable means to resolve many problems. To construct additional schools and provide for additional public facilities, such as those on the University Campus, is difficult with the stringent setback requirements and height limitation.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposed ordinance to amend Section 21-202(f) of the Comprehensive Zoning Code relating to waiver of requirements for public uses or utility installations.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE MAP
(AMENDMENT)
KAHUKU, KAWELA BAY,
PUPUKEA (PLANNING
AREA NO. 27)
RESORT USE
DEL E. WEBB
CORPORATION

The Commission again considered an amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Kahuku, Kawela Bay, Pupukea (Planning Area No. 27), by changing the land use designation from Agriculture to Resort use for an area of land containing 43.5 acres situated in Kahuku and identified by Tax Map Key 5-7-01.

A public hearing was held and closed on May 1, 1969, and the Commission deferred action pending a legal opinion as to whether or not the request for dedication of lands for public purposes prior to its value being escalated by zoning is possible under the present ordinances and statutes.

The following discussion occurred:

Way — We have received a letter from the Corporation Counsel dated May 15, 1969, stating that should possible dedication by developers of land to the City be in order, it would be necessary that there be enabling legislation in effect and that restrictions cannot be imposed without this enabling legislation.

Chun — Inasmuch as I understand there are people who wish to be heard, I will entertain a motion from the Commissioners to have the public hearing reopened.

Rutledge — I think we should have more discussion on the letter. I don't understand the enabling provisions -- does that mean that there must be a law in the book that says we can do it, before we can do it?

Jeremiah — Yes. The City and County, through our ordinances, would have to have something set up and put into effect.

Rutledge — Don't they have something set up?

Jeremiah — Item No. 14 on the agenda shows the proposed ordinance submitted.

Chun — May we reopen the public hearing?

Jeremiah — Yes, I think so due to that nature.

Rutledge — I understand that in 1967, there was a law passed which provides that each county shall adopt ordinances to require a subdivider, as a condition precedent to final approval of a subdivision, to

(1) provide land in perpetuity for park and playground facilities for the use of the purchasers or occupants of lots in subdivisions. The ordinances may prescribe the instances in which the dedications shall be required, the area, location, grade, and other state of the sites so required to be dedicated. In addition thereto, such ordinances may prescribe penalties or other remedies for violation of such ordinances; or

(2) to dedicate land for park and playground facilities for the use of the purchasers or occupants of lots in the subdivision. The ordinances may prescribe the instances in which the dedication shall be required, the area, location, grade, and other state of the sites so required to be dedicated, and the minimum physical facilities required.

This is the law and if it has not been complied with, then I feel we're entirely out of order to consider anything at this time until it has been complied with because we have a mandate by the State to adopt these ordinances. If the City and County has not adopted such an ordinance, it is out of business until such time as they do. Therefore, I feel that the whole procedure is out of order.

In this case, I understand that Campbell Estate is the subdivider, they own the property, Del Webb is the representative and the developer and, as such, the park and playground facilities should be provided in conformance with the ordinance, which should have been adopted. In view of the fact that the ordinance has not been adopted, I don't think there is anything we can do about it and I think it is very clear. I think we are out of order to proceed; not only with this, but with any other subdivider.

Brennan — asked legal counsel for opinion on this.

Jeremiah — The enabling legislation by the State aroused the counties to set up their own ordinance. As pointed out to Mr. Way, we did not have any such ordinances, but we did have the draft before the Council which passed two readings in 1968; but that is the status of it right now.

This enabling legislation says that each county shall set up, which actually is mandatory, and must look at it as proposed, it is not passed yet.

Chun — Is that enabling legislation one which is intended for use by the county to enable dedication of land for public purposes for any subdivision?

Jeremiah — I'm not familiar with Act 294 but I think it is set up so that each county can go into this area and regulate this area.

Chun — In other words, even though the language is that of mandatory wording "shall", it is strictly discretionary in that it is enabling.

Jeremiah — Yes.

Brennan — I wonder if we can proceed with the hearing and then automatically take under advisement the legal aspect with legal counsel at that time.

Rutledge — I think it is very clear that unless we have a law, you cannot change any zoning until these laws have been passed.

Chun — I move that the public hearing closed at the last meeting be reopened. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yamabe subject to comments by Mr. Rutledge as it relates to the enabling act.

Chun — I think that it would be automatic that any action this Commission takes would be subject to legalities

Upon a call by the Chairman, no one spoke in opposition to this proposal.

Albert Sing — I'm a resident in the community. I realize the subject of the debate is to sort of work out some kind of program in the North Shore side to benefit the people in the Windward area to get some improvements in the area. I feel that I would like to support people from the Community Action Program who would like to see this type of program because it will benefit them and a great proportion and number of people to give them the privilege of the training program. I feel that this kind of need and this kind of program is well worth it to consider and the aspect of the need of the people there will be well provided for to take care of their welfare and needs. I am not employed but, as I said, I work with the community action program--I'm a volunteer and I'm anxious to see that the welfare of the community can be well worth served and the poor people can be given some advantage and consideration to get ahead and better themselves with the community.

Yamabe — You said that there was need -- could you elaborate on this need.

Sing — The needs there that we know that there are so many people in the Windward side are grass roots people and I feel that these people need this kind of support of applying for jobs to better themselves in the community and to contribute back to the community by their share of taxes back to the State and to the County.

RALPH DIFFEN — Senior at Kahuku High School:

I am one of the seniors who have sent in a petition on the Del E. Webb Corp. concerning this matter and I was wondering if you could read the reasons as stated in the petition.

Way — Read the petition. (84 signatures -- I understand that these are all student signatures).

Brennan — Tell me in your own words, other than the petition, why you want the project.

Diffen — I will be graduating this year and I would like to see this as a future means of a job and since Kahuku Plantation will be closing, it will also be a means of job for people who live there. Since they live in the country, it will mean coming to town for jobs.

Yamabe — As a point of information, I would like you to take this back to the other petitioners that I don't think there is anyone in the Commission or any government agency who would like to see or intends to delay or defer any progress. This is not the intention of any agency. There are certain amounts of deliberations that must take place so you must understand that these are not unnecessary delays and we do not want to delay any progress.

Rutledge — I would like you to listen carefully and carry back so others may listen to you -- I would like you to arrange with your principal an opportunity to be heard, to explain, that this Commission has not been willfully holding back any approval. The position of this Commission has been that we felt that since there is going to be this large development and since there will be several hundred people required to work there, that the developer who is going to build this hotel complex would provide housing because certainly the people who are now living there are not all qualified to work in the hotel. Many years ago, when plantations were established, those who established the plantation felt it was their obligation to have a place to live. Now that is the most expensive thing. So it is the Commission's desire and we have expressed to the developer that they come back to the Commission and show what they intend to do about providing such housing. At this point they haven't done it. In a way, the hotel industry, particularly hotels in the outskirts can be considered as plantations selling Aloha; however, now years after that the sugar plantation is saying Aloha and we're worse off because no provisions are being made for housing.

Furthermore, the law provides that the City and County establish by ordinance the mandatory provision on the part of the developer that they set aside land for parks and recreational areas and other public uses. This is the thing that is holding up any consideration at this point.

Brennan — I would like to make one point -- I think we have reached a point nationally and locally when we become involved in large subdivisions and resort areas, the requirements today are much greater in order that we might conceivably build a better community so that we don't make some of the mistakes that were done in the past.

at Kahuku. There is a community there now, and there is housing there now, and there are plans to upgrade the present housing to provide for additional new housing in our discussions with the plantation and also with some agreement from the Estate, there are plans to extend this community maintaining what charm and what field and other good things that the people don't want to give up so these things have been discussed.

I'm not too sure about the technical and legal questions which were raised--I haven't heard it before so I suppose that the Commission would very possibly seek legal advice. I would ask the Commission to do this, however -- to give some indication that if enabling legislation is necessary by the City and County, that the Planning Commission itself indicate that if such legislation is passed, they would look favorably upon the petition of Del E. Webb for the development of this resort area complex and that is primarily because of the point that I questioned that we are concerned that the financing might possibly be withdrawn and Kahuku Plantation will fold up and we're faced with a community of 500 people who don't want to leave where they are now and shouldn't have to if there is something that we can possibly do about it.

Rutledge

I believe that most developers of the size of Del E. Webb have a provision in their contracts with those from whom they borrow money to take care of just such incidences as have arisen and in the absence of sealing any documents, and the Commission has not seen any where they are about to lose their financing, it is hard to give any weight to that. I believe that the applicant should tell the Commission about it themselves and show us that they're about to lose their financing. However, the fact that it is mentioned and the way it has been said is a sort of a scare and makes it appear as though they're going to leave here -- and they're not going to leave here -- and I haven't seen their books. I know that they know that it is a good area and I'm satisfied that it will operate and we have to operate in accordance with the rules that are set down. We're handicapped by what is said -- it is said that all zoning shall be accomplished within the framework of the long range comprehensive General Plan or be prepared to guide the overall future development of the county. This is part of the whole area and we must take this all into consideration and this is the reason why when Del E. Webb came in and they asked for 40 acres, we suggested that they come in with a plan to show us what they really intend to do and we found out that there was nearly 1,000 acres. When you go into a

development of 1,000 acres of land, this means that a lot of people will live there. All we want to know is what is going to be done there and the quicker they get going, the quicker there will be money circulating from away. We're all in favor of the application but we have the responsibility of seeing to it that things are done in the manner which are proper.

Brennan — Your point is well taken where the matter relates to where the financing is coming from or the commitments but since the representatives from Del E. Webb are here, they should be able to answer that.

Tangen — Well, Commissioner Rutledge might not want to get people scared. I don't know if scared is right or not but I'm mighty concerned about it. I didn't see any documents that said that the lending institution was going to dump Del Webb Corp. if they didn't get any favorable action from this Commission by a certain date but we have had some experience in this trade along these lines where some major developers have withdrawn because of this sort of thing. So I don't think it is a matter of getting scared. On the matter of what they're going to do, it is my understanding of the procedures there will be several other opportunities when the Del Webb Corp. wants to develop the other 950 acres or whatever it is -- we're talking about 43 acres as I understand this -- and this Commission, the Land Use Commission, and City Council will have an opportunity to demand that certain things should happen and at least take that position if they choose to. All I'm really asking from this Commission, aside from some of the other technicalities and whether or not enabling legislation is required, that there be some indication from this Commission after a full public hearing and after a full day and as I understand it, not one opponent including the Commission, including all the residents of the community, including organizations and including the ILWU that some indication that this Planning Commission, assuming that certain things are met, will act favorably. So that not only the Del E. Webb Corp. but the community and the Kahuku people will have some feeling of security that if certain things are done and if this Commission needs to, let it be laid down as to what they need to have done before them, but to give some indication that if certain things are met and accomplished, that this Commission will act favorably to this petition. This is what I'm asking and I think this is necessary.

Rutledge — I'm only concerned if it meets all the conditions.

Brennan — You referred to some commitments as you said relates to housing -- I wonder if you could clarify that because one of the points raised by the Commission related itself to housing.

Tangen — We have been having discussions for sometime with Alexander & Baldwin, the parent company of Kahuku

Plantation which actually owns the housing out there in what areas can we put in new housing, either through the plantation company, through a developer or done by the union or a non-profit entity such as the Hawaii Council for Housing Action and the upgrading of some of the present housing have been discussed. One of the things that held that back from being specific is whether or not we're going to have a community. We're faced with the prospect of several hundred people being displaced from that area when the plantation closes. This is one of the things where our people have a feeling of insecurity that we're looking for something to come out that is favorable so we know that there is going to have a resort complex built and built fairly soon so the people and their families can continue to reside in the community and if they are, then we can proceed to specifically outline the housing that we're working out between the union, and the company, and the Estate.

KATHLEEN NIHIPALI, Senior at Kahuku High School:

I have an additional petition for the development of North Shore and it is from the residents of Kahuku, Laie, Sunset and Hauula. (Submitted petition to Chairman)

Way — Read petition supporting application.

Rutledge — Were you informed when the applicant was going to construct the hotel?

Nihipali — I only know that it was supposed to be soon.

Yamabe — Did you say that the Commission should act on the 43-acres without considering the whole area?

Tangen — Not necessarily not considering it, except Comm. Rutledge raised the question that it was incumbent upon this Commission to determine that certain conditions had to be met for the whole thing but my point was that the Planning Commission, City Council and the Land Use Commission will have an opportunity to discuss this in developing the 43 acres.

Brennan — I think part of this question revolves itself around the fact that I thought Mr. Tangen said it was subject to meeting the qualifications that the Planning Commission thought was necessary; in other words, to act on it subject to so that the principals could have some indication that this Commission was in favor of the petition subject to the additional legal aspects.

Tangen — That is correct.

Yamabe — I understand that but, for clarification, for my own purposes, this subject, whether it applies to

just 43 acres or talking about 900 acres, this is the thing I wanted to ascertain in my mind because there are many requirements within the 43 acres development but if we looked at the 900 acre development, we're talking about something else again because of additional consideration. Am I correct to assume that you feel that it would be proper for a Commission such as this to consider the other areas, maybe not in such detail where we're talking about a 10 or 20 year plan but to consider the surrounding use of the land because of the fact that this might be helpful to the developer as well; e.g., a hotel with a golf course operation certainly would compliment the development, apartment areas, residential areas where it could be well planned so it would compliment each other instead of scattered type of development. Do you think that this type of consideration, in a general form, is important by a body such as this.

Tangen — I see nothing wrong in taking into consideration the overall project, but this is a very time taking process. When they come in before the Land Use Commission and they come back here and when it goes before the City Council, we're talking about three readings on each aspect of it and what we're concerned is that this thing gets started and gets off the ground and I'm satisfied that this Commission and other public bodies are going to see that they're going to do the thing properly and within the laws but we're anxious to have some indication that this Commission will act favorably upon this. I'm satisfied that once they get the go ahead on this, they'll conform to all the rest and the people will have a feeling of security and so will the rest of the people in the community.

Rutledge — Are you satisfied that this Commission will act favorably from what I said after Del Webb meets the necessary requirements?

Tangen — I assume that the Planning Commission is going to require that the developer is going to meet all the required legal requirements. I'm sure that the applicant is aware of the legal requirements and if the applicant meets the legal requirements for this 43 acres that we get an impression from the Planning Commission that it is o.k., then we can get going.

Brennan — We are dealing with Item #2 and I wonder if we might not tie in Item #3 (LUC) because one relates to LUC and one relates to the 43 acres. I would like to confine questions only to Item #2.

Way — Read letters of support from

1) Kahuku Community with 147 signatures
2) Windward Chamber of Commerce
3) Lindy Ching of Kahuku IGA

FRED KUENTZ, EXECUTIVE VICE-PRESIDENT OF DEL E. WEBB CORP.

First, I think that some indication was given that there is no particular delay involved -- I would like to bring to the Commission's attention that our application is dated December 17, 1968, so it has been some time and still there is no action.

Regarding the concern of financing -- I prefer not to bring it up personally at all because it does sound exactly like a scare tactic. I can assure you that it is not that the Prudential people have 10 places to put every dollar they have -- they are quite concerned about whether they will ever get anything off the ground. The delay, in our opinion, is costing about $150,000 per month just in increased cost which is the standard cost.

Actually the request, in my opinion, is not a subdivision request so I don't quite understand the connotation for it. We're requesting a resort development of one small parcel of 43.5 acres, ignoring Item #3 as you suggested, which again, if I may go ahead of your agenda of Item #3 is a reversion of urban land use from Agricultural to Urban and still there is no specifics. To clarify that, we are asking for two things -- in Item #2, we're asking approval for a resort area of 43.5 acres and in Item #3, we are also asking you to recommend to the State Land Use Commission the conversion from Agricultural to Urban of the center area which really still gives us nothing to do until we come back to the Comm. for specific DLUM uses and then after that again specific zoning and actually after you convert the resort portion of the area we're asking, we still have to come on that back to the Commission on a complete repeat for a specific zoning of that resort area which we are prepared to do.

Maybe we are getting things ahead of itself but we prefer to get started and we will abide by any regulations that exist and we have additional information which may be submitted to the Comm. We quite frankly need something to go on. I'm not sure exactly what Mr. Yamabe additionally wanted. The map is one of the original ones we submitted last December. It delineates each area, what we intend to do, the densities in it, and everything in detail with the exception of a general area to the east of parcel H. We have a tentative breakdown that I will submit to the Commission; in other words, how many acres of golf course, hotels, commercial, etc. Again, we're perhaps getting way ahead of ourselves because everyone of those specific designations must be approved by the Comm. as we come back, either in piece meal or as Mr. Yamabe brought up the last time if we prefer to do it at one time so we will know what we will do on the whole specific situation.

The plan now is on the next go around to come back for the entire other areas so everyone will know what we will do with the exception now of the area identified as "H" -- we're not even asking for a conversion from Agricultural and leave that for a later time but everything will come back at one hearing at one time, and it would seem to me that at that time, we can get into any of the specific requirements or regulations that might exist and I can assure you that we will comply with everyone of them with no protests.

I am a little confused with Mr. Rutledge -- as I understand, he said that one of the requirements for this Commission to approve our request was a housing specification. I wasn't aware that we owed detailed housing analysis to the Commission.

Rutledge: I meant the use of parks.

Brennan: Are you referring to the dedicated property now or are we talking strictly about housing?

Kuentz: Mr. Rutledge, I believe I mentioned when Mr. Tangen was here, that one of the reasons nothing has happened is because the Webb Corp. owed the Commission a housing proposal.

Rutledge: At the meeting before last, I asked you or one of the other gentlemen if you had any plans and if so, what were they and someone testified that they would have housing available for the key people. I was pursuing it on the basis of trying to get something specific where you would say that when the hotel is open, we will have housing for 150 people who would need it as a minimum or whatever the case may be.

Kuentz: If I knew that much, at this moment, I would make that statement but we may need housing when the hotel opens for 300 people--we might not need one unit if all the people happen to be living in housing in the locality. What I said last time is that we are prepared to furnish all housing that would be required for employees that we would have to house in the area in several different manners and that goes beyond key employees. I don't see how we can prepare to discuss this frankly at the moment because I don't have the slightest idea of where employees will come from if they don't come from locally.

Rutledge: When you open your hotel you are prepared to have housing for as many of the people who will work for you who may need it?

Kuentz: Yes, if we can get zoning in time to build housing.

Rutledge: How will you open up a hotel for, I imagine 500 employees, and you're going to find out the hotel that you need housing for them? How will you know?

Kuentz: So far we haven't been in any position to even consider starting employment. We can put housing up in less than a year, probably 9 months, and it will take us a year and a half to put up the hotel, so we have a lot of time.

Rutledge: If you can be specific and we can spell these things out that in the event that if it takes you a year to build, well the picture may change and shortly before that time, if people want to make commitments and show then that it is necessary that you will have housing and you have so much set aside and you will make it available for the people to have housing, that is good.

Kuentz: That is no problem because it is a basic, economic and business problem if housing is required to get out there and work and obviously we must supply housing.

Rutledge: Your attitude is very liberal and forward looking one -- it hasn't been done before.

Brennan: Are we talking about a voluntary proposition now; in other words, you're asking the developer in his best interest to provide housing not as a condition because it is not tied to it.

Yamabe: My primary concern is that there is a large area of land that is going out of cane production in 1971 and I'm very much concerned of what will happen to the people in the area; therefore, I did request at the last meeting if there is a possibility of developing this type of development -- your contract with Campbell Estate is for 900 acres and assuming that there might be more than 900 acres that will be going out of cane, and if it is, how is it going to be used. I'm not asking for detailed plans but if you do happen to have it, I would like to see it so that more or less in my deliberation, I can visualize a whole operation -- I'm not only talking about apartments, golf course, resort areas, parks, residential areas, etc. -- which are all the amenities of a wonderful community.

Kuentz: All I can talk about is 900 acres as delineated on the map, and other than that maybe Mr. Way can discuss it.

Yamabe: This is the reason why -- I believe I did suggest at the last meeting that as far as the resort area is concerned which was the first increment of development, I have no objections.

Kuentz: We did prepare that -- I have that for submittal.

Yamabe: At the same time, you had also indicated that the golf course would be complimenting the resort development but in that particular area that you're asking for a change, we're asking the Land Use Commission to change the land use designation from

Agricultural to Urban and I did point out that it was not necessary because in developing the golf course, you can do that in an Agricultural District. So I have no objections as far as the resort and golf course is concerned, but the question was that was it necessary to have the golf course designated Urban.

Kuentz: What we did was we prepared a transparency of the State Land Use district boundaries which shows what we are requesting by overlay of our development plan and the timing for each of these increments to start and in more detail a tentative plan of when we intend to start each area, and the number of units per acre, I think this will answer your questions and which will be useful. Here is the plan which I believe is self-explanatory. Because of the timing involved, we need to request the change from Agricultural to Urban so that, in turn, we can request for a change in the Detailed Land Use Map and zoning change because we plan to start constructing housing and condominiums in 1970 and timing is such that is going to require us to start immediately. From the plan submitted, we intend to start our increment, as shown in red, and to grade all the way from the easterly boundary of (C) over to the westerly boundary of (J1B) and for that entire area, we will also be supplying utilities to the area and an access road that will open all of the area at the same time and this will all be in our initial improvement costs.

Yamabe: I thought that your initial development for the resort complex at Kuilima Point was to start in September, 1970.

Kuentz: No, if things work out, we will commit ourselves to simultaneously expand the money on working drawings, paralleling zoning and building permits so that hopefully when all of the details have cleared, we will also have the building permit request in and we can start construction hopefully within 30 days which would now look about November 1, 1969, based on Wolbrink Organization's timing on how long these things take. This is for the hotel and golf course plus all the grading and utilities coming in.

Yamabe: Do you foresee any problems where a developer went ahead in construction in anticipation that it will be approved; e.g. your Agricultural area -- you say that you will start grading which I assume would be for the golf course and the hotel -- if we say no you have to come back to the Commission.

Kuentz: Anything we do that has not been approved here is on our own back.

Brennan: How many rooms do you ultimately intend to construct on the 43.5 acres?

Kuentz: Eventually we hope to come back and ask for resort in (A-2) -- we cannot now because that must be reclassified to Urban before we ask for resort

and subsequently a resort designation. When (A1) and (A2) are together, those two areas are planned for 1,000 hotel units. We are talking about two 7-story buildings on (A1) and (A2) combined which will total 820 units and the difference between that and the 1,000 units will be in cottages and cabanas.

Brennan: Do you anticipate any other type of construction on the 43.5 acres besides resort hotel?

Kuentz: No, only ancilliary facilities such as cabanas, cottages, swimming pools--that sort of things.

Brennan: These would be service propositions?

Kuentz: These would be tied to the hotel. All necessary parking is provided for the hotel.

We have a detailed layout of the parking area which was submitted to the Commission. We are requesting H-1 designation which automatically holds us to a height limitation and the 7-story building will be the height limitation anywhere that we request.

Brennan: In addition to the height limitations, I'm more really concerned with how many 7-story buildings or how many structures there will be on the acreage.

Kuentz: Actually in the (A-1) and (A-2) complex totally, there will be 2 Y-shaped 7-story buildings. In general, from the westerly boundary or (E-1) over and including (J1B), there will probably be no additional 7-story buildings. (B) and (H) will have some but if they do, the number of units per acre will develop such a large open area between buildings I don't think you will have any problems with them.

Brennan: Before citing the feeling of this Commission as well as most of the people involved in planning, we would like to avoid some of the mistakes that we made in Waikiki, and we would like to know that we will have a development on the North Shore or on the Leeward side where there is sufficient open area where there are open vistas to the ocean so density itself or height is not the only factor that is involved here because as you know you can develop a tremendous amount of sprawl and still block out some beautiful areas.

Kuentz: I think there are three things: 1) the concept, 2) the height, and 3) the density, and all of them combined, I don't think you can limit any one of them. Actually I'm not sure myself which is correct -- if you restrict yourself to a density and put a number of 7-story buildings and you, of course, increase the amount of open space. On the other hand, if you put it all on two stories, you would cover more ground and cover more area and I would be tempted to have a combination of things but not too many of the seven-story buildings.

(Pointed out on the map) the (A-1) area and combined with (A-2) and eventually it would give us the acreage necessary at a 20-unit per acre density to develop 1,000 hotel units. We plan two 7-story buildings which hold 410 rooms each and the difference will be in cabanas units and cottages and cottage clusters. These cottage clusters, although not finalized, are positioned and aimed in such a way that every room has a view towards the ocean and we put the tennis court and the parking and other items in the center away from the ocean view. I think this is a unique layout because each room in the hotel has an ocean view and every one of these cottages and cabanas has an ocean view. This bay has a natural reef which makes it a natural swimming pool and after the dredging work to take out the coral is done, we will use the bay for swimming. Turtle Bay is used for surfing; and we have put on a public surfer-parking and access to the beach at one end of the development and it is shown on the plan. This, I would say, is generally the maximum type of density we are going to attempt to generate in the entire area and some of the areas will be a little more and a little less. The maximum density that we are proposing anywhere is 30 units to an acre and this would be toward Kahuku Point, but even that is a little misleading because that is eliminating the golf course and the lagoon and if you put that back in, we have a little less than 10 units per acre on an average overall utilization.

Yamabe: Do you find it might be more advantageous for this type of development to come under the planned unit development?

Kuentz: We discussed this at some length last year and I don't think it has any advantage to the Commission if we are going for H-1 zoning which we are because I believe H-1 is more restricted than the PUD. PUD is very cumbersome and difficult but it actually gives us more leeway but it would take us a little more time but we can do everything we want to do under the H-1 zoning, and Wolbrink Organization advised us that it would go much smoother on both sides as long as we don't want a lot more leeway, or satisfied with this to go right through with this specific zoning. You can go either direction depending on what you attempt to do. Actually, in my opinion, PUD gives the Commission more work for you to control because H-1 is specific as far as zoning is concerned.

Brennan: Under these conditions, I wonder whether you would have any objections on the change on the DLUM, whether we could tie it to a 20 per acre proposition -- in other words, if we're talking about 50 acres, then we're talking about a maximum of 1,000 rooms -- would you have any objections to that?

Kuentz: No, because our planning as such is that it would be 20 per acre and we would be happy to go along with that stipulation.

Yamabe: I don't think that you can make that a stipulation, if I'm not mistaken.

Brennan: It is not a question of stipulation at this stage but hypothetically speaking, I don't know whether we legally can or can't but it would be in our best interest and also for the community's best interest that we can be assured that an area such as this would fall in with what our thinking is so that at a later date, once something is rezoned, they don't put up a 7-story building here and a 7-story building there, etc.

Kuentz: Except for minor changes, generally this plan is fixed but definitely the units within the 50 acres is finalized.

This plan has been given a lot of study.

Brennan: Regarding public facilities and public accesses to the beach -- how is that worked out?

Kuentz: This may be changed if we could add some roads but this will be reserved for public use -- there will be 25 parking spaces -- and access to the beach -- we plan to have public ladies and mens toilet facilities for the use of the public. We think it would be wise to reserve it from dawn to dusk operation because it is primarily for surfing and picnic operations but we are prepared to stipulate when we come in for zoning as long as our lease with Campbell Estate runs.

Rutledge: How much square feet do you have for public access to the beach? -- 1/2 acre--1 acre?

Kuentz: I don't know because there is this road to the beach, plus the parking spaces, and other accesses and the entire beach is accessible to the public. I would say little less than 1/2 acre. I think when we come back to the Commission and hopefully this area would be urban and when we discuss where we will go from there, there are some park areas designated and the surfing area we have indicated is almost in the center which gives an almost equal spacing along the length of the area we will be controlling.

Brennan: You don't have any objections to work with the Planning Department to work towards some public facilities that would be satisfactory to the City & County?

Kuentz: Absolutely not -- maybe the areas planned could be changed which would be a better location, but the specific thing is fine. Whatever we say, we will guarantee that we will put that facility in there within the confines of our lease with Campbell Estate and make it accessible to the public.

Rutledge: In relation to the hotel, when you discover that the hotel will be open and you need housing for 150 people, where would the people be put?

Kuentz: You're talking about mass employees and I don't think it would be in the North side of Kam Highway but in the South side of Kam Highway in the Agricultural District.

MOTION: The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Rutledge.

ACTION: The Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Kahuku, Kawela Bay, Pupukea, by changing the land use designation from Agriculture to Resort use for 43.5 acres, based upon the presentation made by the applicant to construct 20 units per acre. The motion was made by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, and carried.

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION
KAHUKU
BETWEEN KUILIMA AND KAHUKU POINTS
INSCON DEVELOPMENT COMPANY
(URBAN DISTRICT)

The Commission again reviewed a petition filed by Inscon Development Company requesting an amendment to the State Land Use Commission District Boundary Map by changing the district classification from Agricultural to Urban District for 220 acres of land situated between Kuilima and Kahuku Points in Kahuku, and identified by Tax Map Keys 5-7-01: portion of Parcels 20 and 22, and 5-6-03: portion of Parcel 8.

The Commission had deferred action to discuss this petition with a General Plan land use change involving the same general area.

The Deputy Director reported that an extension of time was granted by the State Land Use Commission. However, he pointed out that the Land Use Commission will be conducting their hearing on May 23.

From the maps displayed on the wall, he pointed out the area under consideration.

No one spoke in opposition to the petition.

Mr. Fred Kuentz represented the applicant, Inscon Development Co., which is a joint venture of the Del E. Webb Corporation and Prudential Insurance Company.

Mr. Brennan inquired whether discussions were held with Campbell Estate regarding dedication of lands to the City and County as it relates to the hotel area (for parking and public facilities) and the land use area of the 220 acres, as requested by Mr. Rutledge.

Mr. Kuentz replied that he could not answer for Campbell Estate; however, discussions were held about the hotel area. Campbell Estate was informed of their proposal which was a specific stipulation of a long-term easement for the surfer area, but no beach designation was indicated or has ever been discussed within the urban area under discussion. Lengthy discussions were held on the beach areas which are over to the right of Kahuku Point and over Kawela Bay.

In reply to Mr. Brennan's question regarding land which may be needed by the City and County for installation of service areas, schools, etc., and by what method this may be obtained, Mr. Alan Davis, Chairman of the Trustees of the Campbell Estate, replied that the Trustees felt that when it came in with the Del E. Webb Corporation requesting approval, that they were prepared to comply in every way with the law to accomplish this objective. They have been working on this project for over 15 years and only recently got into a position where they have a $20 million commitment and they are anxious to start the project. They know of no requests that have been presented to them to comply with. He was confused as he did not know what law the Commission is requesting them to comply with.

Referring to the enabling legislation, Mr. Brennan inquired that in the event this act is passed, whether the Campbell Estate would comply with the requirements under the Act.

Mr. Davis believed that to be a broad question to ask to commit themselves to something that they are not aware of. But he assured the Commission that the Trustees of the Estate recognize that if there are any laws to be complied with in order to proceed with the development, they will comply with the law.

Regarding the easement, Mr. Yamabe realized that the developer could commit only the portion under lease, but inquired whether Campbell Estate would consider dedicating an easement in fee leading to the beach. This would be a voluntary dedication of easement.

Mr. Davis reiterated that they will comply with the law in order to proceed with the development. But until they are aware of what is contained in the law, they will not be able to commit themselves.

In replying to Mr. Yamabe's question regarding any easement given by the developer, as to whether it will be limited to the extent of the lease, Mr. Davis replied that the lease is for a period of 75 years.

It was Mr. Brennan's belief that in the past, land has been dedicated for park sites, school sites, and other public facilities, which was confirmed by the Director. Since this is a sizeable project, Mr. Brennan believed that a formula should be worked out which will be in the best interest of both the developer and the City and County.

Mr. Davis reported that they have spent considerable sums of money in other areas for the dedication of roads and other facilities.

With respect to Campbell Estate's lands in the adjoining areas, Mr. Chun inquired whether there was a master plan or general plan for the development of those areas or the use of those lands once the plantation is phased out, and whether the master plan includes areas set aside for public facilities, such as schools and parks.

Mr. Davis replied that the master plan was prepared in 1953; however, they are now in the process of reviewing the plan as to the development of the land after the plantation is phased out. That plan has not been completed. The master plan includes areas set aside for public facilities. The plantation area involves approximately 3,000 acres.

Mr. Rutledge did not believe that Mr. Davis, as a Trustee of the Campbell Estate, had the authority to deed or dedicate any land, but to comply with the requirements of the law. On the other hand, if the request is granted and the value of the land is enhanced, some land should be dedicated to the City for public facilities. There is a law which states that the City and County is charged with the responsibility of setting up rules and regulations to have a developer dedicate a portion of the land to the City; however, until such a regulation is passed, the developer cannot be required to dedicate land.

Although Mr. Davis was aware of the Commission's position, he requested favorable consideration by the Commission as any further delays pose serious problems. There is the possibility that the enabling act will be passed before the applicant appears before the Commission at a later date at which time the Commission will be in a position to require that certain provisions be met.

Mr. Rutledge moved that the matter be deferred for one week for discussion with the Corporation Counsel.

Mr. Chun reminded the Commission that the Land Use Commission will be conducting its hearing on May 23rd.

Mr. Rutledge withdrew his motion and took the matter under advisement, which was seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

Mr. Yamabe stated that in looking through the information received from the applicant, he did not believe it was too detrimental to the applicant to recommend that the parcel be kept in Agriculture because if we're talking about a resort development and the golf course, then we could recommend that and they are willing.

If we check the urban boundary, there are a few areas in the urban area. The applicant has stated that the whole area will be graded, which would include the golf course, so that it would not be taking away anything. It is suggested that the area be held in Agricultural for this time.

Mr. Chun stated that it didn't make sense to have urban uses all around an Agricultural district.

Mr. Yamabe commented that once the Land Use Commission takes action, the zoning jurisdiction falls upon the County. Until then, the City has no jurisdiction.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, moved to recommend to the State Land Use Commission that the petitioner's request be approved.

ZONING H-1 RESORT-HOTEL DISTRICT MAKAHA 84-325 MAKAU STREET MRS. MAHEALANI J. FERNANDEZ

The Commission again reviewed a proposal to change the zoning from R-3 Residential District to H-1 Resort-Hotel District for three parcels of land comprising a total area of 39,057 square feet at 84-325 Makau Street, situated approximately 210 feet makai of Farrington Highway in Makaha, and identified by Tax Map Key 8-4-08: Parcels 4, 5, and 6.

A public hearing was held and closed on October 17, 1968. The Commission had deferred action for receipt of further information on the deed restriction.

It was the Director's understanding that the applicant was in the process of having the deed restriction removed. This was in the latter part of last year. The information received was that there was a deed restriction without a time limit which permitted only the construction of single family dwellings on the property. He suggested that the owner or her representative be asked the status of the deed restriction so that the matter can be resolved.

The Commission believed that there were other problems, such as the width of the road, public facilities, etc. Mr. Chun recalled that at the time of the public hearing, the developer had indicated that the applicant was willing to repave that section of the road between the subject property and Kamehameha Highway. Other questions relating to public facilities were raised, such as whether there were curbs and gutters, whether the area was prone to flooding, sewer facilities, etc.

The Director explained that the right-of-way width of the street is 40 feet and the pavement width is 20 feet and in fair condition. There are no curbs, gutters or sidewalks and no curb grades have been established for the street fronting the parcel. There are no sewer facilities; however, the development plan submitted indicates cavitette and seepage pit sewage systems which could be controlled to accommodate the requirements for the development.

Mr. James Trask, agent for the owner, reported that in reviewing the staff report and the minutes of October 17, 1968, they had originally indicated as presented in the staff report that they will comply with all the recommendations. In lieu of this, the Planning Department had recommended that this matter be processed for rezoning. This was in June, 1968. They are still pursuing this matter of the restrictive clause that appears in the deed.

An inquiry was made of the Corporation Counsel as to whether a restrictive clause is any argument against the granting or denial of this rezoning request. It was Mr. Trask's understanding from the Corporation Counsel that this is the reason why this matter is before the Commission. He requested favorable consideration.

The Director confirmed this and it was his understanding that the only item remaining is the deed restriction. The matter with reference to the street improvements would be something to come up at the time the building permit would be issued.

Mr. Trask added that the property adjacent to the applicant is zoned for Resort Hotel use. As a matter of fact, Makaha Shores has already been built and Makaha Reef situated directly adjacent to the right of the applicant's property is being constructed.

Referring to the deed restriction, Mr. Brennan inquired how it related to the Commission taking action on this request.

Legal Counsel Jeremiah did not believe that the deed restriction could preclude the Commission from acting. This deed restriction is something to be worked out by the property owner.

The Director believed that Legal Counsel Jeremiah is considering this from a legal standpoint. From a planning standpoint or at least from an overall community standpoint, it would be more appropriate if this matter was resolved now to avoid the City from becoming involved in the matter, in one way or another.

The Director gave an affirmative reply to Mr. Brennan's question as to whether the Commission could take action to zone the area for resort use since it is so designated on the Detailed Land Use Map.

Mr. Yamabe noted that the applicant is in the process of eliminating the deed restriction; however, he inquired whether there is a possibility that the deed restriction could not be deleted.

Mr. Trask gave an affirmative reply. He could not give an answer at this particular time as to his client's contention of whether the deed restriction could or could not be deleted; however, he was of the

opinion that this matter must be pursued further if the removal of the deed restriction is not possible. As mentioned by Legal Counsel Jeremiah, the deed restriction is to be worked out by the property owner and may possibly have to resort to legal action.

Mr. Brennan inquired whether the Planning Commission could become part of a civil suit if action on this rezoning request is taken. In other words, does the Commission put the landowner in a position of any danger legally.

Legal Counsel Jeremiah did not believe so due to the powers of this Commission and what it is presently considering is a zoning request. What would the effect of these restrictive covenants be on the whole picture of zoning in the county if every landowner would put covenants on zoning. Then zoning would mean nothing.

The matter was taken under advisement, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

DISCUSSION: It was Mr. Chun's belief that the staff recommended denial of this project at the time of the public hearing due to lack of facilities.

Since the area is designated for resort district, with a 44-foot right-of-way and 20-foot pavement, he inquired what would happen if the entire area is rezoned for resort use.

The Director read the report with reference to the street conditions. Although Mr. Chun believed that the applicant is willing to pave that section of the road from the site to the highway, the Director indicated that it could be considered inappropriate at this time because of lack of public facilities.

ACTION: Mr. Chun's motion to defer the request pending site investigation in reference to public facilities, was seconded by Mr. Yamabe and carried.

FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAMS CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU MANAGING DIRECTOR

In compliance with Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, the Managing Director of the City and County of Honolulu submitted an application for Federal funds for a technical studies grant which is intended and designed to provide a sound foundation and technical basis for implementing a program of coordinated bus transportation to serve the needs of the City and County of Honolulu.

The Director reviewed the staff report.

The following discussion occurred.

Mr. Rutledge asked if we are proposing to ask for $800,000 from the Federal Government for another continuing study. "I don't know what happened to the previous study. By the time this is approved, they will tell us what we already know. If we want relief, we must have the buses and we must have the people to ride the buses. I don't understand this as I thought there was the Mancini report, then the Oahu Transportation Study report which went on for several years and somehow got lost; and now we're asked to go ahead and review the study and make recommendations. I have a recommendation of my own and that is to tell Mr. Weinberg what it will cost to get people transportation. If he doesn't give it to them, I think the study remains as to what the Charter says. I think he is bound by the Charter to give transportation and if he can't do it and make a profit at it, then that is the reason why we can't have transportation. Now a study has been made and that is what has been said and he's got the buses."

Noting that each bus costs approximately $40,000, Mr. Brennan stated that almost 20 buses could be purchased with $800,000.

Referring to the recommendations as listed in the report, Mr. Yamabe inquired whether the study is attempted to bring together all the studies that were made in transportation, such as the Oahu Transportation Study, Model Cities Program, and others as mentioned by Mr. Rutledge.

Mr. Sharpless explained that this is an effort to obtain approximately $180,000 of Federal funds for the fiscal year beginning July 1 to be added to $90,000 of City and County funds for the purpose of making a study on an all island bus system and it includes all of the aspects of it; such as what would be the alternatives, what would be the costs, what would be the best routes, fares, and so forth, so it will draw upon any studies previously made in this particular area.

He further explained that an application has been prepared in conjunction with the State authorities, such as the Department of Transportation and Department of Planning and Economic Development.

In reply to Mr. Yamabe's inquiry of the possibility of using any portion of the funds being requested for actual purchasing of the facilities as previously mentioned, Mr. Sharpless gave a negative reply.

Mr. Yamabe inquired whether there are any Federal programs where this type of assistance may be received.

Mr. Sharpless replied in the affirmative and indicated that those would be some of the recommendations to be

derived from the study--whether or not buses will have to be purchased, whether HRT buses will have to be purchased or to permit HRT to continue as a subsidy would be some of the alternatives to consider.

He stressed that this study is necessary because there are not people capable of taking an overall view that should be taken at this time.

Regarding the procedures for the proposed study, Mr. Sharpless pointed out they were very careful in seeing that the procedures were not duplicated with any other study.

Regarding Mr. Rutledge's inquiry on the OTS study which he presumed was made for the entire island, Mr. Sharpless indicated that the study included background information such as land uses, number of people, what would be the route for mass transit if there is going to be mass transit.

Mr. Sharpless further elaborated that the study has a maximum amount of $270,000 of which $90,000 is City and County funds and $180,000, is State funds. The study is estimated to take a year.

(Mr. Rutledge left the meeting at about this point).

In view of the urgency of mass transportation in downtown Honolulu without going out to the Leeward or Windward areas, Mr. Yamabe inquired whether the urgency of the study should be concentrated in the immediate problem areas.

Mr. Sharpless pointed out that there are several programs, such as the TOPICS Program which deals with attempting to speed up traffic, and meetings have been held with the Waikiki Improvement Association during the past four months to work out a solution.

Mr. Brennan believed that obviously new programs must be developed to alleviate the "sore spots" that presently exists, but he felt that the critical thing is the development of the mass transit system, whether it is by bus or some other means of transportation. It is hoped that the mass transportation system will ultimately alleviate the number of cars on the roads. He cited examples in New York where people do not drive their cars but take the train or bus to work for two reasons: (1) parking costs are high; and (2)"by the time you get through the traffic, you just about had it." I think maybe we are eventually going to move into that direction.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, certified that the study project is in consonance with existing planning programs and previous studies to achieve the comprehensive and coordinated physical development of the City and County of Honolulu and to promote the general welfare and prosperity of its people.

FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAMS
STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
HALAWA TO MIDDLE STREET INTERSTATE ROUTE H-1
CONSTRUCTION

In compliance with Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, the Acting Chief of the Highways Division, Department of Transportation, State of Hawaii, has submitted an application for a grant of Federal-aid highway funds for the preliminary engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of interstate Route H-1, Halawa to Middle Street.

The Director reviewed the staff report.

The following discussion occurred.

Yamabe: What is the cost of the project?

Way: This is a State funded project so it would be 90% Federal and 10% State funding. We do not have the construction cost figure for this section.

Edward Asato: Advance Planner and Engineer for the Highways Division:

The estimated cost of this project at this time, based on a very rough estimate, is $140 million from Salt Lake Boulevard to the connection, to Lunalilo Freeway.

Yamabe: I have been told and I have experienced bottle-neck problems in different locations and I'm not an engineer but I assume that all of this is taken into consideration. When you apply for Federal grants, are you going to make it into increments instead of going into fragmented type of development?

Asato: I think there are numerous problems involved -- financing, acquisition of rights-of-way--so that sometimes the projects have to be fragmented and taken care of. The section in which funds, rights-of-way are available and plans are already completed is taken care of first, to get the project going, so that we don't wait until critical areas are free and then start building while funds for the other areas and the plans are sitting.

Brennan: I think that with $140 million, you could almost put up a mass transit system, don't you?

Asato: I don't have the estimated cost of a mass transit system or the extent of it, so I can't answer you.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, recommended that this project be certified as implementing the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu, being in consonance with the long-range proposals of the General Plan, and consistent with the Transportation Systems Planning Office's recommended plan.

STREET NAMES
KULIOUOU
KULIOUOU TERRACE SUBDIVISION

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Sheehan, seconded by Mr. Chun, recommended approval of the following street names:

(1) Roadway in the Kuliouou Terrace Subdivision, Tax Key 3-8-09: 10 & 11

ELELUPE PLACE - Deadend roadway off Elelupe Road between Kalanianaole Highway and Kuliouou Road.

Meaning: Dark Kite.

STREET NAMES
MAKAHA

(2) Roadway to Makaha School, Lot 922E, Makaha, Tax Key 8-4-02: 40:

ALA NA'AUAO PLACE - Deadend roadway off Lahaina Road in a mauka direction between Ikuone Place and Hanalei Street.

Meaning: Way of learning.

STREET NAMES
WAIPIO
MILILANI TOWN

(3) Mililani Town, Units 6A, 6B, 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B, 10A, 10B, 12A and 12B, Waipio, Ewa:

KUAHELANI AVENUE - Extension of existing roadway in a southerly direction to terminate beyond Kaloapau Street and further extension from Kipapa Street in a northeasterly direction to terminate at the proposed H-2 Highway.

HOKULOA LOOP - Loop roadway off Kuahelani Avenue between Alaalaa Loop and Kaopua Loop.

Meaning: Great Star; Hawaiian name for the planet, Venus. Morning star when seen in the morning.

KAOPUA LOOP - Loop roadway off Kuahelani Avenue between Hokuloa Loop and Kaloapau Street.

Meaning: Hawaiian star, may be a variant of Kauopua.

PILILUA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kaopua Loop between Kuahelani Avenue and Hokulea Place.

Meaning: Two-friends-close-together; this Hawaiian pair of stars was supposed to bring the opelu fish to local waters.

HOKULEA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kaopua Loop between Pililua Place and Ulili Place.

Meaning: Star-of-gladness; a Hawaiian star, possibly Arcturus.

ULILI PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Kaopua Loop between Hokulea Place and Kuahelani Avenue.
Meaning:	Blackness; a Hawaiian star in the southern sky.
KALOAPAU STREET	- Extension of an existing roadway in a southerly direction terminating at Kuahelani Avenue and being between Kuahelani Avenue and Kamehameha Highway.
KEHEPUE LOOP	- Loop roadway off Kaloapau Street between Kuahelani Avenue and Kaloapau Street as Kaloapau Street proceeds in a northerly direction.
Meaning:	A Hawaiian star name, possibly a variant of Kekeapue.
KEHEPUE PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Kehepue Loop between Kaopua Loop and Kaloapau Street.
KAILIULA LOOP	- Loop roadway off Kaloapau Street between Kehepue Loop and Hakupokano Loop.
Meaning:	Red Skin; a tutelary star of Kau, Hawaii.
HOEU PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Kailiula Loop between Kaloapau Street and Lealea Place.
Meaning:	Stir-up; a Hawaiian star.
LEALEA PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Kailiula Loop between Hoeu Place and Kailiula Place.
Meaning:	A Hawaiian star, named for Lea, the goddess of shipbuilders.
KAILIULA PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Kailiula Loop between Lealea Place and Kaloapau Street.
HAKUPOKANO LOOP	- Loop roadway off Kaloapau Street between Kailiula Loop and Auhaele Loop.
Meaning:	A Hawaiian star, an example of stars named for islands to which they had served as guides to the mariners in the past history of the Polynesians.

KAOEA PLACE	-	Deadend roadway off Hakupokano Loop between Kaloapau Street and Maiao Place.
Meaning:		Darts-thrown-upward; a Hawaiian constellation presiding over the destiny of Hanalei, Kauai.
MAIAO PLACE	-	Deadend roadway off Hakupokano Loop.
Meaning:		Toward-the-dawn; a Hawaiian navigation star.
HOKUULA LOOP	-	Loop roadway off Kipapa Drive between Kuahelani Avenue and Kipapa Drive.
Meaning:		Red Star; name that the Hawaiians applied to Aldebaran, Mars, Antares, and possibly Betelgeuse.
HOKUULA PLACE	-	Deadend roadway off Hokuula Loop.
IHUKU PLACE	-	Deadend roadway off Hokuula Loop between Kipapa Drive and Hokuula Place.
Meaning:		Peaked-nose; a Hawaiian star which may be the same as Aohuku, a planet name. It is probable that ihuku is a general term applied to any guiding star which the steersman in the stern sees standing above the bow.
HIILEI PLACE	-	Deadend roadway off Kipapa Drive.
Meaning:		Hawaiian star said to rise on the night of Hoaka in the month of Welehu and vanishing on the night of Muku in the same month.
KAUAMEA PLACE	-	Deadend roadway off Kipapa Drive between Kiopaa Place and Hiilei Place.
Meaning:		Sacred Circlet; a Hawaiian constellation, possibly Corona Borealis.
KIOPAA PLACE	-	Deadend roadway off Kipapa Drive between Hokuao Place and Kauamea Place.

Meaning:	Immovable One, or the North Star; one of the stars eternally fixed in the heavens to guide the seaman.
HOKUAO PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Kipapa Drive between Kiopaa Place and Hiikua Place.
Meaning:	Morning star, Venus, when seen in the morning.
HIIKUA PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Kipapa Drive.
Meaning:	Hawaiian star said to rise and vanish at the same time as Hiilei.
KAALOLO PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Kipapa Drive.
Meaning:	The tutelary star of Niihau in Hawaii.
HINALANI PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Kipapa Drive between Kaalolo Place and Ikuwa Street.
Meaning:	Hina-of-the-sky; a Hawaiian star.
IKUWA STREET	- Roadway extending in a southerly direction off Kipapa Drive and being between Kipapa Drive and Kuahelani Avenue.
Meaning:	Crash of black thunder, month considered to be October-November: end of kau (dry season) having Kahela; a Hawaiian "people's star" presiding.
HOAKA PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Ikuwa Street between Kipapa Drive and Ikuwa Place.
Meaning:	Second day of the month and the name means "clear". The shape of the moon on this night, concave with the points curving up on both sides like horns.
IKUWA PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Ikuwa Street between Hoaka Place and Kukolu Street.
KUKOLU STREET	- Roadway extending in a westerly direction between Kipapa Drive and Ikuwa Street.

Meaning: First night of the rising of the moon.

KULUA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kukolu Street extending in a southerly direction between Kipapa Drive and Ikuwa Street.

Meaning: Fourth night of the moon.

NAPEHE PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kukolu Street extending in a southerly direction between Kulua Place and Ikuwa Street.

Meaning: A Hawaiian navigational star.

PAAO PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kukolu Street extending in a northerly direction between Kauopae Place and Ikuwa Street.

Meaning: A Hawaiian star mentioned by Kamohoula as one of the large group resembling a double canoe.

KAUOPAE PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kukolu Street extending in a northerly direction between Kipapa Drive and Paao Place.

Meaning: Shrimp Star; a Hawaiian name for Sirius as patron of shrimp fishing.

KIPAPA DRIVE - Extension of an existing roadway from Kuahelani Avenue in a northerly direction terminating beyond Hiikua Place and further extension in a northeasterly direction to terminate beyond Hiilei Place.

STREET NAMES HEEIA CROWN TERRACE TRACT III (4) Crown Terrace Tract III, Unit II, Heeia, Koolaupoko:

KUNEKI STREET - Roadway extending in a mauka direction off Haiku Road.

Meaning: Filled to overflowing.

KUNEKI PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kuneki Street and being between Puulau Place and Makena Street.

PUULAU PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kuneki Street.

Meaning: To increase rapidly in number.

		MAKENA STREET	- Roadway extending from Kuneki Street and terminating at the other end of Kuneki Street.
		Meaning:	- Many, numerous; often, much.
		MAKENA PLACE	Deadend roadway off Makena Street.
STREET NAMES MAKAKILO CITY	(5)	Makakilo City, Units XVI and XVII:	
		NOHONA STREET	- Extension of an existing roadway to its terminus just past Moaka Street.
		Meaning:	Dwelling, residence.
		NOHONA PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Nohona Street being between Akaula Street and Wainohia Street.
		WAINOHIA STREET	- Roadway extending in a mauka-makai direction off Nohona Street.
		Meaning:	Safe, safety.
		WAINOHIA PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Wainohia Street.
		WAINOHIA WAY	- Deadend roadway off Wainohia Place.
		MOAKA STREET	- Roadway extending in a mauka direction and being between Nohona Street and Kohupono Street.
		Meaning:	The clouds stand clear.
		KOHUPONO STREET	- Roadway off Wainohia Street extending past Moaka Street looping to terminate at Moaka Street.
		Meaning:	Decent, upright.
STREET NAMES HALAWA AND KANEOHE HAWAII HOUSING AUTHORITY PROJECTS	(6)	Hawaii Housing Authority Project HA 1-26 in Halawa Project HA 1-30 in Kaneohe:	
		<u>Project HA 1-26</u>	
		KOHOMUA STREET	- Roadway extending in a mauka direction from Kamehameha Highway to its terminus at Kalaloa Street.
		Meaning:	First choice.
		<u>Project HA 1-30</u>	
		KAMAU PLACE	- Deadend roadway extending in a northeasterly direction and being between Anoi Road and Kahekili Highway.

Meaning: To keep on, continue, persevere.

STREET NAMES AHUIMANU SUBDIVISION

(7) Ahuimanu Subdivision, Units 2A and 2B, Tax Key 4-7-04: portion of 1

UNIT 2A

HUI ULILI STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a mauka direction terminating at Hui Kelu Street.

HUI KELU STREET - Roadway extending in a mauka direction off Hui Iwa Street and terminating just past Hui Ulili Street.

Meaning: Society of Quails.

UNIT 2B

HUI KELU STREET - Roadway extending in a makai direction off Hui Iwa Street.

HUI PALILA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Hui Kelu Street.

Meaning: Society of Finches.

Roadways within this entire subdivision are to be prefixed by the work "HUI" which literally interpreted means "SOCIETY".

The former units in the Ahuimanu Subdivision in in its street names has the second word designating birds.

STREET NAMES KALIHI ANGCO SUBDIVISION

(8) Angco Subdivision, Kalihi, Tax Key 1-3-12: 60:

KEHA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kamehameha IV Road between Owen Street and Rose Street.

Meaning: Height, Pride, Dignity, Lofty.

STREET NAMES PEARL CITY HALE OLA DEVELOPMENT

(9) Hale Ola Development, Pearl City, Tax Key 9-2-24: 27.

HALE OLA STREET - Roadway extending in a mauka direction running between Acacia Road and Hooli Circle Road.

Meaning: House of Life and Health.

HOOLA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Hale Ola Street.

Meaning: To save, heal, cure, spare; salvation, healer, salvation.

The requirements for private roadways have been met.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL BUDGET ORDINANCE AND C.I.P. FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968-1969 SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 7

The Commission reviewed Bill No. 69 entitled: "Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 7. An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 3188, as amended, relating to Capital Improvements of the City and County of Honolulu for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969."

The Director reviewed the staff report.

Mr. Chun reported that he discussed these projects with Jacob Pyo, staff planner and it is his understanding that no additional funds to the C.I.P. will be necessary and that the funds for these projects will be derived from projects which have lapsed from this fiscal year.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, recommended approval of Bill No. 69, Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 7.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director. However, the Commission recommended that the Conditional Use Permit application by SCOPE Corporation and the amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Ewa Beach be initiated for public hearings on different meeting days:

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT MANOA OFF PAMOA ROAD SCOPE CORPORATION

(1) Conditional Use Permit to construct dormitory facilities on two sites comprising an area of approximately 260,101 square feet located off Pamoa Road in Manoa within an R-4 Residential District.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) HAWAII-KAI MAUKA CORNER OF KALANIANAOLE HIGHWAY AND LUNALILO HOME ROAD COMMERCIAL USE (BISHOP ESTATE, OWNER) (KAISER HAWAII-KAI DEVELOPMENT CO., DEVELOPER)

(2) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Hawaii-Kai by changing the land use designation from Residential to Commercial use for an area of 3 acres situated at the mauka corner of Kalanianaole Highway and Lunalilo Home Road in Hawaii-Kai.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) DELETION OF THE HART STREET EXTENSION

(3) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map by deleting the Hart Street Extension.

GENERAL PLAN
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
KAILUA

(4) Adoption of the Development Plan for Kailua for area bounded by Kawainui Drainage Canal, Kawainui Swamp, Kaelepulu Stream and the Shoreline.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
EWA BEACH

(5) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Ewa Beach by changing the land use designation from Apartment to Residential use.

The Director reported that this was discussed at the previous meeting in which the Commission had asked for a report from the Corporation Counsel relating to the initiation of an amendment by the appropriate parties and the Corporation Counsel indicated that there are two avenues to initiate amendments to the General Plan:

(1) through initiation or recommendation by the Planning Department through its Director; or

(2) through the City Council.

INFORMATION
BILL NO. 114, A
PROPOSED ORDINANCE
RELATING TO DEDICATION
OF LAND FOR PARKS
AND PLAYGROUND OR THE
PAYMENT OF MONEY IN
LIEU THEREOF

The Commission reviewed Bill No. 114, an Ordinance to amend Chapter 22, R. O. 1961, as amended, by adding thereto a new article to be numbered Article 6, relating to Dedication of Land for Parks and Playgrounds or the Payment of Money in lieu thereof, as a condition precedent to final approval of a Subdivision.

The Director reported that a letter was received from the Department of Parks and Recreation endorsing this ordinance.

Mr. Yamabe pointed out that Mr. Rutledge had indicated that there is an enabling act which was passed in 1967. He does not know whether there is any time limit involved for the Counties to enact such an ordinance, however, he did not want to create another problem such as at Diamond Head. He requested a written opinion from legal counsel as to whether or not the ordinance should be adopted before the Commission could proceed any further.

Legal Counsel Jeremiah reported that the State Law enables the Counties to set up the regulations. Until this is done, the Commission cannot require anyone to dedicate land.

Mr. Chun inquired whether the Commission should not take action on zoning requests for large parcels until this enabling legislation is enacted.

Mr. Yamabe recalled that Legal Counsel Jeremiah indicated this is a law and it could be mandatory; however, as far as he was concerned, the Commission is not in violation of the State Law.

Mr. Sharpless believed that it might be desirable to look up the Committee Report.

The Director wondered whether the State could mandate legislative action to be taken by the local government, or whether the State could do it itself.

He further commented particularly in reference to the Kahuku area that the ordinance which was proposed is essentially for the neighborhood type of park facility. The other question is on the next level of park facility of a regional park or an area wide park. In other words, to what degree are the landowners, subdividers, and developers expected to be responsible to provide either land or money for the purchase of land. Is there to be a cut-off point wherein the municipalities assume a responsibility; e.g., at the regional park level, State park level, for the acquisition. However, he pointed out that the proposed bill was primarily at the neighborhood park level and did not go beyond that.

Although the act refers to a subdivision and the request under consideration is not a subdivision request, Mr. Brennan believed that the request by Del Webb Corporation will become a subdivision inasmuch as it will incorporate apartment houses and residential.

Mr. Chun felt that the minimum standards must be spelled out in the ordinance to be effective. He inquired of legal counsel as to why the ordinance did not go beyond second reading before the Council.

Legal Counsel Jeremiah reported that the primary reason the ordinance was sent back to the Planning Department is because the Council felt that this type of ordinance was discriminating against, to a certain extent, to developed lands versus undeveloped lands.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, instructed the Director to submit a draft of the ordinance as soon as possible encompassing the standards requested by the City Council as to developed areas which the Commission may review and submit to the City Council for recommendation for passage.

MISCELLANEOUS
REQUEST FOR MORE
COMMISSION
MEMBERS

At the request of the Commission, Mr. Brennan will inform the Mayor of the critical need for more Commission members.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie M. Abbott
Hearings Reporter

Special Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
June 5, 1969

The Planning Commission met in special session on Thursday, June 5, 1969, at 9:00 a.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Acting Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT: Philip T. Chun, Acting Chairman
Arthur A. Rutledge
Ed Sheehan
Lewis Ingleson
Fredda Sullam
James K. Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Moon

ABSENT: Edward Brennan
Thomas N. Yamabe II

PERSONNEL NEW MEMBERS: The two new Commission members, Mrs. Fredda Sullam and Mr. Lewis Ingleson, were welcomed to the Planning Commission.

MINUTES: The minutes of the regular meetings of March 6 and 20 and April 3 and 17, 1969, and the special meeting of April 17, 1969, as circulated, were approved upon the motion of Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Sheehan.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
AMENDMENT TO THE CIP FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1969-1970

Way: Mr. Chairman, this is the CIP being returned to the Planning Commission from the City Council with their recommendations. The CIP for Fiscal Year 1969-1970 was adopted May 29, 1969, by the City Council and has been referred to the Planning Commission to review the amendments proposed by the Council and to consider revisions to the CIP in line with these recommended proposals.

In summary, the increase is to a total of 33 projects for an estimated dollar amount of 7 million dollars and a decrease of 42 projects for a reduction of $4,064,000. This gives then a net increase to the CIP of $2,732,000.

The principal amendments are for,

First, the Honolulu Municipal Stadium. An increase of one million dollars over the Administration and Mayor's CIP. The purpose of this additional fund is to press for working drawings or to contract with the Governor for said drawings on a matching fund basis.

The second major change is a reduction of $900,000 in the project, Diamond Head Monument Area. This is a change in scope to hire appraisers for an accurate cost of land instead of going directly into land acquisition.

The third major item is the Waimalu Stream Flood Control of $1,194,000. The basis for this is to increase construction as requested by the Public Works Department.

The fourth major change is the Traffic Operations Program of $600,000. This is to accelerate plans and construction to relieve traffic congestion.

There is in the report to the Commission, further detailed breakdown indicating the specifics of some of the proposals and the details are shown in the report attached. There has been no other significant change made by the Council. It is the recommendation that approval of all the amendments be recommended. They are in conformity with the General Plan and within the realm of legislative direction and control.

There are two items that require clarification in the descriptive portions. The first item is Administrative Facilities for City. Revised scope to delete square footage and agencies listed should be amended to read "Administrative Facilities for City. Revised scope from construction to P & E and to delete square footage and agencies listed..."

The second one is the Bethel-King Off-Street Parking Facility on page 12 of BCR No. 1 should be amended from "Explanation in detail the use of planning and engineering funds for demolition and surface improvements..." to "Explanation in detail the use of planning and engineering funds for the structure and construction funds for demolition and surface improvements..." These are simply typographical errors in the Committee Report and the corrections would reflect the intent of the Council.

This essentially represents our report to the Commission, Mr. Chairman, and should you have further questions or comments on the CIP will you please discuss it further.

Chun: Are there any questions of the Director by members of the Commission?

Sheehan: Why does it cost so much to hire appraisers--$900,000?

Way: It would be actually no harm. It would be a reduction of $900,000 and a net amount remaining of $100,000 which was for the purpose of appraisal, and actually, the intent of Council, as I understand it, well, the specific work refers to "appraisers" so that the $100,000 in the Budget would actually be available for other surveys or investigations that might be appropriate in the Diamond Head area.

Chun: Mr. Director, would this $100,000 be involved in any perspective study of the Diamond Head area with respect to the possibility of a moratorium on construction?

Way: It might be, Mr. Chairman. There was some discussion about the amount of money even in the $100,000 level for appraisal purposes since it was understood that it is not the Council's intent to actually prepare appraisals that would be suitable for acquisition purposes but rather it would be a broad appraisal type of approach.

Chun: Mr. Sharpless.

Sharpless: Mr. Chairman, may I speak on that point?

Chun: Yes.

Sharpless: I think the overall framework is this. Corporation Counsel advised the Council that in order to justify a moratorium, it would have to be in connection with some sort of plan and that the appraisal is for the purpose of determining what sort of plan shall be adopted or to put that in different words, it could be the first step in a plan, to that extent, what can be the moratorium idea.

Chun: So the description of appraisers is not limited to a land appraisal type of operation?

Sharpless: Well, yes and no. It may, for example, include the appraisal of air rights.

Chun: I was just wondering whether the language in the bill itself would be too restrictive for the purpose that the County may desire to use the funds?

Way: In that connection, Mr. Chairman, Council Chairman has asked the Planning Department and the Parks and Recreation Department to submit wording that would broaden the scope somewhat from that just appraised and this would be taken up by the Council.

Chun: Fine. Any further questions of the Director? Mr. Rutledge.

Rutledge: Perhaps Mr. Sharpless or anyone might answer this. Does this mean that the $100,000 available, that $100,000 need not necessarily include and may lay there, or a very small amount distributed, used and serve the purpose of a moratorium of holding back any further inspection?

Sharpless: In answer to your first question as to whether it has to be used, that depends on whether this ordinance is enacted. The Mayor allots CIP money for that purpose. In other words, this would be an appropriation by Council of $100,000 for the purpose of appraisal. The authorization to spend it as in any CIP authorization, has to be subject to allotment by the head of the Executive Branch so to answer your first question, it would be used up if the Mayor so allots it.

Rutledge: His purpose is to stop construction on Diamond Head and this passage of this takes some sort of plan. The fund allotment of $100,000 is given to the Mayor, whether its spent or not is his business.

Sharpless: I'm speculating when I answer this question. You might run into a legal question. If a plan in connection with Diamond Head is not moving forward some property owner down there could go to court and challenge it. Suppose the property owner wants a building permit and assuming for the purpose of my answer, an ordinance is enacted making a moratorium, he could challenge that moratorium and challenge the validity of that ordinance unless there is some definite plan to back it up because that moratorium is based upon exercise of the police power.

Rutledge: I can see a little race coming.

Chun: Any further questions of the Director?
Ladies and gentlemen, what is your pleasure?

Rutledge: I move that we concur with the revised CIP recommendation.

Chun: Do I hear a second?

Sullam: Well, I, I'm not prepared to vote on this as yet. I would have to study the whole CIP.

Chun: I'm afraid we are a little behind schedule at the present time. I believe under the present time table, this matter has to be before the Council prior to the 17th of June for action. We had this before us in the past and I think we have been behind schedule all year. Mr. Director, you can correct me on that, unless we act within ten days of receipt of the amendment, the Council can act without our recommendation.

Sharpless: I don't have a copy of the Charter before me but they have to enact the ordinance at least, within 15 days before the beginning of the fiscal year, July 1, and these Council amendments are before the Planning Commission for action and if the Planning Commission doesn't act within ten days, the Council can go ahead whether the Commission has acted or not and of course with the Charter limitation as to when it should act, if the Commission doesn't get it back, the point is the Council can act on it anyway.

Rutledge: The staff, administration, the City Council are all in good faith in presenting their.....

Chun: I think the Planning Department worked on the CIP approximately in February of this year and it was presented to the Planning Commission approximately in April. Commission took action on the original CIP and in April it was submitted to the Mayor from the Planning Commission. From the Mayor it went to the City Council and at this point it came back to the Commission with the Council's amendment which was originally drafted by the Planning Department and gone to the Mayor with the recommendation of the Planning Commission. We acted on this once before. What we are acting on the present moment is the amendments made to the CIP by the Council itself.

Sheehan: Express to Mrs. Sullam, on behalf of us old timers, that she has been only five minutes in the meeting and she has encountered her first frustration.

Chun: There is a motion on the table. Do I hear a second to the motion of Mr. Rutledge?

Sheehan: Second.

Chun: It has been moved and seconded that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the amendment made by the City Council to the CIP. Is there any discussion? If not, all those in favor signify by raising their right hand. Opposed. Carried unanimously.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
AMENDMENT TO THE CIP FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1968-1969
(SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 8)

Chun: The next is CIP Supplementary No. 8, Mr. Director?

Way: Mr. Chairman, this is a recommendation for concurrence of Bill No. 85, Capital Improvement Supplementary Number 8 which passed second reading by the City Council on June 3, 1969. The Bill has been referred to the Planning Commission for review and comments. Copies of the Bill, I believe, have been distributed to you. This Bill provides additional funds for five projects. Two projects for Fire Protection in the amount of $52,101; one project for Flood Control in the amount of $30,000; and two projects for Participant Recreation in the amount of $346,000. The total of the five projects is $428,101. The total City-financed CIP for Fiscal Year 1968-1969 will be $46,189,772 if this supplement is approved as proposed. This compares with $43,407,000 CIP proposed by the Council for Fiscal Year 1969-1970. The requests are for additional funds to cover previously authorized projects that are underfunded as a result of increased construction and equipment bids. The departments affected will need to move expeditiously in order to expend or encumber these funds during the remaining few weeks of this fiscal year. The projects are in conformity with the General Plan and are recommended for approval.

The Bill sets forth the particulars of this. The first item happens to do with the Hawaii-Kai Fire Station. The increase is in the order of $48,000 and this cost is approving the budget amendment. It is roughly in the order of 25% increase in construction cost. As I recall, the amount estimated is $190,000. The other Fire Department item involves equipment and this is an increase, relatively nominal amount of budget item. The Public Works Flood Control item. This one is a $30,000 increase in construction, in the estimated construction cost of $1.2 million dollars, a rather nominal, construction-wise, increase of construction cost.

The Department of Parks and Recreation item totals $346,000 for the Kahuku and Leeward Golf Courses of $21,000 and $325,000 respectively. It is our recommendation that the increase in cost of the supplemental items be approved.

Chun: Any question of the Director by members of the Commission? Jimmy, all these contracts have been let out for bid and the monies are available, is that correct?

Sakai: Yes.

Rutledge: Mr. Chairman, I recommend approval.

Sheehan: Second

Chun: (vote taken) Carried.

(Recess called. Mrs. Sullam and Mr. Ingleson were called to the Mayor's Office.)

Chun: Before we go further, I think we can now officially recognize Mrs. Sullam and Mr. Ingleson officially to the Planning Commission.

Rutledge: I move that the Commission officially once again approve the two previous motions that happens to be on the CIP budget items.

Sheehan: Second.

Chun: It has been moved and seconded that the Commission ratify the actions taken for the two previous items. Is there any discussion? If not, signify by raising your hand. Carried.

ZONING H-1 RESORT-HOTEL
MAKAHA
84-325 MAKAU STREET
MRS. MAHEALANI J. FERNANDEZ
BY: JAMES TRASK

Way: Mr. Chairman, for purposes of orientation to the Planning Commission, referring to the map on the wall, this being the portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Makaha, this is Farrington Highway and the Makaha Surfing Beach and beach park. This is the resort development in the Makaha Valley. Subject property is located on the Detailed Land Use Map planned as an area for resort purpose. The total parcel of 31,000 square feet which is in fact three lots is shown on the plan here--this being Farrington Highway, this Kaena Point--the Honolulu side. There is a loop road with an access road out on the Makaha side and an entrance from Farrington Highway. This being the shoreline, a portion of the shoreline in Makaha Beach area and the red, the parcel under consideration. Also shown is the preliminary plot plan indicating approximate location of the proposed six-story structure which incidentally, needs some refining in terms of the new requirements under the CZC.

As a matter of background information, a public hearing on this application was held on October 17, 1968, and the matter was taken under advisement by the Commission. Commission's deliberations resulted in a decision to defer action until receipt of more information on the matter concerning a deed restriction on the property. Since the public hearing held on October 17, 1968, no further data was submitted on this matter and the application was brought to the attention of the Planning Commission again on May 15, this year. During this meeting, the Commission asked the staff to conduct a field check of the area to further ascertain land uses, existing road conditions, availability of utilities and other matters. We have some further information in this regard and would like to report to you.

Again, for orientation on this map, this being Farrington Highway here and the entrance road to the property, this being the property in question. The first photograph is the view of a parcel across the street indicating the general character of the mauka section up into the valley. The second view is of Makaha Shores, an existing resort designation here, I guess, this is primarily a condominium form of hotels and hotel-apartment use. View number three is an adjoining property, duplex; number four, simply indicates the beach area, the beach park; five, resort designated area, present use, empty lot, here; six, is Makau Street which is a vacant parcel, this is the intersection here. No. seven, a parcel immediately back of the intersection indicates single-family dwelling development. Parcel No. 8 is across the intersection and is occupied by an abandoned quonset hut and bushes. No. 9 is a view of the parcel, resort on the Detailed Land Use Map, both lots contain single-family dwellings. Views Nos. 10 and 11 are along the roadway, this shows Makau Street here and Holt Street which are 44-foot rights-of-way with a 20-foot asphalt pavements without curbs, gutters, or sidewalks. There are cesspools in the area and electricity, of course, is provided. No. 12, the corner parcel is in residential use, residential on the Detailed Land Use Map and the present use is

residential, occupied by a quonset hut used as a single-family dwelling. No. 13, this end parcel, this is in the resort area again and utilized for single-family dwelling purposes. No. 14, across the street, single-family residence. Generally speaking, the area fronting on Makau Street and Holt Street are in single-family residential use with a few vacant lots. The resort facilities on the adjacent area consist of Makaha Shores Hotel which has 88 units and is located immediately adjacent to the beach park on Farrington Highway. The paving as indicated is a 20-foot pavement on both Makau Street and Holt Street and the City's standard for this type of roadway is a minimum 40-foot right-of-way with a 26-foot pavement including curbs and gutters with a 7-foot strip on each side for sidewalks. This would be the minimum requirement of the City for single-family residential use. Overhead pole lines provide electric power and street lights for the area. Waterlines are provided throughout the subdivision. However, the present sewerage system involves the use of cesspools.

Recent staff investigations confirm the findings of the original report relating to utilities, roads and land uses in the area. In addition, we find that only two exit-entrances for the Makau Street subdivision area are available to Farrington Highway. It is apparent that the Makau Street intersection with Farrington Highway would be heavily used since the major direction of primary destination areas is towards Waianae town. Assuming that only about half of the residents would use the Makau Street exit-entrance to Farrington Highway, approximately 60 lots in the area would be served. The zoning sought under the new CZC involves the H-1 Resort Hotel District which was intended to provide medium density hotel areas for general application in the City and County. Additionally, the principal uses within a Resort-Hotel District is specified for hotels and other park and playground uses, including public utilities installations. The Comprehensive Zoning Code is silent on the matter of apartment uses as proposed under the applicant's plan. Therefore, apartment uses are prohibited within an H-1 Resort Hotel District.

In summary, in view of the lack of public facilities in the area, especially relating to roads and in view of the approximate doubling of traffic volume at Makau Street and Farrington Highway, should a 90 percent increase in units for the area be allowed, and in view of the protest of the Makaha Civic Association and other citizens in the area, it is the recommendation of the Planning Department staff that this application for rezoning from an R-3 Residential area to an H-1 Resort Hotel area be denied at this time.

Chun: Thank you, Mr. Director. Are there any questions directed by members of the Commission? Would you like to look at the pictures first?

(Apparently looking at pictures.)

Chun: Members of the Commission. If not, ladies and gentlemen, what is your pleasure? Yes, Mr. Trask.

James Trask: Mr. Chairman, is it possible for me to be heard on this matter?

Chun: Yes, in view of the fact that we have two new Commission members, Mr. Trask will you come forward, although this is not a public hearing.

Trask: Thank you very much. The latest report is a complete reversal of the report that was made in June 10th of 1968 by the staff which recommended at that particular time that this request be granted. Now, all of these factors which the present report points out were taken into consideration at that particular time and I have not seen the report other than what was presented here, but I would like to ask, if I may Mr. Chairman, whether the matter of one of the conditions against denying the request for rezoning is that of this matter of possible traffic hazard. Is that right, Mr. Way?

Way: We felt that the matter of traffic in terms of the street improvements as well as the number of lots served by that one entrance accessway off Farrington Highway was a consideration.

Trask: This matter originally, when the petition was filed, was referred to all the departments--Traffic, water and sewers, and they gave their approval one hundred percent at that particular time. The boundary of the property exists only about 200 feet away from Farrington Highway. Now, I certainly can't see at this particular time that there is such a vast change at this particular time, that this petition should be denied. I mean, this is a complete reversal of the report made by the same people, that has come back and in this subsequent report they are recommending denial of the petition.

If I may I would like to quote at this time and this is signed and this was filed on the 6th of June. "The new development plan indicates that cavittete and seepage pit sewage system will be installed to take care of the development. It is recommended that this matter be processed for rezoning on the basis that: 1) it conforms to the Waianae DLUM; 2) water is adequate and available; 3) a sewage system will be installed; and 4) the development plans comply with the Resort-Hotel District No. 1 regulations."

I mean, it complies 100% with the requirements as set down by the City Planning Commission for a rezoning. I hate to use the words but it seems to me, at this particular time, that I would say that the present recommendation certainly does not warrant a denial of this request for rezoning. In lieu of the fact that it hasn't been that long, I mean, I can't see a tremendous change in the area that it would make that much difference at this particular time, and since the property is practically off Farrington Highway, the adjoining areas are resort, and as a matter of fact, the second increment of this particular adjoining area is being built. Across the street in Makaha Valley, more development is being put in, condominium, hotel, resort. On the makai side of the property is a right-of-way to the beach for the general public. On Farrington Highway there is a big park. So recreational facilities and the matter of utilizing the beach is taken care of, so nobody, at this particular time, the way the property is being situated, is being hurt by the request for a change in zoning.

Chun: Are there any questions of Mr. Trask by members of the Commission? Mr. Rutledge.

Rutledge: Mr. Trask, did you receive a copy of the report?

Trask: No, I didn't get a copy of the staff's report.

Rutledge: I think if you did, on the second page it cites some reasons.

Trask: No, it was not made available to me. I was not aware of the report other than what was read to me now.

Rutledge: It seems to me that interested parties ought to have a copy of the report, the reasons behind it and so on and be able to intelligently answer some of the questions.

Trask: I did go down to try and get a report but it was refused. They said they can't let the report out unless it was first shown to the Planning Commission.

Chun: I think Mr. Rutledge has a valid point. I think a policy should be discussed by the Commission as to reports being made available to applicants prior to the hearings so that the applicant is made aware of what the report includes.

Rutledge: Several months ago, we were meeting over at the Salvation Army there, the same thing came up. It would be just like being faced with a charge without knowing what it's all about and not being able to answer it. There seems to be on the second page, the reasons the Planning Commission had in the past of not gone along with it. It seems to be it was rezoned by action of the Board of Supervisors or the City Council and the Planning Commission should be consistent with it so it seems to me that Mr. Trask or any representative of the owner should be able to go to the Planning Director or someone designated to discuss these things ahead of time so they can be prepared.

Way: This is a policy issue. This is the point that I wanted to raise with the Commission as to their wishes since you have a number of new members. Apparently, it has been the previous policy for the Commission to receive the report first and then have it made available to others. We're open to suggestion as to what might be the best approach to this.

Rutledge: Mr. Chairman, I move that the hearing be closed and the matter be taken under advisement.

Chun: The hearing has been closed. I think the matter can be taken under advisement.

Trask: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Chun: Yes, Mr. Trask.

Trask: Isn't this area designated under the General Plan as resort-hotel?

Way: Yes, that is correct, but may I make a point. The application is for an apartment and this would not be in conformity with the Detailed Land Use Map, the General Plan.

Trask: It is our intention, Mr. Way, Mr. Chairman, that this would be for a condominium type of development.

Way: That would still not be permitted under the resort zoning.

Trask: Isn't this H-1 apartment?

Way: No. H-1 resort.

Trask: H-1 resort, so it has to be hotel?

Way: Yes.

Trask: Then it would be in conformity to.

Way: If you are changing it from apartment to resort.

Trask: This is the only way, you are saying, we are not in a position under the existing ordinance to put a condominium type of development. Is that what you are saying?

Way: Under the zoning it would be hotels, that is correct.

Trask: We cannot have a condominium type of development as it exists now?

Way: Under the requirements of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, no.

Trask: If it was rezoned, then we would be able to file a condominium type of development?

Chun: No.

Trask: No, then this is what I'm not too clear.

Chun: I think what the Director is getting at, Mr. Trask, is that even with the rezoning, to comply with the Detailed Land Use Map, you would still not be able to develop a condominium type of an operation.

Trask: So the only development that would be forthcoming there, if it were rezoned would be a hotel type of development?

Chun: Right.

Trask: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Rutledge: I don't think you should go away with the impression, that's it, because you got to comply with other things.

Chun: It's been moved that this matter be taken under advisement. Do I hear a second to the motion?

Sheehan: Second.

Chun: Any discussion? If not, there is no dicussion. All in favor of the motion please signify by raising your right hand? Carried.

Trask: Is it all right if I keep this copy?

Chun: Yes.

<u>Later Discussion</u>:

Chun: We now come back to Item 3 on the agenda, a matter which was taken under advisement as to the proposed rezoning to H-1 Resort-Hotel by Mrs. Fernandez. Ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Rutledge.

Rutledge: I suggest that we carry this over and discuss this when the other two Commissioners are here at the next meeting and in the meantime also to see whether Mr. Trask can get together with Mr. Way and possibly, as you expressed here, if he changes his request to hotel use they will still have some problem. It seems as though there is something wrong here. When we said no, the staff said no, the City Council said yes.

Chun: Will someone want to second that motion before we go into discussion?

Sheehan: Second the motion.

Chun: Moved and seconded that this matter be deferred until the next meeting. Is there any discussion?

Bob, before I forget, on this matter, Mr. Trask indicated that the staff recommended approval on June 6, 1968. If I remember correctly at the hearing that we did have on this item, and maybe Dick can correct me, the staff had recommended denial at that time on the basis that it was premature, traffic and sewer facilities were not adequate and a couple of other things.

Sharpless: That's my recollection, but it's real hazy.

Way: Maybe the minutes of the meeting at which time the public hearing was held could be checked and I'll report back to the Commission.

Chun: Is there further discussion on this matter? If not will you signify by raising your right hand. Opposed, carried.

STREET NAMES PUULOA, EWA EWA ESTATES, UNIT II SUBDIVISION

The Commission upon the motion by Mrs. Sullam, seconded by Mr. Sheehan, recommended approval of the following street names for roadways within the Ewa Estates, Unit II Subdivision at Puuloa, Ewa:

KEI PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kehue Street between Kehue Place and Keele Place.
Meaning: To glory in, take pride in, dignified.

KEELE PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kehue Street between Kei Place and Kekaihili Place.
Meaning: Great, excessive.

KEKAIHILI PLACE - Deadend roadway off Kehue Street.
Meaning: Furlong, stadia, in surveying.

LAUPAPA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Laupapa Street between Kehue Street and Lakana Place.
Meaning: A broad flat, as of coral, lava, reef.

LAKANA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Laupapa Street between Laupapa Place and Kauwili Street.
Meaning: Lantana, a thorny, tropical American bush.

KAUWILI STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a mauka direction between Lakana Place and Lapine Place.

LAPINE PLACE - Deadend roadway off Laupapa Street between Kauwili Street and Lawalu Place.
Meaning: Lemon Grass.

LAWALU PLACE - Deadend roadway off Laupapa Street between Lapine Place and Hanakahi Street.
Meaning: Fish or meat bound in ti leaves and broiled on coals.

LIPAKI PLACE - Deadend roadway off Laupapa Street between Hanakahi Street and Liuliu Place.
Meaning: Liberty.

LIULIU PLACE - Deadend roadway off Laupapa Street between Lipaki Place and Haiamu Street.
Meaning: Prepared, ready.

HAIAMU STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a mauka direction.

HAIWA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Haiamu Street between Haimu Place and Laupapa Street.
Meaning: To plant far apart, as taro, coconuts.

HAIANO PLACE - Deadend roadway off Haiamu Street.
Meaning: To describe, tell the nature of.

KAPANA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Laupapa Street between Haiamu Street and Keakula Place.
Meaning: A slender native shrub.

KEAKAULA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Laupapa Street between Kapana Place and Hanakahi Street.
Meaning: Box, a tree or shrub.

KEKAKIA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Laupapa Street between Hanakahi Street and Keleawe Place.
Meaning: Furlong, stadia, in surveying.

KELEAWE PLACE - Deadend roadway off Laupapa Street between Kekakia Place and Kauwili Street.
Meaning: One who makes brass, copper or tin articles.

KEMIKA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Laupapa Street between Kauwili Street and Keena Place.
Meaning: Chemist, chemical.

KEENA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Laupapa Street between Kemika Place and Kehue Street.
Meaning: Office, room, booth.

(b) Momilani Suburb Unit X-C at Manana-Uka in Waimano, Ewa:

HOOUI PLACE - Deadend roadway off Komo Mai Drive proceeding in a northwesterly direction and being between Hoomoana Street and Hoolehua Street.
Meaning: To beautify, make beautiful.

STREET NAMES
KAPALAMA
KAPALAMA
IMPROVEMENT
DISTRICT NO. 158,
UNITS II & III

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Ingleson, seconded by Mr. Sheehan, recommended approval of the following street name changes for roadways within the Kapalama Improvement District No. 158, Units II and III, at Kapalama.

McNEILL STREET - Extension and realignment of an existing roadway to begin at Kalani Street including a former portion of Kahanu Street thence going to its terminus at Waiakamilo Road.

KAHANU STREET - Delete only that portion of roadway from Kalakaua Intermediate School to Waiakamilo Street from further usage.

KAIWIULA STREET - Delete only that former portion of roadway from Kalani Street to Kahanu (now McNeill) Street. (Now roadway extending from McNeill Street to Alokele Street being between Kalakaua School and Kaahumanu Homes.)

WINANT STREET - Delete only that former portion of roadway from Kalani Street to Kahanu (now McNeill) Street. (Now roadway extending from King Street to Alokele Street between Waiakamilo Road and Kalihi Street.)

LIBBY STREET - Delete only that former portion from Kalani Street extending mauka to Kaumualii Street. (Now roadway extending mauka from Auiki Street to Oahu Railway and Land right-of-way between Waiakamilo Road and Kalihi Street.)

HAU STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a makai direction to terminate at Kalani Street and includes a portion of the former Libby Street.

KAUMUALII STREET - Delete only that former portion from Kalihi Street to Kahanu (now McNeill) Street.

COMPREHENSIVE ZONING CODE
AMENDMENTS

Chun: Next are items to be authorized for public hearing. Mr. Director.

Way: Mr. Chairman, the Planning Department has initiated amendments to the Comprehensive Zoning Code concerning a number of items and in general I would like to say that we have found in about five months of administration of the Comprehensive Zoning Code that there were areas where clarifications were indicated and where some modifications of the Code were in order.

Specifically, we are proposing a redefinition of Family, Ground Elevation and Retaining Walls, Front Yards, Fences and Walls in Yards, Cluster Developments, Conditional Uses in Agricultural, Residential Districts and Accessory Uses in Residential Districts. Also Height Provisions in Preservation, Agricultural, and Residential Districts, and A-1 Apartment Districts. Mr. Jack Gilliam of the Planning Department staff will review the proposals more specifically.

I would comment that we request and recommend that public hearings be authorized for these zoning code amendments.

Jack Gilliam: We would first like to briefly explain the background, the present and the proposed provisions of the CZC.

Sharpless: Mr. Chairman, may I make one observation before they start?

Chun: Yes, Mr. Sharpless.

Sharpless: Simply to indicate the speed of the passage of time. Now the family definition is changing in only five months. (Laughter)

Gilliam: We have two sets here. The first one, we have several of these amendments on this particular one relating to the problem of retaining walls, walls, and yards and ground elevation which intermix in the enforcement of this particular section. We are redefining "ground elevation" and in the Code presently, "ground elevation" is the elevation at the buildable area boundary line which is the line within the yard requirement. The proposed amendment will take "ground elevation" at the property line which happens to be the intent of the previous Code but somehow in the final draft it was changed to this total area boundary line, so the "ground elevation" definition would be established as the natural elevation at the side and rear boundaries and the elevation of any sidewalk on any street side or the property line would have been the sidewalk. There are three definitions we are editing.

The other one is the definition of "family". The present definition includes those people related by blood or marriage as a family. In addition, any domestic servants employed on the premises and four or five unrelated people living in a dwelling could be classified as a family. We also have within the definition of family, having up to three roomers within two rooms. The problem we have run into is that through interpretation, a family is five unrelated people plus the three roomers which make eight people living in a dwelling and considered a "family". So this is to further define our original intent that three roomers cannot be added on to five unrelated people. This is a clarification

really, we are putting the roomers in as accessory use rather than within the definition of a "family". The five unrelated people would be in lieu of the related people and to domestic servants.

We are adding a definition of "retaining wall" so that we can make a distinction between a regular wall and a retaining wall. The definition of a "retaining wall" here would be the definition of a retaining wall which is "any wall which function is to resist the lateral displacement of any material."

We have a redefinition of how to measure yard. (Points out illustration -- on wall) Presently we measure -- front yard would be, in this case, the front yard requirement here 10 feet -- this line would be 10 feet back, but on curved streets, the definition relates from property line to property line cord, the yard requirement would be parallel to that cord so on a cul-de-sacs, this in effect would be the requirements. Sometimes this line is on a steep grade, and here it would be the front yard requirement. To curve this way -- here is your cord, we have much more front yard as requiring in this particular one. These two have been giving us problem in that there are some very peculiar shaped lots. Sometimes this might be extended all around the yard, extend right across and take up more area. The new definition would make the yard definition parallel to property lines.

We have a long amendment relating to yards or walls and fences within yard requirements. The present definition says that no wall or fence can exceed 30 inches above ground elevation. This gives us particular problems on slopes whereby the ground elevation is established here, (Pointing out illustrations on the board) but the problem is here. So by moving the ground elevation back here, the proposal is to allow a 6-foot retaining wall and here we can make a distinction between a regular wall and a retaining wall. We will allow under the new amendment, a 6-foot wall along any property line or a retaining wall of 6 feet. Presently, here, they could build a 6-foot wall here but not a retaining wall because the retaining wall would be limited to 30 inches. This gives a peculiar situation, property line to property line, at the buildable area boundary line to do that they are allowed a 6-foot retaining wall. This area, for fill purposes, which would allow, at this line a 6-foot wall and a line to fill. On a cut then there would be no line, the retaining wall could come down, they could have a 6-foot wall, the ground elevation could be established on the property line.

The primary thinking in limiting the retaining walls or building up on the street side was for visibility from driveway and so forth -- the safety factor in coming out of a driveway. In allowing this 6-foot fill in the front now, we have added in a visibility triangle coming from the driveway 10 feet out, 10 feet in and within this visibility triangle, nothing including walls could be built in excess of 30 inches thus preserving the safety factor in driving out of a driveway where you have a sidewalk and not being able to see anyone coming out of the sidewalk. This 30 inches would be measured parallel to the elevation of this driveway because your driveway is going to be coming down and so any point within this triangle, no higher than 30 inches above the elevation perpendicular to that particular point. In essence, it would maintain the safety factor and visibility to get, allow for little more flexibility on sloped lots.

There is also a sentence in here that allows the Director to review plans of walls which exceed the 6 feet and provides that other conditions can be attached, especially where we do have very peculiar topographic situations and where the 6-foot wall would not be proper. Instead of going through a variance and all the technical problems, we would have some flexibility in that regard.

We also have an amendment to our cluster development and this takes in page 4. All this does is change one word from "less" to "more" and this is relating to the area of the cluster development where you reduce the common area into open space. We had a provision, the intent was that of this common area, at least 50 percent of it had to be where the slope was no more than 20% slope, so that at least half the common area had to be fairly level and usable, but somehow the word got changed, "more" to "less" so the requirement as written in the Code requires over 50 percent to be on slopes greater than 50 percent.....This is minor but of importance.

The last one here is putting the roomers in as an accessory use, taking it out of the definition of family thereby putting in a fine line as to what a family is and what roomers are. These roomers would only be allowed as accessory to a family composed of persons related by blood, adoption and not accessory to five unrelated so you could not, therefore, have eight people plus servants and other people living there.

The second amendment deals strictly with the height envelope contained for residential, preservation, agricultural or residential in the A-1 Apartment district. In all these districts, we have now at the buildable area boundary line, which is the line within the side yard, 12-foot and then a 45 degree angle up to the maximum 25-foot height limit. This has caused quite a bit of problems in some of the basic designs of housing. The proposal is to go to the same concept that we have now on height envelope in the other apartment and hotel districts. The proposed amendment would allow at the buildable area boundary line to go up 15 feet and then anything above 15 feet would have to setback an additional one foot for every two-foot height. The 45 degree angle is actually one to one above the 12-foot line. We are now saying, one foot for each two-foot in height above 15 thereby giving more flexibility in the height. This has particularly been a problem on sloping lots. All of these amendments go through the Preservation, Agricultural, Residential and the A-1 Apartment District, and then you see others in the Business District. We have a provision that where the Business District is adjacent to a residential lot, this Business District has to conform to the envelope on that side as though it were residential. So that the Business District in this case, next door, would have to go up 15 feet and anything above 15 would have to setback one to two from the property line. So these are amendments in the Business and Industrial Districts ought to conform to this type of arrangement rather than the 12-foot, 45 degree angle.

Chun: Any questions?

Sullam: So you are actually getting more space to the buildings?

Gilliam: That's right. We found that this has been quite restrictive, this 45 degree.

Ingleson: Is the 15-foot height at the buildable area boundary line, does it, on slopes, does it follow the slope of the property?

Gilliam: It's straight up measured from the lot width if the buildable area boundary line is a sloping lot.

Ingleson: Is the 15-foot height also sloping? The 25-foot maximum height is still the high point?

Gilliam: Yes. The 25-foot would still be the maximum so we were getting away from defining this 15-foot as being 15-foot above ground level. This is just 15-foot of building wherever it is on the lot.

Chun: Any further questions from members of the Commission? If not, thank you Jack.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Ingelson, authorized the calling of public hearing to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director:

COMPREHENSIVE ZONING CODE VARIOUS AMENDMENTS

(1) Proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Zoning Code as follows:

Section 21-110, Definition of "Family" and "Ground Elevation" and adding definition of "Retaining Walls"

Section 21-202(a), Front Yards

Section 21-202(d), Fences and Walls in Yards

Section 21-280(i)(4), Cluster Developments

Section 21-301(c), Conditional Uses in Agricultural Districts

Section 21-501(c), Conditional Uses in Residential Districts

Section 21-501(b), Accessory Uses in Residential Districts

Heights provisions in the Preservation, Agricultural, Residential and A-1 Apartment Districts.

GENERAL PLAN DLUM & DP (AMENDMENT) UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN (PLAN AREA 14) MAKIKI STREAM REALIGNMENT AND WIDENING

(2) Proposed amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan for the University Community area (Planning Area No. 14) by realigning and widening Makiki Stream between Ala Wai Canal and King Street as part of the Department of Public Works Flood Control Program.

GENERAL PLAN DLUM AMENDMENT KANEOHE TO KUALOA

(3) Proposed amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe to Kualoa by:

a. Deleting all of Luluku Place;

b. Widening a portion of Luluku Road to 56 feet;

c. Changing the land use designation of Parcels 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 from Light Industry to Commercial;

d. Changing the land use designation of Parcels 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and a portion of Parcels 2, 3, and 4 from Light Industry to Medium Density Apartment; and

e. Changing the land use designation of Parcels 2, 3, and 4 from Light Industry to Parks and Recreation.

MISCELLANEOUS
DISTRIBUTION OF STAFF REPORT

Chun: At this time, perhaps we could discuss the question of policy as to what we should do with respect to staff reports prior to hearings. Art, I think you mentioned that perhaps these reports should be made available to the applicant and I think I'm in agreement with you. I'm also of the opinion that perhaps before the applicant gets them, the Commission should also have a copy of the report. I don't know if the staff can do it in the time alloted so that we get the report and the applicant get the report prior to the hearing.

Sharpless: I notice that the report in question is dated June 5.

Chun: Most of the times I think these reports are dated on the day of the hearing.

Rutledge: In some way the Director could adopt the policy of carrying out communication with these people, to discuss their problem before the day, before it gets to us and I think oftentimes they come together with a key to an agreement or an understanding of their respective positions and we wouldn't have to be the buffer, and I think this is good and they can negotiate within the areas of what the law provides for them. Gives ourself that much less work.

Chun: I think the problem we've gotten into in the past, especially in the conditional use permits, where the conditions are presented to the Commission at the same meeting that the applicant receives those conditions and they know nothing about the conditions being imposed by the Director.

Sharpless: What would be wrong with making a distribution to the representative of the applicant at the same time this release is made to the Planning Commission?

Chun: I think there's nothing wrong with that.

Rutledge: That would be good if its about 48 or 72 hours before the meeting.

Way: I think we could get it out in advance of the meeting and at the same time the applicant getting it.

Sharpless: Yes, at the same time.

Rutledge: Would it be 72 hours before the meeting?

Way: We would certainly strive toward that. We could schedule for it.

Chun: I think it's fair that at the time the agenda and the support report are sent to the Commission that a report can be sent to the applicant at the same time. We normally receive that within 24 to 48 hours.

Way: We can attempt to move it forward.

Sharpless: Has there been any policy made as to distributions made to the press on staff's reports?

Chun: Any member of the press present? Oh, there you are.

Sharpless: I was just wondering, if we do have a policy. If we're distributing to the applicant and the Commission, we would want to consider the distribution to the press.

Chun: I see nothing wrong.

Sharpless: I don't. I see nothing wrong in making a distribution list. I think anybody should have it.

Chun: I have been informed that because of advance distribution to the press in the past, sometimes editorials appear prior to the hearing. However, I see no reason for not distributing to the press.

Sharpless: I think we would get better reporting and get a discussion from more people and better coverage and so forth.

Chun: Should we have it in the form of a motion that it would be a policy of this Commission?

Rutledge: So move Mr. Chairman.

Sheehan: Second.

Chun: It has been moved and seconded....

Sheehan: Wait a minute. I don't mean to argue this but if the staff's report and recommendation goes to the press two days before the Commission meeting recommending that the application be turned down, wouldn't that be an awkward situation?

Chun: Perhaps the staff's recommendation need not be included in the report.

Rutledge: That's part of what they should know. Anyone who reads it in the paper may oppose it and can participate if they have an interest in it. That's part of their job.

Sharpless: I see nothing wrong.

Rutledge: You can't have any more trouble than what Mr. Centeio had.

Chun: Rather than adopting it as a policy, how about trying it out in effect?

Rutledge: Oh, we can draft it as a policy and.....

Sharpless: Nothing is unchangeable.

Sheehan: I'll second it.

Chun: Moved and seconded that the reports be made available to the press as well as the applicant and the Commission prior to the regular scheduled meeting several days in advance as possible. Any discussion? If not, all those in favor signify by raising the right hand. Carried.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie Abbott

Mitzie Abbott
Hearings Reporter

FLASH NO. 3

PLANNING COMMISSION

INDEX TO MINUTES

JUNE 12, 1969 TO NOVEMBER 20, 1969

BOOK NO. 126

Note: Items are indexed according to the DATE of their occurrence and listed under the appropriate CLASSIFICATION (i.e. - Capital Improvement Program, Conditional Use Permit, etc.).

		PAGE
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM		
Aug. 6, 1969	Bill No. 105, CIP Supplementary No. 1 Amending the Capital Budget Program by Appropriating $1,046,000 for Park and for four Public Works projects.	162
Oct. 23, 1969	Bill No. 147, CIP Supplementary No. 2 Fiscal Year 1969 - 1970.	378
COMPREHENSIVE ZONING CODE		
June 26, 1969	Various Amendments	42
June 26, 1969	Amendment, Height Regulations	43
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT		
June 12, 1969	Manoa - 2642 Pamoa Rd. and 2730 Hipawai Pl. Scope Corporation - By: Leon Chun, Attorney - (Dormitory Use)	1
June 26, 1969	Manoa - 2215 Kam. Ave. - Clifford K. F. Kong (Dormitory Use).	20
July 24, 1969	Manoa - 2642 Pamoa Rd. & 2730 Hipawai Place Scope Corporation - By: Leon Chun, Attorney - (Dormitory Use)	82
July 24, 1969	Manoa - 2215 Kam. Ave. - Clifford K. F. Kong (Dormitory Use).	103
July 31, 1969	Makiki - Makiki and Nehoa St. - The Chinese Center - (Convalescent Home).	145

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (Continued)

Aug. 6, 1969	Waimanalo - Pacific Concrete and Rock Company, Ltd.	162
Aug. 14, 1969	Makiki - Makiki and Nehoe Streets - Chinese Center - Convalescent Home.	174
Aug. 21, 1969	Waimanalo - North of Kulaiwi Street - Pacific Rock and Concrete Company, Ltd. - Extractive Industry.	191
Aug. 21, 1969	Manoa - 2642 Pamoa Rd. and 2730 Hipawai Place Scope Corporation - Leon Chun, Attorney Dormitory Use.	197
Aug. 28, 1969	Makiki - Makiki and Nehoa St. - The Chinese Center - Convalescent Home.	214
Sept. 4, 1969	Waimanalo - North of Kulaiwi Street - Pacific Concrete and Rock Co., Ltd.	247
Sept. 4, 1969	Manoa - 2642 Pamoa Rd. and 2730 Hipawai Place Scope Corporation - Leon Chun, Attorney Dormitory Use.	249
Sept. 4, 1969	Kauluwela Redevelopment Project - HCHA Hawaii Development Corporation.	263
Sept. 18, 1969	Makiki - East Corner of Makiki St. and Nehoa St. Convalescent Home - The Chinese Center.	325
Oct. 2, 1969	Makiki - East Corner of Makiki St. and Nehoa St. Convalescent Home - The Chinese Center.	337
Oct. 2, 1969	Manoa - 2642 Pamoa Rd. and 2730 Hipawai Place Scope Corporation - Leon Chun, Attorney - Dormitory Use.	339
Oct. 23, 1969	Makiki - Makiki and Nehoa Sts - The Chinese Center (Convalescent Home)	370
Nov. 6, 1969	Kaimuki - 1041 Tenth Ave. - Columbarium Use Church of the Epiphany	398
Nov. 6, 1969	Kapahulu - Off-street Parking - Care Animal Center.	398
Nov. 20, 1969	Kaimuki - 1041 Tenth Avenue - Church of the Epiphany - By: Jack Atnip, Sr.	401
Nov. 20, 1969	Kapahulu - Care Animal Center	403

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (Continued)

Nov. 20, 1969	Kahuku - Kuilima Point - Golf Course Use - Inscon Development Company.	410
Nov. 20, 1969	Kahuku - Kuilima Point - Interim Sewerage System - Inscon Development Co.	410

FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAM

June 26, 1969	Maile Beach Park Land Acquisition - Urban Renewal Coordinator	46
Aug. 28, 1969	Kualoa Beach Park - Urban Renewal Coordinator	218
Oct. 23, 1969	Areawide Review Agency - Federal Grant Assistance - Waianae District - Water Development Project - Board of Water Supply.	379

GENERAL PLAN/DETAILED LAND USE MAP/DEVELOPMENT PLAN

June 12, 1969	Kailua - Development Plan for the Area Bounded by Kawainui Drainage Canal, Kawainui Swamp, Kaelepulu Stream and the Shoreline.	15
June 26, 1969	" " " " " " "	17
July 10, 1969	" " " " " " "	53
July 17, 1969	" " " " " " "	78
July 24, 1969	" " " " " " "	96
Aug. 14, 1969	Kailua - Planning Area No. 24 - Single Family	186

GENERAL PLAN/DETAILED LAND USE MAP/DEVELOPMENT PLAN -(AMENDMENT)

June 12, 1969	Laie to Kualoa - Hauula - Adjoining Hauula Beach Park (Commercial Use)	16
June 26, 1969	University Community Plan - Moiliili, University, Manoa - Makiki Stream - Public Works Dept.	25
June 26, 1969	Maunalua - Mauka - Koko Head Corner of Kalanianaole Highway and Lunalilo Home Rd. - Commercial Use - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	31
June 26, 1969	Kapalama - Iwilei - Deletion of Proposed Hart Street Extension.	34
June 26, 1969	Kaneohe - Kualoa - Kaneohe, Luluku Rd. area - Various Changes - Fairfield Manor.	35

GENERAL PLAN/DETAILED LAND USE MAP/DEVELOPMENT PLAN - (AMENDMENT) Continued

June 26, 1969	Waianae - Nanakuli - Commercial Use - Dr. Timothy Wee, et al.	45
June 26, 1969	Waianae - Nanakuli - Collector Rd. - Joseph L. Dwight, Sr.	45
June 26, 1969	Halawa-Waiawa - Aiea - Public Facilities Use (Fire Station).	46
June 26, 1969	Diamond Head - Park Use.	46
July 10, 1969	Ewa Beach - Iroquois Point - Planning Dept.	49
July 10, 1969	University Community Plan - Moiliili-University Manoa - Makiki Stream - Public Works Dept.	53
July 10, 1969	Maunalua - Mauka-Koko Head Corner Kalanianaole Hwy and Lunalilo Home Rd. - Commercial Use Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	54
July 17, 1969	Laie to Kaaawa - Hauula Adj. - Hauula Beach Park Business Use - Iris J. Cullen.	60
July 17, 1969	Waianae - Lualualei - Mauka side of Farrington Hwy - Commercial Use - Dr. Timothy Wee and Lillian Aki as Nanakuli Investment Company, Partners.	72
July 17, 1969	Waianae - Deletion of Proposed Collector Street Adjacent to Ulehawa Stream - Joseph L. Dwight, Sr.	74
July 17, 1969	Kailua - Kapaa Valley - Industrial Use - HC&D, Ltd. and Hawaiian Trust Company.	76
July 17, 1969	University Community Plan - Clark Street and Griffiths Street.	76
July 17, 1969	Waiawa to Halawa - Kalauao - Ulune Street across Aiea Recreation Center - Public Facilities Use (Fire Station).	81
July 24, 1969	Ewa Beach - Iroquois Point - Fort Weaver Road and Kimopelekani Rd. - Residential Use.	95
July 24, 1969	Maunalua - Kalanianaole Hwy and Lunalilo Home Rd. - Commercial Use.	102
July 24, 1969	Wahiawa - Kunia Rd. (Medium Density Apt.)	102
July 24, 1969	Waianae - Nanakuli Valley - School Use.	103
July 24, 1969	Wahiawa - Alawaini Way - Park Use.	103
July 31, 1969	University Community Plan - Whitney St. Dead End Clark Street Turnaround.	130

GP/DLUM/DP (AMENDMENT) Continued

July 31, 1969	Kaipapau Plan Area No. 26 - Medium Density Apt. Jonathan Manor, Inc. - Proposal No. 1.	144
July 31, 1969	Kaipapau Plan Area No. 26 - Commercial - Kahuku Shopping Center, Ltd. - Proposal No. 2.	145
Aug. 6, 1969	Kailua - Various Changes - Kapaa Valley Area HC&D Ltd. and Hawaiian Trust Co.	151
Aug. 6, 1969	Waianae - Nanakuli Valley - School Use (DAGS for DOE).	158
Aug. 6, 1969	Maunalua - Kalanianaole Hwy and Lunalilo Home Rd. - Commercial Use - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company.	161
Aug. 14, 1969	Kaipapau - Planning Area No. 26 - Medium-Density Apt. - Jonathan Manor, Inc. - Donald K. Iwai - Proposal No. 1.	178
Aug. 14, 1969	Kahuku - Planning Area No. 26 - Commercial Kahuku Shopping Center, Ltd. - Nicholas Rodrigues Pao and Mabel Gomes Pao - Hiroshi Sakai - Proposal No. 2.	178
Aug. 14, 1969	Wahiawa - Alawani Way - Park Use - Department of Parks and Recreation - Planning Area No. 35.	180
Aug. 14, 1969	Wahiawa - Planning Area No. 35 - Fai Tom - Proposal No. 1, Medium-Density Apt. - Proposal No. 2, Pedestrian Public Easement.	181
Aug. 21, 1969	Ewa Beach - Various Changes.	198
Aug. 21, 1969	Waipio - Mililani Town, Inc. Various Amendments.	203
Aug. 28, 1969	Kailua - Makai end of the Kawainui Drainage Canal - Planning Area No. 24.	206
Aug. 28, 1969	Kailua - Kapaa Valley and Kawainui Swamp - HC&D and Hawaiian Trust PA #25.	208
Aug. 28, 1969	Laie, Kaipapau, Hauula, Makao, Kapaka, Kaluanui, Punaluu, Kahana and Kaaawa - Commercial Use Kahuku Shopping Center, Ltd. - Nicholas Pao and Mabel G. Pao by Hiroshi Sakai - PA #26.	212
Aug. 28, 1969	Ewa Beach - Iroquois Point - Various Changes.	214
Aug. 28, 1969	Waikiki - Jefferson School Vicinity - State Dept. of Accounting and General Services for the Department of Education.	219

GP/DLUM/DP (AMENDMENT) Continued

Sept. 4, 1969	Waipio - Mililani Town - Mililani Town, Inc.	225
Sept. 4, 1969	Laie, Kaipapau, Hauula, Makao, Kapaka, Kaluanui, Punaluu, Kahana, and Kaaawa - Planning Area No. 26 - Residential Use.	264
Sept. 4, 1969	Ewa Beach - Iroquois Point.	265
Sept. 11, 1969	Waikiki - Kaneloa Rd. - Wai Nani Way - Kuhio Rd. - Jefferson School Grounds.	268
Sept. 11, 1969	Waipio - Mililani Town - Mililani Town, Inc.	278
Sept. 18, 1969	Laie-Kaaawa - Northeast to Kawaewae Way and to the rear of the Hauula Shopping Center - Residential Use.	309
Sept. 18, 1969	Kaipapau-Hauula - Kaneohe side of Hauula Shopping Center - Kahuku Shopping Center, Ltd. Commercial Use - By: Hiroshi Sakai, Attorney.	315
Sept. 18, 1969	Waikiki - Deleting a portion of Wainani Way, Extension of Wainani Way, Creation of a cul-de-sac off Kuhio Rd.	320
Sept. 18, 1969	Waiawa, Pearl City, Waiau, Waimalu, Kalauao, Aiea and Halawa - Planning Area No. 32 Park Use.	326
Oct. 2, 1969	Waiawa to Halawa - Planning Area #32 - Kaonohi Ridge - Park Use.	332
Oct. 9, 1969	Waikiki - Change in circulation system and expansion of Jefferson Elementary School.	357
Oct. 9, 1969	Waiawa to Halawa - Kaonohi Ridge Subdivision - Residential Use.	364
Oct. 23, 1969	Central Business District - Deleting a public off-street parking lot from the proposed Municipal Office Building site.	383
Oct. 23, 1969	Waianae - Makaha - Makai of Farrington Hwy. Residential Use.	383
Nov. 6, 1969	Central Business District - Hotel Street and Kapiolani Blvd. (Public Facilities Use).	385
Nov. 6, 1969	Laie to Kaaawa - Kaipapau - Rear of the Hauula Shopping Center (Jonathan Manor).	393
Nov. 6, 1969	Laie to Kaaawa - Kaipapau - Kaneohe side of Hauula Shopping Center (Kahuku Shopping Center, Ltd.)	395

GP/DLUM/DP (AMENDMENT) Continued

Nov. 20, 1969	McCully - Alexander Street between Bingham and South Beretania Street - Kuniyuki Bros., Inc.	410

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION

Aug. 28, 1969	Waipio Urban District - Mililani Town, Inc.	215
Aug. 28, 1969	Waipahu - Kunia Rd. and Waikele Gulch - HSM Ventures and Robinson Trust.	220
Sept. 4, 1969	Waipio - Urban Use - Mililani Town, Incorporated.	250
Sept. 4, 1969	Waipahu - Urban Use - HSM Ventures and Robinson Trusts.	251
Oct. 2, 1969	Manoa - Off Huelani Place - Urban Use - Clyde E. Griggs.	334

MISCELLANEOUS

June 26, 1969	Backlog of pending cases, special meetings of the Planning Commission to be held.	47
July 10, 1969	Council Resolution No. 239 requesting Planning Commission recommendation on GP Change to Diamond Head.	59
Aug. 21, 1969	Amendment to Chapter 22.	203
Aug. 28, 1969	Summary of Proposed Sign Regulations - Discussion.	219
Sept. 4, 1969	Variance - Anuenue (Rainbow Island) Seatrain Lines, Inc. - State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation (Discussion).	266
Sept. 11, 1969	Resolution - Diamond Head Area - Zoning R-1.	283
Sept. 18, 1969	Seatrain Variance - Anuenue Island (Discussion).	327
Sept. 18, 1969	Skyland Inn Variance (Discussion).	329
Sept. 18, 1969	Mobile and Prefabricated Homes (Discussion)	329
Oct. 2, 1969	Resolution by Councilman Charles Campbell - Waikiki-Diamond Head - Re: Proposed Acquisition and Rezoning of Diamond Head Terrace Tract Area.	343
Oct. 2, 1969	Planning Dept. Organizational Structure Chart.	348

MISCELLANEOUS (Continued)

Oct. 2, 1969	Transcript of the Seatrain Variance Request at ZBA Meeting Aug. 28, 1969 reviewed by Commission.	349
Oct. 23, 1969	Resolution by Councilman Charles Campbell - Waikiki-Diamond Head - Re: Proposed Acquisition and Rezoning of Diamond Head Terrace Tract Area.	372
Nov. 20, 1969	City Council Request Representative of Commission Re: Campbell Resolution.	411

PARK DEDICATION ORDINANCE

July 17, 1969	Supplemental Report	78
Sept. 4, 1969	Subdivision Rules and Regulations (Amendments) Dedication of Parks and Playgrounds or the Payment of Money in Lieu Thereof.	237
Sept. 18, 1969	Dedication of Land for Parks and Playgrounds or the Payment of Money in Lieu Thereof.	316
Oct. 23, 1969	Proposed Amendment Relating to Park Dedication.	384
Nov. 6, 1969	Zoning Ordinance - Park Dedication.	397
Nov. 20, 1969	Zoning Ordinance - Park Dedication.	406

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT HOUSING DISTRICT

Sept. 4, 1969	Kaneohe - Kaneohe Bay Drive - Aikahi Gardens Mid-Pac Development Corp. and Dan Ostrow Dev.	263
Oct. 19, 1969	Kaneohe - Kaneohe Bay Drive - Aikahi Gardens Mid-Pac Development Corp. and Dan Ostrow Dev.	350
Nov. 6, 1969	Heeia - Haiku Villa - Qualpac Development.	398

STREET NAMES

July 10, 1969	HRA Kukui Area (Deletions).	55
July 10, 1969	Waiaka Road (Deletion).	58
July 10, 1969	Makakilo City, Units XVI and XVII - Honouliuli, Ewa - "Akaula Street".	58
July 10, 1969	Mililani Town, Units 6A, 6B, 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B, 10A, 10B, 12A and 12B - Waipio, Ewa.	58

STREET NAMES (Continued)

Aug. 21, 1969	Kailua - Pooakea Subdivision.	203
Aug. 28, 1969	Kukui and Kauluwela - Honolulu Redevelopment Agency Project Areas.	218
Sept. 18, 1969	Lower Nuuanu - Hayashi Subdivision.	326
Oct. 2, 1969	Kalauao - Kaonohi Ridge, Unit I - Pacific Village Project.	348
Oct. 9, 1969	Lualualei, Waianae - Mohihi Court Subdivision.	364
Oct. 9, 1969	Waialae-Iki - Waialae Ridgeline Estates - Units II and III.	365
Oct. 23, 1969	Waimalu, Ewa - Waimalu Subdivision Unit I.	380
Oct. 23, 1969	Central Honolulu.	382
Oct. 23, 1969	Moanalua - Shafter Flats - Industrial Development Unit III.	382
Oct. 23, 1969	Kaneohe - Heeia.	382
Nov. 6, 1969	Kaneohe - Heeia.	396
Nov. 20, 1969	Pearl City - Momilani Subdivision - Unit XI.	409
Nov. 20, 1969	Deleting Kakaako Street and Substituting Punchbowl Street.	409

ZONING -- A-2 APARTMENT DISTRICT

July 17, 1969	Pearl City - 949 Lehua Avenue - Motohiki Iguchi.	77
Aug. 6, 1969	Pearl City - 949 Lehua Avenue - Motohiki Iguchi.	146

ZONING -- A-3 APARTMENT DISTRICT

July 17, 1969	Maunalua - Hahaione Valley, Unit I-D - Kaiser, Hawaii-Kai Development Company.	76
July 17, 1969	Waianae - Makaha Valley - Makaha Valley, Inc.	77
July 31, 1969	Maunalua - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	132
Aug. 14, 1969	Maunalua - Hahaione Valley - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Co.	183
Aug. 21, 1969	Makaha - Northeast of Makaha Elementary School Makaha Valley, Inc.	187
Sept. 4, 1969	" " " " " " "	247
Sept. 11, 1969	" " " " " " "	282

ZONING -- A-3 APARTMENT DISTRICT (Continued)

Oct. 9, 1969	Kalauao, Kaonohi Ridge - Mauka of Moanalua Road Amfac-Trousdale.	366
Oct. 23, 1969	" " " " " " "	368
Nov. 6, 1969	" " " " " " "	393
Nov. 20, 1969	" " " " " " "	406

ZONING -- B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT

June 26, 1969	Laie - Kamehameha Highway, Palekana and Iosepa Streets - Zions Securities Corp.	45
June 26, 1969	Hauula = 54-060 Kamehameha Highway - Masami Sagami.	45
July 10, 1969	" " " " " " "	48
July 17, 1969	Laie - Near the Polnesian Cultural Center - Zions Securities Corporation.	69
July 17, 1969	Kewalo - Makai-Diamond Head Corner of Kapiolani Blvd. and Ward Ave. - Island Federal Savings and Loan Association.	76
July 17, 1969	Waianae-Kai -- makai side of Farrington Hwy - Southwest of Guard Street - Kazumasa and Fumiko Teramoto.	77
July 31, 1969	Kewalo - makai Diamond Head Corner of Kapiolani Blvd. and Ward Ave. - Island Federal Savings and Loan Association.	126
July 31, 1969	Waianae-Kai - Makae side of Farrington Hwy, southwest of Guard St. - Kazumasa and Fumiko Teramoto.	128
July 31, 1969	Laie - Zions Securities Corporation.	144
Aug. 6, 1969	Laie - Near the Polynesian Cultural Center Zions Securities Corporation.	162
Aug. 21, 1969	Central Honolulu District - 1020-1022 South King St. - Dr. Kiyoshi Inouye.	202
Sept. 4, 1969	Civic Center - Queen's Hospital Site - The Queen's Medical Center.	263
Sept. 18, 1969	Civic Center (Queen's Hospital Site) - The Queen's Medical Center.	288
Oct. 9, 1969	Laie - Near the Polynesian Cultural Center - Zions Securities Corporation.	361
Oct. 23, 1969	Kaneohe - Makai of Kamehameha Highway between Lilipuna and William Henry Road - Hawaiian Telephone Co., Ltd.	383

ZONING -- B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT (Continued)

Nov. 6, 1969	Kaneohe - Makai of Kamehameha Highway between Lilipuna and William Henry Road - Hawaiian Telephone Co., Ltd.	391
Nov. 6, 1969	Waipahu - Mokuola and Waipahu Streets - Crown Land Corporation.	398

ZONING -- B-3 COMMUNITY BUSINESS-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

July 24, 1969	Central Honolulu District - 1020-1022 S. King Street - Dr. Kiyoshi Inouye.	102
Aug. 6, 1969	Central Honolulu District - 1020-1022 S. King Street - Dr. Kiyoshi Inouye.	148
Sept. 11, 1969	Central Honolulu - Multi-story Commercial with dwelling units - Dr. Kiyoshi Inouye.	281
Oct. 2, 1969	Central Honolulu District - 1020-1022 S. King Street - Dr. Kiyoshi Inouye.	342

ZONING -- B-5 RESORT-COMMERCIAL DISTRICT

Nov. 20, 1969	Waikiki - Mauka-Ewa Corner of Kalakaua and Liliuokalani Avenue - Noboru Iha.	410
July 24, 1969	Makaha - 84-325 Makau Street - Mrs. Mahealani J. Fernandez.	85
July 24, 1969	Kahuku - Kuilima Point - Del E. Webb Corp.	103
Aug. 14, 1969	Kahuku - Kuilima Point - Del E. Webb Corp.	166

ZONING -- I-1 LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT

July 10, 1969	Waimalu - Makai of Kamehameha Hwy and to the rear of the City's Kalauao Sewer Pump Station - Theodore C. B. Farm.	54
July 24, 1969	" " " " " " "	79

ZONING -- R-6 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

Oct. 23, 1969	Hawaii-Kai - Hahaione Valley - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company.	383
Nov. 6, 1969	Maunalua - Hawaii-Kai Hahaione Valley - Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company.	386

ZONING -- R-6 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (Continued)

Nov. 20, 1969 Waipahu - Corner of Mokuola Street and Waipahu Street - Crown Land Corporation. 399

URBAN RENEWAL

July 24, 1969 Kauluwela Project No. Hawaii R-7 (Modifications) Honolulu Redevelopment Agency. 114

(Completion of Book No. 126)
(June 12, 1969 thru November 20, 1969)

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
June 12, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, June 12, 1969, at 1:35 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Edward Brennan presiding.

PRESENT:

Edward Brennan, Chairman
Philip T. Chun
Ed Sheehan
Fredda Sullam
Lewis Ingleson
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Arthur A. Rutledge (present at 1:50 p.m.)
James Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
George Moriguchi, Deputy Planning Director
Albert Jeremiah, Deputy Corporation Counsel

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT
MANOA
2642 PAMOA ROAD AND
2730 HIPAWAI PLACE
(DORMITORY USE)
SCOPE CORPORATION

A public hearing was held to consider a Conditional Use Permit by Scope Corporation to construct and operate the following:

1. Three- and four-story dormitory buildings for 850 students;

2. A two-story commons building; and

3. One-half story parking buildings for 252 cars,

located at 2642 Pamoa Road and 2730 Hipawai Place in Manoa.

Mr. Moriguchi, Deputy Planning Director, reviewed specifics of the proposal and the recommendations of the Planning Department staff. Site A is described by Tax Map Key 2-9-13: 12 and 51 and Site B is described by Tax Map Key 2-9-23, parcels 2, 3, 8, 13, and 14. The landowners are represented by Mr. Leon Chun, their attorney. Scope Corporation will be the lessee and developer with DMJM as architects, and Dillingham Corporation, the contractor. Site A measures 113,019 square feet at East Manoa Road and the south end of Kolowalu Street.

The following is proposed for construction at Site A: Two 4-story residence halls housing a total of 310 students. These are the dormitory structures, the food service facilities near the commons building, and a parking garage. The two-

story commons building covers an area of approximately 16,000 square feet. Food service facilities to serve dormitory residents of both Sites A and B will be located in this building. The two level underground facility is actually a half story above ground and will provide for 152 spaces. Additional 10 spaces at grade will also be located at Site A. One 800-foot swimming pool and a deck measuring 1,630 sq. ft. or a total pool and deck area of 2,430 sq. ft. is also proposed in this Site A. Yard areas, walkways, and building areas including parking buildings and lot coverage of buildings are approximately 53 percent of the total parcel.

Site B is located adjacent to Manoa Stream, along Pamoa Street. The facilities proposed involve a 4-story and a 3-story residence hall housing a total of 540 students. This involves 54 units at approximately 10 persons per unit. One 2-level parking facility for approximately 100 cars is also proposed at Site B. An 800-sq. ft. swimming pool is also proposed; a 1,400 sq. ft. luau area for the residents is also proposed. Off-street parking involving some 11 spaces, at grade, is included. There are 12 spaces at grade. Lot coverage for Site B is approximately 33 percent as compared with 53 percent at Site A. These sites are approximately three-quarters of a mile from the intersection of University Avenue and Dole Street.

Mr. Moriguchi further discussed the surrounding land uses and street patterns. Site A is vacant and Site B on the makai side is half vacant and mauka half filled.

He stated the existing zoning for the area is R-6 Residential and described the Detailed Land Use Map for the area.

The applicant's justifications were summarized into eight points:

1. The land is ideally suited for University of Hawaii student dormitory use because of its central location to the University campus.

2. Building heights will be a maximum of 25 feet at the highest point and will be below the treetops in the area. Structures will fit nicely into the existing topography.

3. Size and height of buildings will be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood since both lots adjoin school facilities as well as residences.

4. The University welcomes the proposed development and the dormitory use will enhance the University's potential.

5. Manoa residents are proud of the University located in their valley but apparently some do not want students to live in the valley.

6. The dormitory will meet a critical need for the housing of University students and it will certainly enhance the neighborhood.

7. The welfare and interests of many groups of people must be considered and not only those of nearby residents and a few vocal and active Manoa residents.

8. The objections raised are insubstantial or can be met by the conditional use permit itself.

Letters indicating opposition to the proposal from the following people were received: Mark Lester, President of Manoa Valley Community Association; Mrs. Howard Moore, Alaula Way; Mark Lester, transmitting 84 signatures of residents in the immediate area of the proposed project; 253 families out of the 285 families of the Noelani PTA; Mrs. Robert Kamins of 2400 Parker Place; Sister Bonaventure, Principal of St. Francis Convent School; Mrs. James Cherry; Mrs. Olive Bonar of 2377 East Manoa Road; Mrs. Sally Plateros, Corresponding Secretary, St. Francis Convent School Parent-Teacher's Guild; Mr. Donald Sanborn, Beaumont Woods Place; Miss Helen Lau Ho of Pamoa Road; Mrs. Robert Muirhead of Cooper Road; Gail Price; Mrs. Peter Dow; Mrs. Robert Chapman; Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Lyons, Mr. Kawahara, President of the Manoa Acres Resident's Association; and State Senator Eureka Forbes.

The traffic, access, and disruption of the immediate neighborhood and disruption to activities of Noelani School were factors against the proposal.

Another fact is that the students would probably cut through Noelani School to get from one facility to another, thereby adversely affecting the educational process at Noelani School. Another item indicated was the potential parking problem there, although some 380 parking spaces are provided. They feel with 850 students in the area, there will probably be more cars in the area. In fact, some of them cited the fact that they might spill over into the Noelani School parking which is adjacent. Indications concerning the overloading of Manoa Library has also been cited several

times. These are the general comments involving the protestants.

A statement from Dr. Robert Hiatt, the former Acting President of the University of Hawaii, has indicated that while it is their policy to encourage private development, it is also their policy not to make recommendations with respect to specific individual applications for conditional use permits or zoning variances.

Mr. Moriguchi stated that these sites would accommodate about 28 residential lots if developed under the existing zoning. On the basis of an average of 4 persons per family, Sites A and B would possibly accommodate a total of approximately 112 persons and require parking for 56 car spaces.

This is contrasted with the proposed Conditional Use Permit project which seeks to house 850 persons with approximately 275 parking spaces. A comparison of possible residential development and the proposed dormitory facilities indicates potentially a 660 percent increase in population and approximately a 400 percent increase in parking spaces.

Under the present conditions of zoning for an R-4 Residential area, the maximum height limitations involve a 12-foot height limit at the side and rear yard setback lines up to a 25-foot maximum overall. The proposed dormitory structures involve 3- and 4-story heights ranging from 30 feet to 40 feet at the minimum.

Pamoa Road, with its existing 40-foot right-of-way and 20-foot pavement and no sidewalks, is presently controlled on the mauka side by a 'no parking at any time' traffic sign and on the makai side by a 'no parking during the peak traffic hours' sign under existing conditions to service the residents of the area and the St. Francis Convent School. It is not a matter of conjecture as to the inadequacy of Pamoa Road in the event that 111 additional vehicles from Site B are imposed upon it. The extreme and critical nature of this problem relative to the safety of pedestrians and motorists has been recognized by many of the citizens protesting and by the developers' architects who have indicated that "the lack of sidewalks and narrowness of the road (Pamoa Road) makes this dangerous for the student and to the motorists." This observation was made by the architects of the dormitory in their attempt to obtain permission from the Department of Education to provide a covered walkway within the Noelani School grounds

in order to connect Site B with Site A since boarders at Site B would need adequate access to the food service facilities located at Site A. The Department of Education has dismissed this request for the covered walkway through Noelani School.

A traffic situation more specifically related to elementary school students attending Noelani School must also be analyzed and evaluated. The applicant's proposal would impose two driveways from Kolowalu Street to the 152-car parking garage at Site A. Both driveways, paralleling each other, would be located on two sides of a very large monkeypod tree presently located adjacent to the curbing along a sharply curved section of Kolowalu Street. Young school children ranging in age from the kindergarten level to the six grade level presently use only that side of Kolowalu Street adjacent to the proposed development in going to and from Noelani School since the opposite side is unimproved and covered with brush and, therefore, impassable. Young children would be crossing the two parking garage driveways where sight distances would be seriously and dangerously reduced by the large monkeypod tree with its 5-foot diameter trunk. An additional factor in the matter of hazard involves the relatively steep slope of the driveway from Kolowalu Street down to the parking garage. Sight distances and visibility for motorists using the driveway to get in and out of the parking garage and for motorists using Kolowalu Street would be seriously affected under these conditions and will contribute to the potential hazards to the safety and well-being of young children as well as motorists and other pedestrians in the area. In addition, the curvature of Kolowalu Street and the poor sight distances and visibility during daylight hours as well as nighttime hours compound the entire problem of hazardous traffic conditions.

The proposed General Plan extension of Woodlawn Drive to connect with Kolowalu Street will find traffic increased considerably in this area when the extension is completed. The driveways from the proposed 152-car parking garage would be located only approximately 400 feet from the intersection of Kolowalu Street and East Manoa Road. In the event that 16 cars were to queue on Kolowalu Street at the East Manoa Road intersection over the distance of approximately 400 feet, egress from the 152-car parking garage would be blocked for left-turn movements out of the garage. Traffic congestion and confusion of this nature would be frequent and common under these circumstances and would pose a serious safety problem for children going to school or leaving school.

The traffic situation on both Kolowalu Street and Pamoa Road that would be encountered upon the imposition of the proposed parking structures has been cited by the Department of Traffic as extremely undesirable in light of the basic intent and design of the existing street system for single-family residential uses. The Traffic Department has expressed its concern and indicated its opposition to the project. The Development Plan adopted by the City Council for the area proposes no widening for Pamoa Road.

The Detailed Land Use Map for the University Community Area as adopted by the City Council clearly indicates that the lands throughout the valley area are to be allowed primarily for development as residential uses. Only a scattering of commercial and public facilities are proposed in the Development Plan with no provision for apartment areas. All developments proposed for apartment and major commercial uses have been specified for areas out of the valley, makai of Maile Way. It is clearly the intent of the General Plan that high density uses such as proposed under the subject project should not be permitted in the valley.

It should be noted that approximately 90 acres of apartment use is also scheduled on the master plan. This is in the area below Maile Street. As indicated by Sister Bonaventure, the area should not be exposed to the influences of college-age students. This is particularly related to St. Francis Convent and Noelani School.

The recommendation of the Planning Director was that the proposed use does not conform to the requirements of the Comprehensive Zoning Code and will have considerable adverse effect on the health, safety or comfort of persons living or working in the area and will be more injurious, economically other otherwise, to property or improvements in the surrounding area than would any use generally permitted in the district. The applicant had submitted petitions indicating approximately 850 signatures of various people throughout the island who have indicated that they are in favor of this application, including Mr. H. Y. Young.

It was additionally brought out by Senator Eureka Forbes that residential land is very scarce and to utilize it for dormitory purposes would not be proper. She also brought out the fact that there are 147 acres of State land that could be made available.

Mr. Ingleson questioned the new development planned for the University for the mauka campus area.

It was reported that the area was proposed for non-instructional types of research-oriented activities for the University. The academic uses would be in the areas below that.

Mr. Rutledge questioned the abrupt rise of land costs as mentioned in the applicant's brief. It was felt that the applicant could answer that question when his testimony was presented. The Chairman then asked if there were no objections to have all those in favor of the project come forth before those opposing.

Mr. Leon Chun, attorney, represented the Scope Corporation. He made the following points:

1. He discussed the location of the sites in relation to the University of Hawaii. It was felt that the location was of major importance for a dormitory. The sites were practically encompassed by University land.

2. The tremendous need for dormitory space and for student housing.

3. The fact that the need will continue to increase.

4. A copy of a location map showed that the sites border the University facilities on the makai as well as the mauka side.

5. Discussions with the University of Hawaii administration were held since 1966 with the idea of meeting the University's needs.

6. The University of Hawaii has two problems--one is the great need of student housing and the other is a matter of access to the mauka campus.

7. The plans which have been drawn reflect the cooperation with the University in these two aspects.

It was also pointed out to the Commission that there is a wide space on Site A which forms somewhat of a corridor. This corridor is exactly opposite what is the University's fire road which would allow the University access from that fire road directly across that site into its upper campus. It was felt that this plan which has been submitted will be a great advantage to the University.

The Commission's attention was then directed to a memo of May 29, to the section concerning Summaries of Newspaper Articles. The following facts were pointed out:

1. There is a lot of talk that the University has lots of land but that land is needed for educational facilities--academic uses.

2. There are a few plans for dormitories that the University itself plans to build for dormitory use through public funds.

3. There has been no real attempt by any responsible persons to meet the demand that the University wants, that private developers take over part of that responsibility of providing student housing. It has taken a good deal of work to locate a responsible corporation such as Scope, with financing available, with experience, and with the interest of students at heart to work on a project of this magnitude.

   The newspapers reported that the need has risen from a few thousand to almost 8,000 students now who need student accommodations. The University has set up the guidelines for dormitory projects for private developers and these guidelines have been followed in the Scope project.

4. Mr. Burgyone, as well as the Reverend Walt Fukunaga of the Ministry of University Students, have indicated that there is a tremendous need to take care of our student community. If these needs are not taken care of now, there will be other problems which will arise.

5. Dr. Robert Hiatt, who was Acting President of the University of Hawaii, said that the Scope location was excellent.

6. The Commission should consider that we are not just considering few people who are living right in that area, although they are very important; we are also considering the fact that we have a lack of public funds available that is very costly to build dormitories, that it will affect all of us, and that each one of us do have a say as to what should be done here, and that the Planning Commission should consider all these people who will have to pay additional taxes in order to build the dormitories which are needed with public funds and even though the cost may be, say 20% higher than the dormitory accommodations provided by the State, we feel that it

would add more spaces available so that those who need some State help would find it possible to get additional dormitory space where now it would not be available to them.

Arguments against the proposal seemed insubstantial. Mr. Chun pointed out the following:

1. There is a claim that the University students will preempt the Manoa people from the use of the library. The Manoa Branch Library is not that complete a library; it's a small library; it's even smaller than the Kaimuki Library. There is no danger of that.

2. It is assumed that the University students will be ruffians to preempt the use of all the areas around that, and create noise and social problems for the area but, in fact, they are responsible people.

Further evidence for the proposal was presented by Mr. Chun:

1. Location-wise, there will never be another site for dormitories so eminently suitable for University students' use.

2. The site is within three to twelve minutes walking distance to the University of Hawaii facilities.

3. It is about ten minutes driving distance to the University parking lot from the dorm site. It takes ten minutes to walk back to the University facilities, e.g., the University of Hawaii Sinclair Library and Hemmenway Hall. It does not make sense to argue that University students will drive to school.

4. It will not make sense to say that there is a tremendous amount of rain in the valley. Mr. Mark Lester says that over 100 inches of rain fall at the University of Hawaii site annually. The U. S. Weather Bureau states that exactly 41.17 inches of rain fall annually, which figure is an average rainfall of over 10 years.

5. A total of 3,255 persons are in favor of this dormitory project. These people are not only from outlying islands, but from Ewa, Wahiawa, the Windward side, and the Leeward side of Oahu, the rural districts of Oahu, many from the city itself, and a great number from University students, as well as about 200 Manoa Valley residents.

Mr. Yamabe then asked Mr. Chun if they had explored the possibility of utilizing existing apartment land.

Mr. Chun replied that a very intensive search had been made and that it was a difficult task due to the type of accommodations needed for student housing, especially dining facilities.

Mr. Rutledge had a question as to who were the previous owners of the land in question.

Mr. Chun replied that the previous owners had been James Woolsey and the Magoon Estate and is being leased to Scope Corporation.

Mr. Rutledge again pursued the question of why housing on these parcels were considered prohibitive.

Mr. Chun replied that when the word prohibitive was used, it meant that the cost of land for residential development at $6.00 a square foot was expensive. It was further brought out that Mr. Chun had assembled the land.

Again the location of the parcels to the existing UH facilities was brought out as the criteria for proposing such a use for the sites. Further discussion centered around the needs of the students for some kind of housing and the plight of the property owners in the immediate vicinity of the projects.

Discussion was then directed towards Mrs. Forbes' statement that the State had 147 acres of land makai of Dole Street. It was noted by Mr. Chun that three 500-bed dorms were planned for the area in 1972-1973.

Mr. Chun then defended Scope's stand on the objections and recommendation of the Planning staff.

1. As far as parking is concerned, a recent survey of local student dormitory residents and mainland dormitory residents showed 1 car among 9 dorm residents.

2. College students will not interfere with the younger students at Noelani School. (Examples of existing elementary schools existing in co-harmony were cited.)

3. One parking space for each three beds were provided according to the CZC, but it is felt that they will not all be utilized.

Mr. Chun was questioned on the size of the rooms.

He answered that there would be one or two bedrooms having a common living room with bath facilities arranged accordingly.

When questioned about a possible 20% raise in rent over existing dorms, Mr. Chun replied that he was not qualified to answer that. He noted that there was someone present who was more qualified to answer that question.

Mr. Chun presented three letters from Manoa residents who are supporting the project. Again it was debated as to whether the sites in question were the best possible sites.

Mr. Chun was then questioned as to whether the University had any part in setting guidelines and long-range plans for the dormitories.

After a 5-minute recess, Mr. Walter Muraoka, Director of Physical Planning and Instruction for the University of Hawaii, was called on to testify in behalf of the University of Hawaii. He reiterated that the University is unable to take a stand on specific private development for obvious reasons--financial, etc. However, it was stated that there is a real need for dormitory space. For example, next Fall a total of 18,000 students is expected and there is a need for about 9,000 beds on and off the campus. Presently, there are only 838 beds available for students. The University does favor dormitories off-campus in general. As far as the building program is concerned, there is a program going on now which will provide 500 additional beds in 1971, 500 beds in 1972, and 500 additional beds in 1973. However, with the increase in enrollment, there will be little progress against the need for dormitory space.

It was brought out in further discussion that even though there is a tremendous need for housing, the University has managed to maintain the growth of a greater number of students. It was indicated that the implementation of the transfer program from Leeward Community College where the students go for their first two years has helped quite a bit.

Mr. Yamabe queried Mr. Muraoka on the policy statement, "The University will not sell or lease any land to a private developer for the building of dormitories and apartments." He wanted to know what the reason was for establishing this policy.

Mr. Muraoka's answer was that the University does not have enough land for even instructional facilities and to build additional dormitories beyond 2,500 would mean they must buy more land. There are no plans to lease any land to private developers at this time. The University has a housing policy which provides standards for square feet per room, study areas, dining areas, parking areas, and play area. Many developers that are now coming in for conditional use permits try to meet these requirements as much as possible to satisfy the students' needs.

As far as the University facilities, these requirements are rules but outside of University facilities, the requirements are a guide as the University has no control over the type of construction.

Mr. Muraoka mentioned receiving inquiries from all sorts of developers, land owners, real estate people; whether any of the projects actually come into being was not known. He then went on to explain projected plans for the expansion of dormitory facilities on the University, and where these dormitories will be constructed. He discussed various site locations for dorms.

Mr. Muraoka and members of the Commission discussed the various aspects of the total dormitory needs and problems of the University.

Mr. Howland Swift, Executive Vice President of Scope Corporation, discussed the organization of the Scope Corporation and their operation of various dormitories. Some of the Mainland universities were discussed concerning their methods of providing student housing and that many of them depended on private housing for a large share of their requirements.

Mrs. Sarah Lee Yang, a resident of Manoa, spoke in favor of the application.

Mr. John McKay, an ASUH Senator and a member of the ASUH Campus Affairs Committee, testified in favor of this proposal. He discussed the problems of the University getting money for dormitories from the Legislature. A discussion followed with the Commission about student cars and housing and parking problems.

Mr. Allen Yukitomo, Chairman of the Campus Affairs Committee, spoke in favor of the application. He discussed the philosophy or attitude of the students toward the housing and the image. A discussion with the Commission followed concerning the various

problems which students have had in finding suitable housing at a reasonable cost.

Dr. Mark Lester, President of the Manoa Valley Community Association and Associate Professor at the University, spoke in opposition to the application. Dr. Lester pointed out two major points of objection:

1. The site is the wrong site for a building or a complex of that size and it's actually two separate independent buildings.

2. The basic conception for detailed land use plan in the Valley and the environment of the University is spelled out and the proper place for large-scale student housing is on the lower edge of the campus where you are near public facilities, transportation, major arterial highways, freeways, a variety of stores, and shops. He further discussed the physical relationship of student housing with the regular campus activities, the problems of weather, and the pedestrian and vehicular traffic this project would create.

Dr. Lester stated that he would like answers to the following questions from the applicant:

1. Is it possible to get room separately from board? If so, what are the costs of board? what are the costs of room?

2. How much would students be charged to park their cars?

3. If the students don't occupy all the parking spaces, would the parking stalls be rented out to outsiders?

4. Must students, if board is required, be provided lunch?

5. Would Scope Corporation be willing to commit itself as part of the conditional use to some arbitrary percentage figure above University dormitory prices?

Mr. Patrick Arakaki, representing the Noelani School PTA, presented the PTA's position for opposing the proposed University student dormitory. The main reasons presented for the opposition are as follows:

1. Traffic

2. Safety of children

3. Changes character of residential area

4. Invasion of privacy

Sister Bonaventure, Principal of St. Francis Convent School, objected to the application. Her concern was about the proximity of the dormitories to our school and that this would adversely affect the operation of the school.

A discussion followed with the Commission regarding the operation of the Convent School.

Mr. William H. Kawahara, President of the Manoa Acres Residents Association, spoke in opposition to the application restating many of the previous objections concerning traffic and the change in character of the area this would bring.

Mrs. Howard Moore, a resident of Manoa for 27 years, spoke in opposition to the application. She presented a petition with 18 signatures from the people in the area who felt that the added traffic would be a real detriment.

A discussion followed concerning assessed values in the University area, pedestrian and vehicular traffic which the dormitories would create, and students now living in houses in the area.

Mrs. Mae Morita, a resident on Pamoa Road between the two sites, discussed the traffic problems and the substandard roads. She also submitted photos of the area.

Mr. Tony Hodges, a member of the Manoa Valley Community Association, discussed the relation on the site plan to the proposed University building in the area and pointed out that the University did not propose dormitories in this area on their long-range plans.

Mr. Swift submitted the answers to Dr. Lester's five questions:

1. The answer is no. The only way our projects are economically feasible is that room and board is in one package.

2. We would charge a nominal fee for parking to pay for parking stickers so we can control

who park in our lots so it would only be resident students.

3. I don't contemplate that we would sell parking to outsiders.

4. We would be serving lunch, however, if our experience of other facilities are of any gauge and I would guess it would be very similar here, a great majority of the students will take sack lunches that we pack for them in the morning.

5. Yes, we would agree to a percentage if he can guarantee construction cost and the cost of borrowing money in the interim.

He discussed various answers to other questions which were raised by the protestors to the project.

Mr. Richard Lowe discussed the relationship of the University to the community as a whole.

Mr. Yamabe stated it was his understanding that the applicants have withdrawn the plans.

Mr. Swift indicated they are withdrawing the plans for modification purposes and would resubmit within 10 to 15 days.

There was a discussion on the status of the proposed revisions and the procedures which should be followed. There was a discussion on how many times changes could be made by the applicant and what notice is necessary to let the community know what would happen.

Mr. Yamabe moved and Mr. Chun seconded the motion to keep the public hearing open and the matter be deferred. The motion was carried with Mrs. Sullam and Mr. Ingleson abstaining.

PUBLIC HEARING
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
KAILUA

The Commission upon the motion by Mr. Chun seconded by Mr. Yamabe, continued until the next regular meeting of the Commission, the public hearing scheduled for today relating to a proposal to adopt a portion of the Development Plan for Kailua for an area bounded by the Kawainui Drainage Canal, Kawainui Swamp, Kaelepulu Stream, and the shoreline at Kailua.

GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
LAIE TO KUALOA
HAUULA
ADJOINING HAUULA
BEACH PARK
(COMMERCIAL USE)

Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission authorized the calling of a public hearing and authorized the Planning Director to schedule the date of the public hearing to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Laie to Kualoa by changing the land use designation from Residential to Business use for a 19,890 sq. ft. parcel of land situated in Hauula adjoining the Hauula Beach Park and identified by Tax Map Key 5-4-01: Parcels 33 and 35.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie Abbott
Hearings Reporter

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
June 26, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, June 26, 1969, at 1:40 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT:

Philip T. Chun, Chairman
Lewis Ingleson
Fredda Sullam
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Calvin Ching, Staff Planner
Jack Gilliam, Staff Planner
Herbert Mark, Staff Planner

ABSENT:

Edward Brennan
Arthur A. Rutledge
Ed Sheehan
James Sakai, ex-officio

PUBLIC HEARING
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
KAILUA
AREA BOUNDED BY
KAWAINUI DRAINAGE
CANAL, KAWAINUI
SWAMP, KAELEPULU
STREAM AND THE
SHORELINE

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to adopt a portion of the Development Plan for Kailua, Lanikai, Waimanalo, specifically, for the area bounded by the Kawainui Drainage Canal, Kawainui Swamp, Kaelepulu Stream, and the shoreline at Kailua, Oahu.

The hearing notice was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 15, 1969, and copies of the notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various civic and community associations in the Kailua area, and to interested parties.

The Director presented the proposal by first giving a brief background history of the Kailua area as follows:

1. A Detailed Land Use Plan for the Kailua area was adopted on July 24, 1964, but there is no adopted Development Plan for the area.

2. A study for a Development Plan proposal for the Kailua area was initiated in March, 1969, when the Department of Public Works verbally requested for a Development Plan to include the Coconut Grove Improvement District project because of drainage problems in the area.

3. The Development Plan boundary was increased to include the Kailua Road-Wanaao Road Improvement District Project and the potential improvement district project in the vicinity of Kaimake Loop.

(The Development Plan boundaries were outlined on the map displayed.

4. The Kailua Road widening project from Hahani Street to Awakea Road is included in the current as well as the next fiscal year Capital Improvement Program. The total cost is estimated to be $854,000. No funds have been programmed for other major highway improvements in the area.

In order to accommodate the increased traffic flow to and from Keolu Hills and Enchanted Lakes, the Director recommended that the Kailua Road Improvement District boundaries be extended along Wanaao Road to the bridge over Kaelepulu Stream. Wanaao Road should be widened from a 40-foot to a 60-foot right-of-way.

For Kailua Road widening, the recommendation is for a 96-foot right-of-way with a 16-foot median strip between Hahani Street and Wanaao Road. Beyond Wanaao Road to Kailua Beach Park, the proposal is for a 60-foot right-of-way with a 40-foot pavement but no median strip. Existing trees on the Kaneohe side of the road would remain.

To illustrate the existing street conditions in the area, several slides were shown of the roadways proposed for widening in the Kailua area.

Mr. Calvin Ching, staff planner, elaborated on other features of the Development Plan, as follows:

1. North Kalaheo Avenue between the bridge over Kawainui Drainage Canal and Kainui Drive is proposed to be widened from a 40-foot to an 80-foot right-of-way.

2. North and South Kalaheo Avenue between Kainui Drive and Kailua Road is proposed to be widened from a 50-foot to a 56-foot right-of-way.

3. Maluniu Avenue is proposed to be widened from a 40-foot to a 56-foot right-of-way from Uluniu Street to Kalama Street and extended for about 340 feet to meet Maluniu Avenue near the vicinity of Uilama Street.

4. Oneawa Street is proposed to be widened from a 40-foot to a 56-foot right-of-way between Kaha and Wailepo Streets.

5. Kaulani Way is proposed to be widened from a 30-foot to a 44-foot right-of-way between Oneawa Street and Hinano Way.

6. Hinano Way is proposed to be widened from a 30-foot to a 44-foot right-of-way between Kaulani Way and Kuaaina Way.

7. Kuaaina Way is proposed to be widened from a 30-foot to a 44-foot right-of-way between Hinano Way and Oneawa Street.

8. Kihapai Street is proposed to be widened from a 40-foot to a 56-foot right-of-way from Wailepo Street and extended in the Kaneohe direction by 370 feet to meet existing Kaipii Street.

9. Kuulei Road is proposed to be widened from a 60-foot to an 80-foot right-of-way between Maluniu Avenue and South Kalaheo Avenue.

10. Kipuka Place is proposed to be widened from a 30-foot to a 40-foot right-of-way from the entrance of Kipuka Place to a point 220 feet towards Kawainui Swamp.

11. Hamakua Drive is proposed to be extended all the way to the Enchanted Lake Subdivision area, but under this Development Plan is shown as extended only up to Kaelepulu Stream which is the boundary of this planning area.

Testimony was then heard from the opponents.

Councilman Mary George inquired whether any of the proposed widenings are inconsistent with present setbacks existing on the roadways.

The Director's reply was that the widenings are consistent with existing setbacks except along Kailua Road.

Mr. Frank Feistal, a property owner affected by the proposed widening of Kailua Road to 96 feet, had two main objections as follows:

1. He was opposed to the additional taking of land than was originally proposed for Kailua Road widening. The taking of 25 feet of his land will place the roadway only about 3 feet from his house. He had no objection to the taking of 20 feet as originally proposed.

2. He objected to being assessed for a roadway improvement that would be of more benefit to developers who will be building homes in the outlying areas and to the new home owners who will be using the street than to the affected property owners who must suffer the inconvenience caused by increased traffic and the additional burden of an assessment.

He then questioned the need for such a wide 6-lane roadway with an 8-foot sidewalk through a residential section. He compared the traffic volume on Kailua

Road as against Waikiki and noted that the volume through Waikiki is much greater than Kailua Road, yet Kailua Road is to be widened much more than roadways in the Waikiki area.

He felt that traffic from Keolu Hills and Enchanted Lakes should not be funneled through town but through some other means of access away from town. In this respect, extending Hamakua Drive might help to divert traffic away from town.

He then submitted 7 photographs taken of the proposed widening area to prove the points of his objections.

When questioned by the Commission, Mr. Feistal felt it much better to save existing shrubs and trees planted by the residents than the ironwood trees which shed needles and cones and create a mess in the area.

Mr. Ralph Miller residing at 217 Kailua Road for the past 15 years, objected to the proposal to take 8 feet from his property to widen Kailua Road between Wanaao Road and Kalaheo Avenue to a 60-foot right-of-way. He moved there with the knowledge that there was no street widening setback on his property but that it was all on the other side of the street in the Kuulei Subdivision area where the residents are aware of a 20-foot setback area. If the reason for the 8-foot setback on his side of the street is to preserve the ironwood trees that are on the other side of the street, he felt that this was poor planning and that now was the time to plan for better shade trees to improve the area. The Poinciana trees planted on his side of the street were the type of trees that should be saved rather than the ironwood trees. His lot area of 10,000 sq. ft. is also much smaller than the lots on the other side of the street where the sizes range from 11,000 to 15,000 sq. ft.

When asked by the Commission about the traffic situation and the need for a wider roadway, Mr. Miller stated that traffic has never been a problem to him. Because of proposals to develop apartments in the area near the beach, he saw the need for a wider roadway in the future, but his objection was to the proposal to take 8 feet from his side of the street and not 20 feet on the other side as originally committed.

Mr. David Babineau speaking for the Windward Chamber of Commerce agreed with the two previous speakers in their objections. He stated that the Chamber studied the proposals and agreed with the recommendations for street widenings and extensions except for the following:

1. They feel that top priority should be given to extending Hamakua Drive, which is at the entrance to Kailua town, to meet Hamakua Drive within the

Enchanted Lake Subdivision even though this road must be built through property that is not pre-planned for development. If this is done, traffic flow into and out of Enchanted Lake would be greatly relieved. If necessary, this extension could be constructed at City expense.

2. They are restating a position taken early in 1968 to support the original proposal for an 80-foot right-of-way for Kailua Road. After much study they decided against the proposal for a median strip to save the ironwood trees because of the need for additional acquisition of land from about ten properties, the funding which would have to be made available for such purchase and the delay in instituting the road widening while condemnation was in process. (He read a copy of a letter sent to the Planning Director in 1968 stating this position taken by the Chamber of Commerce.)

3. Kailua Road widening between Wanaao Road and Kalaheo Avenue should be given second priority to the widening of Wanaao Road between Kailua Road and the Wanaao Road bridge over Kaelepulu Stream into Enchanted Lakes.

Mr. Babineau stated that their study further revealed that the ironwood trees were planted in the early twenties by Mr. Campos and his father. They were planted for three reasons: (1) As a boundary marker between the Bishop Tract and the Kaneohe Ranch property; (2) To provide shade for cattle; and (3) To provide a windbreak. Two rows of trees were planted. One row exists while the second row was cut when the apartments were built.

In the interrogation that followed, Mr. Babineau reiterated the Chamber's support for an 80-foot right-of-way for Kailua Road even though this meant the elimination of the ironwood trees. He felt that other appropriate shade trees can be planted in the area. In speaking to residents in the area, none are in favor of retaining the ironwood trees.

Mr. V. J. Kennell a resident of Kailua for over 23 years spoke on the traffic situation and Kailua Road widening proposal. It was his recollection that back in 1966, Kailua Road between Hahani Street and Wanaao Road was planned as an 80-foot right-of-way with a setback of 20 feet on each side of the existing 40-foot roadway and Kailua Road between Wanaao Road and Kalaheo Avenue as a 60-foot right-of-way with a 20-foot setback on the Kaneohe side of the road with no setback on the Lanikai side. People who purchased homes were aware of the setback area and provided for it by planting their hedges 20 feet back from the edge of the road. Because someone said "save the ironwoods", the road widening plans are now changed, thereby, affecting

many more property owners. He could not understand the reason for saving the ironwoods when, to his knowledge, no organization on the Windward side, including the Outdoor Circle, has indicated a desire to save the trees.

Regarding the traffic situation, he indicated that there is congestion now and the situation will become worst when the proposed apartment developments on the former dairy site are completed. As shown on the General Plan map, he felt that Hamakua Drive should be extended into the Enchanted Lake area thereby creating an access road that would divert traffic away from the center of Kailua town. He concurred with the statements given by the previous speakers.

At the request of the Commission, the Director gave a brief background report on the proposal to extend Hamakua Drive into the Enchanted Lakes area. This roadway is proposed as an 80-foot right-of-way but its construction is not programmed in the City's Six-Year Capital Improvement Program. He cannot verify the information, but it was his understanding that the developers of abutting lands were to construct the roadway as part of their subdivision development.

Since Hamakua Drive extension is not a part of this public hearing consideration, the Commission did not discuss the matter further.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Kennell stated that he did not notice too much difference in the traffic situation while the temporary roadway leading directly out of Enchanted Lakes onto Kalanianaole Highway was being used. There was always a pile up of traffic at the traffic light on Kailua Road. He felt that traffic out of Kailua town might flow faster if a separate left turn movement arrow was installed. Traffic lights at the intersection of Hamakua Drive and Kailua Road might also help.

(Mr. Sharpless was excused from the meeting at this point of the hearing.)

Mrs. Louise Gilman, speaking on behalf of the Lani-Kailua Outdoor Circle and also as a citizen residing in Kailua, informed the Commission of the stand taken by the Outdoor Circle not to favor the preservation of the ironwood trees because they are detrimental to the progress of moving traffic on Kailua Road. If there must be trees, other types of trees can be planted.

Speaking as a private individual, she was against the proposal to widen Kailua Road beyond the originally proposed 80-foot width up to the Wanaao Road traffic light. She agreed with the proposed 60-foot width. Beyond the traffic light to Kalaheo Avenue and to the

beach, She also believed that the extension of Hamakua Drive should help to resolve much of the traffic problem in the area.

Eve Drolet, co-editor of the Pali Press, felt that an updated traffic count for Kailua should be available before deciding on the width of a road. She made inquiries and could not obtain any information on current studies made by either the City or the State.

No one else spoke against the proposal. There was no one to speak in support of the proposal.

Mr. George Moriwaki and Mr. Ernest Kagawa from the Traffic Department were present and they were questioned by the Commission.

Mr. Moriwaki reported as follows:

1. A recent traffic count was made on Kailua Road to evaluate the volume on the access road for the Joe Pao development and the result is as follows:

   On Kailua Road, during the morning peak hour, going from the traffic light at Wanaao Road to the Oneawa-Kuulei intersection, the volume was 711.

   Coming from Enchanted Lakes into the intersection of Wanaao and Kailua Road at the traffic light, the highest volume was 585 between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 a.m. At the intersection of Kalanianaole Highway and the access road from Keolu Drive, the volume was 551 between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 7:30 a.m. From the Lanikai area towards the traffic light at Wanaao and Kailua Road, the volume was 126.

   Going in the opposite direction, the critical period, which was Saturday, the volume was about 400.

2. An 80-foot, a 90-foot, or a 96-foot right-of-way can accommodate six moving lanes.

3. From data collected on traffic volume and expanding that to anticipated traffic generation resulting from future developments in the Keolu Hills-Enchanted Lakes area and also the Lanikai area, they had recommended 6 moving lanes on Kailua Road from the business district to Wanaao Road and 4 moving lanes from Wanaao Road to Kalaheo Avenue.

4. It is anticipated that the new right-of-way widths should adequately handle traffic through the area for the next 20 to 30 years.

5. Their recommendation was based on a projected traffic volume of 972 vehicles per hour coming

from the Keolu Hills and Enchanted Lakes area and 200 vehicles from the Lanikai area and going through the intersection of Wanaao Road and Kailua Road.

6. In making their projection, they did take into consideration, the projected volume going through Hamakua Drive and also through the access road off Keolu Drive at the other end.

The Director then briefly summarized the substance of letters submitted by the following: (They generally supported the road widening proposal for Kailua Road to an 80-foot right-of-way and requested at the same time that Hamakua Drive extension be constructed. None supported the proposal to save the ironwood trees:)

1. Lani-Kailua Outdoor Circle
2. Mrs. Louise Gilman
3. Dr. James L. Mertz
4. Mrs. B. R. Jacobsen
5. Mrs. M. S. McLeod
6. Windward Citizens Planning Conference
7. Suzanne Holmes, Betty Gordon, Jane H. Ball, Mary King, F. R. McLeod, and Polly Walters
8. Bob Hargreaves

Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

In considering this matter later, the Commission decided to act on the proposals separately.

ACTION: 1. Mrs. Sullam made a motion to recommend the adoption of a portion of the Development Plan for Kailua, Lanikai, Waimanalo, as proposed by the Planning Director, except for the proposal involving Kailua Road widening. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yamabe and carried.

2. Mr. Yamabe moved to recommend that Kailua Road widening between Hahani Street and Wanaao Road revert to its original right-of-way width designation of 80 feet with the deletion of the medial strip, and Kailua Road widening between Wanaao Road and Kalaheo Avenue be established at 60-foot right-of-way but revert to the existing setback designation of 20 feet on the Kuulei Subdivision side of the road rather than the proposed setback designation of 12 feet on the Kuulei Subdivision side and 8 feet on the Lanikai side of the road. The motion died for lack of a second.

3. The Commission discussed the need for a wider Kailua Road in view of plans for extension of

Hamakua Drive into the Enchanted Lake Subdivision area and the access road directly from the Enchanted Lake area onto Kalanianaole Highway near Waimanalo. With the construction of these two roads, much of the traffic would not be using Kailua Road to go to Honolulu. However, it was pointed out that parents discharge their children at school before going to work and will use Kailua Road.

It was reported by the Director that there are no plans for extension and construction of Hamakua Drive in this current fiscal year's Capital Improvement Program budget.

ACTION: The Commission deferred further consideration of Kailua Road widening proposal until the next meeting upon the motion by Mrs. Sullam, seconded by Mr. Ingleson.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DLUM & DP (AMEND)
UNIVERSITY
COMMUNITY PLAN
(MOILIILI-UNIVERSITY-MANOA)
MAKIKI STREAM

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan, more particularly the Detailed Land Use Map and Development Plan of the University Community area (Moiliili-University-Manoa) by realigning and widening Makiki Stream as part of the Department of Public Works Flood Control Program involving Tax Map Keys 2-3-23, 24, 25, 32, and 34.

The notice of public hearing was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 15, 1969, and copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community and civic organizations in the area and to 51 property owners in the surrounding area.

Mr. Herbert Mark, staff planner, explained the proposed amendments involving that portion of Makiki Stream from King Street to Ala Wai Canal, as follows:

1. Realigning and widening of Makiki Stream to 45 feet between King and Philip Streets; 50 feet between Philip and Fern Streets; and 70 feet between Fern Street and Ala Wai Canal.

2. Establishing multiple-use corridors along both sides of the new stream alignment for construction and maintenance purposes and, where possible, for landscaping and/or park use.

3. Deadending of Lime Street at the stream.

Some pertinent facts brought out were that:

1. The existing ditch is inadequate to handle flood waters as evidenced by the occasional flooding of adjacent properties.

2. The stream improvement is the first part of

the Department of Public Works' flood control program for the Makiki Stream project which is scheduled for fiscal year 1969-70. The total cost of the project, both mauka and makai of King Street, is expected to be $4.3 million.

3. The design of the stream improvement calls for a lined, box-type ditch with vertical walls.

4. The establishment of a multi-use area on both sides of the stream for stream maintenance purposes as well as for open space and park use. The Department of Parks and Recreation supports this concept which is similar to the strip park along Ala Wai Canal.

5. The stream widening will displace approximately 52 structures of which 29 are single family homes; 6 duplexes; 4, three-unit apartments; 8, four-unit apartments; and 5, other types of structures.

Mr. William Ling, Chief Planning and Design for the Division of Engineering, Department of Public Works, was called upon to elaborate on the stream widening project. Representing Mr. Albert C. Zane, Director and Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works, Mr. Ling read Mr. Zane's statement explaining the purpose of the project, the proposed improvements, and the cost. The design and construction plans for the channel and bridges are scheduled for completion by January 1971 with construction to start by the end of fiscal year 1971 and completed in 1973.

He stated that the C.I.P. budget for this current fiscal year has programmed approximately $417,000 for land acqusition and $64,000 for planning and engineering. Until the stream widening project is shown on the Development Plan, they are unable to proceed with the acquisition of land to initiate the project. They generally acquire only the necessary rights-of-way for the channel and the easement areas for maintenance purpose, but in this instance, because of plans for open space and strip park areas, where necessary, entire parcels would be purchased. The need for an open channel is primarily for maintenance purpose. In low lying areas, if the channel is closed, there is maintenance problem. Another problem in this area is that they have difficulty in maintaining the channel because there are no easements along the existing channel. As a result, several lawsuits have been filed by the property owners whose properties were flooded by overflow from the channel.

At the request of the Commission, Mr. Mark reported on the existing zoning and land uses as well as the General Plan land use designations for the areas on both sides of the drainage channel. Only a land use change and no rezoning is involved to accomplish the purpose intended for a stream widening project.

Mr. Mark then read into the record, the following letters received in support and in opposition to the proposal:

In Support:

1. The Outdoor Circle

In Opposition:

1. Hawaiian Host, Inc., by M. Takitani, owner of real property fronting Makiki Stream on Kalakaua Avenue, identified by Tax Map Key 2-3-25: 003.

2. Helen S. Tokuda, owner of land at the corner of Kalakaua Avenue and King Street, Tax Map Key 2-3-25: 002.

3. Mason M. Hironaka, First Hawaiian Bank, agent of Agenes S. Lewis, owner of Tax Map Key 2-3-32: 57 and 64.

4. John Young and Mabel K. Young, owners of land at 1554 Kalakaua Avenue, Tax Map Key 2-3-25: 16.

5. Wendell H. Marumoto, attorney for H. W. Ching, owner of property identified by Tax Map Key 2-3-34: 28.

6. Mrs. Edith Kohama of 1603 Pualoke Place, owner of Tax Map Key 2-3-23: 28.

7. Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Mun of 1528 Kalakaua Avenue, owner of Tax Map Key 2-3-25: 05.

8. Wilfred H. C. Youth, representing Mr. and Mrs. Mun Cho Yim, owners of Tax Map Key 2-3-25: 6.

9. Mr. and Mrs. Walter Lum, owners of Tax Map Key 2-3-23: 13.

10. Mr. and Mrs. Cheong Wong, owners of Tax Map Key 2-3-23: 15.

11. Mr. and Mrs. Raymond J. F. Chang, owners of Tax Map Key 2-3-23: 12, 796 Punahou Street.

12. Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Choy, owners of Tax Map Key 2-3-23: 17.

The protestants' reasons for objection generally related to the fact that all or a major portion of their properties would be taken for the stream widening project. This taking will deprive many of them from their source of income or displace them from their long established residence. Some

felt that the taking was too excessive or not equitable and suggested the taking from both sides of the stream alignment. Others suggested increasing the depth of the stream rather than widening it.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. Harry Tanaka, attorney, represented Mr. and Mrs. T. Hata, owner of property at 1564 Kalakaua Avenue, which is the third parcel mauka of Philip Street. The proposed widening will entirely eliminate Mr. Hata's electrical contracting shop and warehouse and a portion of his residence but leave his apartment building.

Mr. Tanaka failed to see the necessity for widening the stream as wide as that proposed between King and Philip Streets and noted a narrower width for that area makai of Philip Street. It was his understanding that flooding occurs along the stream alignment mauka of King Street and asked about the improvement plans for that section. It was his contention that unless somthing is done to improve the situation in that mauka section, it would be meaningless to make improvements on the makai section.

Mr. Arthur S. Uyehara, owner of property located at the corner of Punahou Street Extension and Malanai Street, read and filed his letter of protest. He was distressed by the proposal which would affect his property containing three, two-story structures purchased a few years ago as investment for his retirement. He was also disturbed because there was such short notification to them about a proposal which might involve condemnation of properties as early as six months from this date. He doubted that he would be able to acquire a similar property with equal value and in a desirable location as his present property. He suggested that further studies be given to the proposal with alternatives considered to either widen the stream on the Kalakaua Avenue side and at the same time widen Kalakaua Avenue or widen the stream on both sides and deepen it with higher walls.

Mr. Charles W. K. Hee, owner of a parcel of land at 1709 Fern Street which is across from the bridge, lived in the area for the past 30 years. He stated that the stream by his property was open originally and they had no problem of flooding. He believed that the flooding started when the property owner across from his home was given permission to cover the stream because right by that bridge, the stream narrows and the opening becomes plugged by debris. Under the new proposal, he noted a narrow opening right at the same location and he feared that the same overflow problem would occur. He was opposed to the new proposal because it would not remedy the present flooding condition yet it would cause a lot of trouble and expense for the property owners.

Mr. Mason Hironaka asked for clarification of what is actually proposed for the area. On the basis of testimony heard, he understands that there will be condemnation of properties for widening of the stream and in addition there would be easement areas for maintenance of the stream. There is also a proposal to use the easement areas for park purposes--jogging picnicking and so forth. Since his understanding of an easement is merely a right for the City to use the area for maintenance purpose with ownership of the land retained by the property owners, he reported the property owners concern that people will be picnicking on their land.

Mr. Mark explained that the terminology easement was used, but what is actually proposed is fee acquisition of the areas needed for the stream widening and maintenance purposes. As a multi-use, the maintenance areas are to be used as a park.

In the discussion that followed, questions asked by the Commission were answered as follows:

1. The Director stated that acquisition in order to make the stream improvement will require virtually taking all the properties at one time fairly immediately so that construction can start. He did not believe that any remnant parcels would remain.

2. Mr. Mark stated that the Department of Public Works as the displacing agency will issue Certificates of Displacement to the affected residents and refer them to the Relocation Division of the Honolulu Redevelopment Agency for assistance in relocation. Although relocation funds for public works projects have not been provided by the City in the past, a recommendation should be made for such fund in the Public Works budget. State standards suggest up to $100 per family for moving costs and up to $300 for businesses. The relocation services of the HRA are seriously hampered by the critical housing shortage and the high rent situation in Honolulu, but the low and low-middle income groups are referred to the Hawaii Housing Authority where they are given some priority in public housing or in the rent supplement program, and the middle income groups are given some priority in moderate income housing projects, such as at Kukui and Red Hill.

3. Mr. Mark could not give a plausible explanation as to why there was a delay of two years before the initiation of this proposed amendment to the Development Plan except to state that the proposal was an administrative matter and possibly may have been delayed administratively.

4. Mr. Ling explained that a narrow channel as shown on the plan on the lower portion does not mean that it has a lesser carrying capacity than the wider channel shown on the upper portion. To a layman, the capacity of a channel means the dimension but to an engineer, this is only one facet because other factors are taken into consideration, such as the slope of the channel, the geometrics or perimeter, and so forth. This is merely a preliminary design and they will be incorporating the existing channel in the final plan.

5. Mr. Ling stated that the improvement of the mauka portion of the channel is included in this project. The proposal is to put a box drain from the King Street open channel to approximately the Mormon Church property on Beretania Street. There is a tunnel underneath the King-Kalakaua Building and they will be putting in another channel to handle increase flow. This is only the first phase of an ultimate plan to improve the waterways from Ala Wai Canal all the way to Pensacola Street.

6. Mr. Ling further stated that the existing Makiki Ditch was designed and constructed in 1930 and the present capacity is 510 cubic feet of water per second. This capacity is very low and accounts for the numerous flooding of the area as well as the build up of the stream wall by the residents along the stream in order to protect their properties. Based on available hydrological data, the design discharge of the stream is being increased to handle 5,600 cfs.

7. Regarding aesthetics, Mr. Ling felt that the open green areas with proper landscaping and hedges along the ditch should improve the area and hide the ditch slightly. Regarding the ditch itself, he explained that it could be left in its natural state but by doing so, the capacity of the waterway would be less than the waterway of a lined channel. In order to carry the same amount of runoff as a lined channel, the natural stream must be much wider than it is now proposed thus requiring a larger land area.

8. Regarding the possibility of an easement area for maintenance purpose rather than an outright purchase, Mr. Ling pointed out that in some areas the stream is to be widened from 20 to 30 feet to 50 to 70 feet so that the affected properties would have only a narrow sliver of land left which cannot be built upon. For this reason, the mini-park concept was incorporated with the widening and maintenance area for the stream. The taking is from only one side of the stream because a taking from both sides will result in substandard lots on both sides of the stream.

(Mr. Sharpless returned to the meeting at about this portion of the discussion. 5:10 p.m.)

No one else testified either in favor of or in opposition to the proposal.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mrs. Sullam.

In later consideration, Mrs. Sullam moved to recommend approval of the proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan, more particularly of the University Community area (Moiliili-University-Manoa), by realigning and widening Makiki Stream as reported. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ingleson but failed to carry due to the lack of four affirmative votes.

ACTION: The Commission deferred action on this matter upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
MAUNALUA
MAUKA-KOKO HEAD
CORNER OF KALANI-
ANAOLE HIGHWAY &
LUNALILI HOME ROAD
COMMERCIAL USE
(KAISER HAWAII-
KAI DEV. CO.)

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and Detailed Land Use Map of Maunalua by changing the land use designation from Residential use to Commercial use for a 2.77-acre parcel of land situated at the mauka-Koko Head corner of Kalanianaole Highway and Lunalilo Home Road, Hawaii-Kai, Maunalua, and identified by Tax Map Key 3-9-40: Parcel 40.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 15, 1969, was read by the Director who reported that copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community and civic organizations in the Hawaii-Kai, Koko Head and Maunalua areas, and to interested parties.

The Director read the staff's report giving a brief background information on the overall development plan of the Hawaii-Kai area and the present proposal to construct a branch medical clinic of the Kaiser Foundation Hospitals on the subject property. The applicant proposes to renovate an existing sales office building on the site and utilize it as a medical clinic for the next few years. As the need arises, this building will be reconstructed to a two-story building. Access will be from Lunalilo Home Road which is an 80-foot collector street. Water and sewer facilities are available and adequate to accommodate the proposed use.

The staff concluded that a medical clinic is needed in this vicinity to service the residents of Hawaii-Kai and the adjoining communities but felt it undesirable to expand commercial use in a Koko Head direction from the Hawaii-Kai Shopping Center which is on the mauka-Ewa corner of Lunalilo Home Road and Kalanianaole

Highway. Therefore, the staff's recommendation is for denial of the proposed amendment to the Detailed Land Use Map based on the following:

1. The subject property was originally laid out for residential development. It is presently zoned R-6 Residential.

2. To permit a commercial development which would generate sizable traffic volumes on both sides of Lunalilo Home Road adjacent to Kalanianaole Highway constitutes poor planning.

3. It is undesirable to permit access on Lunalilo Home Road for another major traffic-generating use this close to its intersection with Kalanianaole Highway.

In reply to Mr. Sharpless' inquiry, the Director stated that no reply has been received from the Traffic Department as to whether or not any traffic study was conducted of this intersection.

There was no one to testify against the proposal.

Mr. Donald Iwai, attorney, represented the Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company, the applicant. He displayed a map showing the specific parcel and the improvements contained thereon and gave the following information:

1. Although Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company first made the application and is listed as the applicant, the parcel of land in question has subsequently been conveyed from the Bishop Estate to the Kaiser Foundation Hospitals with the understanding that Kaiser Hawaii-Kai will proceed with the application.

2. The existing improvements on the parcel are three cottage-like single story structures which are proposed to be converted into a clinic until such time as the demand may call for expansion or new structures.

3. The ultimate development of the area is unknown at this time but in keeping with the other developments by the Kaiser Clinic in the rural areas--Kaneohe and Maili--the ultimate development will probably be single story or at the most two story structures.

4. They realize that there will be some increase in traffic on Lunalilo Home Road as a result of the proposed use, but they cannot say how much of an increase or what amount of traffic will create a problem. However, some ideas can be given by the following projections made by the Kaiser Clinic people:

a. During the first few years of operation, it

is projected that the clinic will be serving approximately 1,200 patients per month.

b. After about 5 years, the number of patients is expected to double or about 2,400 patients per month.

c. After 10 years, the number of patients is estimated to be double of the fifth year or about 4,800 patients per month.

5. Upon completion, the entire Hawaii Kai development area is estimated to house a population of about 50,000 to 60,000 people.

6. This clinic is planned primarily to service the immediate areas of Hawaii-Kai and possibly the Kuliouou, Aina Haina and Waimanalo areas.

7. As of this date, Kaiser Hawaii-Kai has approximately 2,900 leases actually drawn, although this does not mean that there are 2,900 families living there.

8. They anticipate a population growth of about 9 percent per annum in the area. This growth shows a definite need for a clinic in the area.

9. Because the clinic would be primarily servicing the Hawaii-Kai residents, the traffic generated in the area will be the same traffic that is there already. The majority of the traffic will not be coming from the Kaimuki or outside areas.

10. Using the operational standards of the Kaiser Clinic in Kaneohe, the hours of operation will be as follows:

a. On Mondays through Fridays, the hours will be from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., and on Saturdays, from 8:30 a.m. to 12 noon.

b. There is a one hour lunch break from noon to 1:00 p.m.

c. There will be after-hour emergency services when the clinic will be staffed with one doctor and one nurse after 4:30 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., on weekdays, from noon to 10:00 p.m., on Saturdays, from 10:00 a.m., to 10:00 p.m., on Sundays, and during the lunch hours.

11. By using the first year patient count of 1,200 per month and dividing that by 25 days per month, the patient count would be 48 visitors per day or 6 visitors per hour. Assuming that each patient came in his own car, the traffic count would be 6 cars per hour.

After 10 years, based on the projection given, the patient count would be 192 per day or 24 cars per hour.

12. Based on the preceding projection, they do not envision a major traffic problem created in the area by the proposed operation. Furthermore, the traffic generation in the area would be spread out during the day and generally be during the off-peak hours after 8:30 a.m., and before 4:30 p.m. The peak hour traffic is between 6:30 to about 7:30 or 8:00 in the morning and between 4:30 or 5:00 to about 5:30 or 6:00 in the evening.

Interrograted by the Commission, Mr. Iwai stated that they did consider putting the clinic in the shopping center across the street, but by the time Kaiser Clinic was ready to select a site, plans for the shopping center were about completed with tenants committed so that there was no room for the clinic there.

Mr. Sharpless suggested the possibility of the Traffic Department conducting a study to determine the traffic situation as it exists there now with the shopping center across the street, visualize what the situation might be with the proposed operation and submit its view as to whether or not there is or there will be a traffic problem in the future.

No one else testified either in favor of or in opposition to the proposed amendment to the Detailed Land Use Map.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson.

X ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission deferred action and referred this matter to the Traffic Department for a recommendation.

PUBLIC HEARING GENERAL PLAN (AMENDMENT) KAPALAMA-IWILEI DELETION OF PROPOSED HART ST. EXTENSION

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu, more particularly of the Kapalama-Iwilei area, by deleting the proposed Hart Street extension between Puuhale Road and Mokauea Street, identified by Tax Map Key 1-2-08.

The notice of public hearing published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 15, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community and civic organizations in the Kalihi and Palama areas and to interested parties.

The Director oriented the Commission to the location of the proposed extension area and reported that the land is presently being used by Puuhale School. The

existing zoning of the area is I-1 Industrial District within which district public buildings and uses are permitted. A Detailed Land Use Map and a Development Plan for this Kapalama-Iwilei planning area have not yet been adopted. The request for deletion was made by the State Department of Accounting and General Service which is presently preparing the master plan of Puuhale Elementary School for an ultimate enrollment of 1,200 students.

The Director recommended the deletion of proposed Hart Street extension between Mokauea Street and Puuhale Road from the General Plan based upon the following evaluation:

1. The extension would create a very narrow and undesirable shaped block between Hart and Kalani Streets which would probably create more traffic problems.

2. The extension would almost entirely involve school property of which the recreational area is at a minimum and is used extensively by the community during non-school hours.

No one spoke either in favor of or in opposition to the proposed amendment to the General Plan.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposed amendment to the General Plan as reported.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
KANEOHE-KUALOA
KANEOHE, LULUKU
ROAD AREA
VARIOUS CHANGES
(FAIRFIELD MANOR)

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe to Kualoa (Planning Area No. 25), Tax Map Key 4-5-39 as follows:

1. Deleting all of Luluku Place, which is unimproved and privately owned;

2. Widening a portion of Luluku Road to 56 feet;

3. Changing the land use designation of Parcels 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 from Light Industrial to Commercial.

4. Changing the land use designation of Parcels 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 and a portion of Parcels 2, 3, and 4 from Light Industrial to Medium Density Apartment; and

5. Changing a portion of Parcels 2, 3, and 4 from Light Industrial to Park and Recreation.

The subject area is bounded on the makai side by Kamehameha Highway, on the Waimanalo side by Luluku

Road, on the mauka side by Napali Gardens Apartments, and on the Kaneohe side by Kaiser Koolau Clinic Grounds.

The Director read the notice of public hearing published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 15, 1969. Copies of the notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community and civic organizations in the Kaneohe area, and to interested parties. No written protests have been received to date.

The Director oriented the Commission to the location of the area under discussion by pointing out the major land uses in the surrounding area and gave the following report:

1. The changes in land use designations involve 46,621 sq. ft. to Commercial; 70,559 sq. ft. to Medium Density Apartment; and 30,000 sq. ft. to Parks and Recreation from Light Industrial.

2. The developer plans to construct a 24-floor, 211-unit apartment or condominium building, a 4-floor, 262-car parking building, and a commercial development fronting on Kamehameha Highway, Kaneohe side of Luluku Road.

3. Several residential and commercial buildings on the site are to be removed.

4. Traffic facilities are adequate. Luluku Road, a collector street, feeds onto Kamehameha Highway which is the major highway.

5. All utilities are available. All electric and telephone lines will be placed underground by the developer.

6. The developer proposes to donate the park area of approximately 30,000 sq. ft. to the City and to improve 620 feet of Luluku Road including its widening from 30 feet to 56 feet with a 40-foot pavement and curbs, gutters and sidewalks.

The Director recommended approval of the proposed changes to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Kaneohe area.

A letter received from Mary L. B. Avant, owner of Parcels 41, 42, 43, 44, 45 and 46 of Tax Map Key 4-5-76 which are located in Kaneohe, two of which front on Luluku Road, was read by the Director. As an interested landowner in the area, Mrs. Avant was favorably impressed by the development planned for the subject area and particularly expressed her approval of the proposal to widen a portion of Luluku Road to 56 feet.

In reply to questions from the Commission, the Director gave additional information as follows:

1. Whether the park designation is a proposal of the Department or a voluntary action by the developer, he could not say, but he assumed that the park proposal was mentioned during the discussion stages with the developer. A letter is on file from the Parks Department accepting the site as a tot lot.

2. The developer has submitted a letter indicating that he has a lease of 75 years on the various parcels of land owned by other individuals and groups.

3. There are no comments from the Traffic Department on anticipated traffic generation by the proposed project.

4. Adjacent land uses are mixed. There are several types of commercial uses extending along Kamehameha Highway frontage, a clinic, an apartment use on the mauka side, and single family residential uses for the remaining areas.

5. The topography of the land is generally level. The road slopes down sharply as it extends into the interior area.

6. The bases for recommending approval of the changes are:

a. There is a need for the type of high density housing proposed in the location.

b. Because of existing facilities, such as the nearby commercial and apartment developments, it seems more appropriate to have apartment density as a transitional use between the high density commercial uses along the highway frontage and the low density single family residential uses in the mauka section.

c. Although the General Plan designates a large section of this area for light industrial use, this type of development has not occurred. There are very few light industrial facilities developed in the area. Whatever large parcels of land available for light industrial uses have been developed with a clinic and an apartment. A land use survey made recently showed that there is no available land for light industrial development.

7. One of the bases for the designation of light industrial use for the area was to provide for the greatest latitude for land uses.

8. Further amendments to the General Plan can

be proposed to eliminate the light industrial use designation from the area.

9. There is a medial strip opening on Kamehameha Highway for left turn movements into and out of Luluku Road.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. Kenneth Ishimoto, one of the property owners affected by the proposed development, testified that he had no knowledge of the proposal now under consideration. Although Mr. Fairfield did approach him about six months ago and mentioned the project, he did not make any commitment to Mr. Fairfield regarding his property. He pointed out his property situated at the makai-Kaneohe corner of Luluku Place and Luluku Road.

He had purchased the property with the intention of establishing a veterinary clinic because there is a need for this type of service in the Kaneohe area. Under the old zoning ordinance, a veterinary clinic was permitted in a light industrial district but just recently, he learned that under the Comprehensive Zoning Code, this use is not permitted in that district.

He had mixed feelings about the offer made by Mr. Fairfield because there is no assurance of a lease should the project fail somehow after he had committed himself and the property is zoned. He stressed that at this time, he has no agreement or a lease with Mr. Fairfield to have his property included in the proposed project. He stated that Mr. Fairfield's lawyer just handed him a copy of a letter dated June 24 sent to his home, but as yet he has not received it at his home.

Mr. James G. Fairfield, developer, reported that financing for the project is all arranged but the option money will be available after the change in the General Plan is made. He stated that Mr. Ishimoto and he had agreed on a lease price and he had also agreed to take care of a piece of property in Kaneohe for Mr. Ishimoto. His attorney has sent out letters to all the tenants in the project area on June 24 stating that option money would be available immediately after the amendments to the General Plan are approved by the Planning Commission and the City Council. The option money and lease documents have already been drafted and each tenant will be given an opportunity to place whatever conditions he wants in the lease. The tenants were advised to have their attorney meet with his attorney after the General Plan amendments were approved.

When questioned by the Commission, Mr. Fairfield stated further that:

1. He has documents in writing from all the property owners except Mr. Ishimoto giving him the authority to proceed with the General Plan amendments respecting their properties.

2. By developing as a planned unit project, he would be able to proceed with the project without using Mr. Ishimoto's property.

3. The same letter dated June 24 sent to Mr. Ishimoto was also sent to Mrs. Harriet Akuna, Mrs. Helen Y. M. Wong, the Tanaka brothers, Mr. and Mrs. Wood Mee Hee Young, Mr. and Mrs. Shigeru Yonamine and to the Kaiser Foundation, owner of Parcel 14 which is being purchased by Fairfield Manor at a price agreed upon by both parties.

4. The parcel to be designated as park is owned by Mrs. Wong. The dedication offer to the City of the 30,000 sq. ft. of land for park purpose is for a period of 75 years, the term of the lease agreement with Mrs. Wong. Mrs. Wong will receive the lease agreement price promised her.

5. He did not contact Mr. Ishimoto again because he thought that the oral agreement made in Mr. Ishimoto's office in Kailua settled the matter.

Mrs. Harriet Akuna, owner of the fourth parcel from the corner of Kamehameha Highway and Luluku Road, stated that her mother, Mrs. Wong, owns the corner parcel and also the parcel in the back to be designated as a park. She also represented her neighbors, the Tanaka brothers, owners of the adjoining two parcels fronting on Kamehameha Highway, and the Yonamines, who live in the back of her parcel. (These parcels were pointed out on the map.)

She stated that she and her neighbors including Mr. and Mrs. Young, did sign a document authorizing Mr. Fairfield to represent them in obtaining the proper zoning of their parcels because they agreed that his proposed project of a condominium or apartment site in the back and commercial developments in the front was the highest and best use of the area. She was of the understanding that Dr. Ishimoto was to develop a veterinary clinic on his property and, therefore, was not included with Mr. Fairfield's project. She reported that at no time, during negotiations, did Mr. Fairfield mention giving 30,000 sq. ft. of her mother's property to the City as a park site. She did not know whether the park site was a requirement of the City, but she did not object to any use being placed on the land as long as there is a signed lease and rental is paid for the land.

When questioned by the Commission, Mrs. Akuna stated further that Mr. Fairfield had approached them about

the proposed project. The agreement signed with him authorized him to proceed with the rezoning application for commercial uses fronting the highway and apartment use in the back and option money to be paid to them after the zoning was approved. Nothing specific as to what types of buildings or their locations had been agreed upon. Mr. Fairfield was to construct the road improvements at no cost to them. The lease rental has not been agreed upon and is still subject to negotiation.

A question was then brought up that in the event the proposed changes showing commercial, apartment and park uses were made on the Detailed Land Use Map and the project somehow failed to start, what is to happen to the land designated for park use.

The Commission noted that the land would remain in park designation until changed to some other use.

Mrs. Akuna, thereupon, registered her objection to the park designation of her mother's property.

When asked for his comment, Mr. Fairfield stated that the park is contingent upon his obtaining the requested amendment to the Detailed Land Use Map; therefore, should the project be abandoned, he was sure that the park use would also be canceled.

The Commission pointed out to Mr. Fairfield that once the proposed changes are made on the DLUM, those uses would remain until changed again following the usual procedure. Therefore, failure of the project does not automatically cancel the park designation shown on the land.

Mr. Fairfield stated that he did not know about the park plan until two weeks ago when the matter was brought up at the Commission meeting. He had inquired and upon being informed that he could use the park area for calculating the density of his project, he agreed to the park designation. He was confident that his project will be undertaken and stated that the owner of the park designated land will receive the same lease rental agreement made on the other parcels.

Mr. Elmer Worley, staff planner, stated that he had encouraged Mr. Fairfield to agree to the park designation of a portion of his project area and to dedicate the park land to the City. He had also assured Mr. Fairfield that should the project fail to go through that he would not be held responsible for giving the park designated land to the City.

When questioned by the Commission for taking such an independent action, Mr. Worley cited the need for more park land in the area and his attempt to encourage the setting aside of needed park land. He did not feel

it unreasonable to give a man assurance of not being bound to giving park land to the City should the project fail. He was under the impression that the Commission would give such flexibility by agreeing to such an arrangement. He may have been mistaken in giving that assurance, but he had also informed Mr. Fairfield that the park area could be used in meeting the open space and recreational space requirements of the Comprehensive Zoning Code.

No one else testified on this matter.

MOTION: Mr. Yamabe's motion to close the public hearing and to recommend denial of the proposed amendments to the Detailed Land Use Map of Kaneohe to Kualoa was seconded by Mr. Ingleson.

In the discussion that followed, some of the Commission members felt that rather than an outright denial, an opportunity should be given to the developer to meet with the property owners and settle their differences before coming back to the Commission for consideration of the proposed changes.

The Commission stated that it cannot grant zoning or General Plan changes with contingencies attached to such changes. It was also brought out that further changes to the General Plan would require the calling of another public hearing.

VOTE: A vote was taken and the motion for denial failed to carry lacking four affirmative votes. Commissioners Yamabe, Sullam and Ingleson voted for the motion and Commissioner Chun against the motion.

ACTION: A motion to close the public hearing and to take the matter under advisement was made by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, and carried.

In discussing this matter later, Mr. Chun explained his negative vote as his desire to discuss the matter further. According to testimony received, he noted that the developer does not represent all of the property owners within the project area as claimed by him and that initiation of the project is contingent upon his negotiating a satisfactory lease arrangement with the owners after the zoning changes were made. He was reluctant to act on a project based on proposals only and was inclined to agree with the denial recommendation made earlier.

The rest of the Commissioners were in agreement with the Chairman and stated that until all applicable legal requirements are met, applications of this nature should not be brought before the Commission for action. However, the Commission was cognizant of the fact that

Mr. Gilliam replied that the proposed amendments were discussed with those people.

Commissioner Ingleson disclosed that he is a member of the Home Builders Association and stated that the membership in general supported the proposed amendments although he is not associated with any projects at this time.

The Chairman ruled that there is no conflict of interest.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mrs. Howard Moore, speaking for the Manoa Valley Community Association, was very pleased with the amendment which changes the definition of "family" and limits the occupants of a dwelling or lodging unit to no more than 5 unrelated persons in addition to the family members. Especially in Manoa, they have found that these additional people have created quite a traffic problem because of the lack of sufficient off-street parking spaces. She was also pleased by the separate definition for "roomers" and asked whether an inclusion could be made to require two off-street parking spaces for the three roomers.

The Commission replied that such an inclusion cannot be made at this time.

No one spoke against the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Zoning Code.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposed ordinance to amend Chapter 21 of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu 1961, as amended.

PUBLIC HEARING COMPREHENSIVE ZONING CODE AMENDMENT (HEIGHT REG.)

A public hearing was held to consider a proposed ordinance to amend Chapter 21, Revised Ordinances of Honolulu 1961, as amended, by amending the following sections:

a. Section 21-303 thereof, relating to Height Regulations in the P-1 Preservation District;

b. Section 21-403 thereof, relating to Height Regulations in the AG-1 Restricted Agricultural District;

c. Section 21-503 thereof, relating to Height Regulations in the R-1 Residential District;

d. Section 21-603 thereof, relating to Height Regulations in the A-1 Apartment District;

e. Section 21-803(b) thereof, relating to Height Regulations in the B-2 Community Business District;

f. Section 21-813(b) thereof, relating to Height Regulations in the B-2 Community Business District;

g. Section 21-833(b) thereof, relating to Height Regulations in the B-4 Central Business District;

h. Section 21-843(b) thereof, relating to Height Regulations in the B-5 Resort Commercial District; and

i. Section 21-904(b) thereof, relating to Height Regulations in the I-1 Light Industrial District.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of June 15, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies and to interested individuals and organizations. He acknowledged receipt of letters of support from the following:

1. Home Builders Association of Hawaii, signed by Mr. Bill Hogarty, Vice-Chairman of the Builder/Developer Committee;

2. Oahu Development Conference, signed by Mr. Aaron Levine, Executive Vice President; and

3. Mr. A. Daniel Klein, architect, with the firm of Frank S. Robert & Associates, Inc.

Mr. Jack Gilliam, staff planner, explained the proposed amendments and by illustration on the board, showed the difference in height envelope calculated under the present regulations and the proposed regulations.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mrs. Howard Moore, representing the Manoa Valley Community Association, spoke against the proposed amendments involving height regulations. She felt that houses should be designed to meet the various standards of the Code and not designed to exceed the requirements then applying for a variance. She was disturbed by the new height regulations which would permit a two-story structure to be set back 6 feet from the property line rather than the present requirement of 10 feet. With the added bulk, there would be twice as much noise and disturbances to adjoining buildings.

Mr. Gilliam explained that the setback for a two-story structure would be greater than 6 feet because of the additional setback requirement beyond 15 feet in height. For instance, for a building 20 feet high, the setback would be 8-1/2 feet.

There was no further testimony from the public.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Ingleson, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposed ordinance to amend Chapter 21 of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu 1961, as amended.

Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director and authorized the Director to establish the dates of the public hearings.

ZONING B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS LAIE KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY, PALEKANA AND IOSEPA STREETS ZIONS SECURITIES CORPORATION	(1) Change in zoning from R-6 Residential to B-2 Community Business for .85-acre of land situated off Kamehameha Highway at Palekana and Iosepa Streets in Laie and identified by Tax Map Key 5-5-14: portions of Parcels 25 to 28, 30, 32 and 34.
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT MANOA 2215 KAMEHAMEHA AVENUE (DORMITORY USE) CLIFFORD K. F. KONG	(2) An application for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a 4-story student dormitory containing 42 units with 90 beds on a 15,000 sq. ft. parcel of land at 2215 Kamehameha Avenue in Manoa within an R-4 Residential District.
ZONING B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS HAUULA 54-060 KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY MASAMI SAGAMI	(3) Change in zoning from R-6 Residential to B-2 Community Business for a 16,067 sq. ft. parcel of land at 54-060 Kamehameha Highway in Hauula and identified by Tax Map Key 5-4-9: Parcels 17, 18 and 34.
GENERAL PLAN DLUM (AMENDMENT) WAIANAE NANAKULI COMMERCIAL USE (DR. TIMOTHY WEE, ET AL)	(4) A proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Waianae (Planning Area No. 29) by changing the land use designation from Residential to Commercial use for a 3.49-acre parcel of land in Nanakuli identified by Tax Map Key 8-7-08: Parcels 11, 65 and 75.
GENERAL PLAN DLUM (AMENDMENT) WAIANAE NANAKULI (COLLECTOR ROAD) (JOSEPH L. DWIGHT, SR.)	(5) A proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Waianae (Planning Area No. 29) by deleting a proposed collector street in the area adjacent to and partially occupied by the Ulehawa Stream flood control channel in Nanakuli.

GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
HALAWA-WAIAWA
AIEA
PUBLIC FACILITIES
USE (FIRE STATION)

(6) A proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Halawa to Waiawa by changing the land use designation from Park to Public Facilities use (fire station site) for 5 acres of land identified by Tax Map Key 9-8-29: Parcel 1 situated adjacent to Alvah Scott Elementary School in Aiea.

GENERAL PLAN
(AMENDMENT)
DIAMOND HEAD
PARK USE

(7) A proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu by changing the land use designation for certain areas of land at Diamond Head as follows:

a. Redesignating Residential areas totaling approximately 29.3 acres to Parks and Recreation; and

b. Redesignating Apartment areas totaling approximately 6.8 acres to Parks and Recreation.

FEDERAL GRANT
PROGRAM
MAILE BEACH PARK
LAND ACQUISITION
URBAN RENEWAL
COORDINATOR

In compliance with Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, the Urban Renewal Coordinator of the City and County of Honolulu has referred to the Planning Commission for review and project certification, an application for Federal Grant to acquire land for open space purposes under Title VII, Housing Act of 1961, as amended. The grant will be used to acquire an initial 6.54 acres of the total proposed 26-acre addition to the existing 14.5-acre Maile Beach Park.

The Director read the staff's report explaining the proposal and the need for the park acreage addition. He reported that this proposed project conforms with the overall General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu and will help achieve the implementation of the goals to plan for a well-balanced community by providing for efficient land use patterns for living, working and raising a family; for convenient access to places of employment and shopping; and for ample recreational facilities in the following manner:

1. The subject area is designated for park use on the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Waianae.

2. The project implements a portion of the elements of the General Plan.

3. The park will provide open space for beach recreation and picnicking to serve a rapidly urbanizing area.

4. The encroaching urbanization might preclude the future expansion of the park if the necessary land included in the planned addition is not acquired soon.

5. The community, the administration, and the City Council are in favor of this project as evidenced by the adoption of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map and the

required appropriation to acquire and develop this additional land for beach park use.

The Director recommended that this project application be certified as being consistent and in consonance with existing planning programs and studies to achieve the comprehensive and coordinated physical development of the City and County of Honolulu and to promote the general welfare and prosperity of its people.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamane, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, the Commission certified this project application as being consistent and in consonance with existing planning programs and studies of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu.

MISC. SPECIAL MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION

The Director informed the Commission of approximately 51 applications for zone changes, conditional use permits and planned developments still to be processed before the Planning Commission. In addition, there are several proposed amendments to the Detailed Land Use Map and the Development Plan, and the adoption of official zoning maps. In order to expedite the processing of these pending cases, he suggested that the Commission hold additional meetings, possibly on Thursday mornings prior to the afternoon meetings of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

The Commission suggested to the Director that he prepare a schedule of the meeting dates and bring it back to the Commission for discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie Abbott

Mitzie Abbott
Hearings Reporter

47

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
July 10, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, July 10, 1969, at 2:04 p.m. with Chairman Edward Brennan presiding:

PRESENT:
Edward Brennan, Chairman
Philip T. Chun, Vice-Chairman
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Arthur A. Rutledge
Ed Sheehan
Fredda Sullam
Lewis Ingleson
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio
James K. Sakai, ex-officio

STAFF PRESENT:
Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Albert Jeremiah, Deputy Corporation Counsel

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING B-2 COMM.BUS.
HAUULA
54-060 KAM.HWY.
MASAMI SAGAMI
BY: HIRAM K. KAMAKA, ATTORNEY

A public hearing was held to consider a change in zoning under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, from an existing R-6 Residential District to B-2 Community Business District for three parcels of land containing 16,067 square feet, situated on Kamehameha Highway in Hauula, and identified as Tax Map Key 5-4-09: Parcels 17, 18 and 34, in conformity with the adopted General Plan and Detailed Land Use Map of Laie and Hauula areas.

Publication of this item was made in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser on June 29, 1969. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to applicable governmental agencies and to interested parties. No letters of protest were received.

The Director reviewed the staff's report with the Commissioners. There were no questions from the Commission concerning the report.

Attorney Hiram K. Kamaka represented the applicant and had no additional testimony to present.

There was no further discussion and no other person appeared to speak either for or against this proposal. The public hearing was closed and the matter taken under advisement on motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

ACTION: The Commission recommended the approval of the applicant's request on motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe and carried.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DLUM AMENDMENT
EWA BEACH-
IROQUOIS PT.
PLANNING DEPT.

A public hearing was held to consider amending a portion of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu, and the Ewa Beach-Iroquois Point Detailed Land Use Map, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, by changing the land uses as follows:

1. Designating 12.1 acres of land along the mauka side of Ft. Weaver Road between Kimopelekane Road and a proposed 56-foot roadway from Medium Density Apartment use to Residential use;

2. Designating the 5.0-acre parcel along the proposed 56-foot roadway from Low Density Apartment use to Residential use; and

3. Designating 4.5 acres of Low Density Apartment use along the mauka side of Ft. Weaver Road between the proposed 56-foot roadway and U. S. Coast and Geodetic Observatory to Residential use.

Publication was made June 29, 1969. Letters of protest were received and placed on file.

The staff presented a chronological report of previous actions concerning the subject property which is on file.

The Commission questioned the following points:

1. Where the demand for zoning is far in excess of the demand for dwelling units, this downgrades the subject property and encourages a potential slum area. Since full development did not occur, this would tend to encourage non-repair of existing dwellings in the area. This is a speculative venture.

2. Concerning a question whether there was a request for change of the general plan regarding the 19-acre Low Density apartment area; no request was made. The Planning Department in its approval of subdivisions considers the general plan and its elements. Final subdivision approval on this application was given by the previous planning director.

Testimony FOR the proposal was given by the following people:

1. Mrs. Anita Keith, President, Ewa Beach Community Association
2. Mrs. Florida Underwood, President, 10-4 Precinct Democratic Club, submitted letter dated July 10, 1969
3. Mrs. Ursula Yoshida, President, Ewa Beach Y-Wives Club, submitted written statement dated June 12, 1969

Their reasons in support are:

1. Sewers - There are no approved plans for sewers which should be provided before a higher density development occurs. The present cesspool system is undesirable, and the Board of Health is concerned about it.

2. Roads - Since there is no projection date for the widening of Fort Weaver Road, the existing roadway is adequate to service the existing density only, not a higher one.

3. The cost of living in homes in Ewa Beach is comparable to, and normally lower than the cost of living in apartments in nearby Waipahu as well as Ewa Beach apartments.

4. With more than 825 homes presently under construction along North Road, there is enough housing for new residents without the need for apartments.

5. Developers claim that land value will rise by apartment zoning; however, consideration should be given to small home owners and not only to those who use the development purely for financial gain.

6. They objected to any apartment development in Ewa Beach a year ago, and voice the same objection now.

Testimony AGAINST the proposal was given by--

1. Wendell H. Marumoto, Attorney for Dr. and Mrs. Thomas K.L. Lau, purchasers under an agreement of sale of Lot 1411, Map 179 of Land Court Application 242; and William A. Winder, et al, purchasers under an agreement of sale of Lot 1407, as shown on said Map 179. (Submitted written statement dated July 10, 1969, statement on file)

2. Dr. and Mrs. Oliver W. C. Choy, adjoining property owners, submitted letter dated July 7, 1969, letter on file

3. Masaru Uyeda, property owner, Lot 1409, Tax Map Key: 9-1-01-08, submitted letter dated July 9, 1969

4. William Chee, representing Sidney Hashimoto, Attorney for Ewa Acres, submitted Petition signed by 6 purchasers of lots

5. Katsugo Miho and Thomas Higa, recent purchasers of lots

6. Phyllis Shay, representing Dr. and Mrs. Edmund Wong, recent lot purchasers

They object for the following reasons:

1. They question the propriety of consideration of any proposal of this nature by private parties who do not have a direct proprietary interest in the subject property.

2. The subject application and proposal should be dismissed and denied without further consideration, inasmuch as the Ewa Beach Community Association unsuccessfully protested the change to the existing Apartment use designation when such changes were sought less than a year ago. At that time, it had the opportunity for administrative and judicial appeal which was not done.

3. This application is just a rehearing and a reconsideration of matters already given due consideration by the Commission less than a year ago.

4. The actions by the Commission and the City Council approving apartment zoning last year was relied upon. In good faith, considerable land investments were made. To change such use at this time to reduce the economic utility and value of the property, particularly upon the application of a party whose protest was rejected less than a year ago would be totally arbitrary, capricious and inequitable.

   Various substantial investments made include the following:

   a. Ewa Acres Subdivision - All lots are sold, contracts signed, and matters in escrow. Approximately $56,000 was expended for the construction of a drainage canal plus $38,000 for engineering costs.

      Engineering installations include fire hydrants along Fort Weaver Road utilizing the existing water line, laterals to service the lots, private driveways, a 56-foot roadway, a service road, consolidation of the existing water system to service 23 lots, plus the approval to subdivide into 6,000 square foot lots.

      Since the designation of area for park and apartment uses were mutually agreed upon with the City, a question exists as to whether any change in use for the apartment designated area will automatically nullify the land use for the area designated as park.

   b. Katsugo Miho and Tom Tadao Higa, purchasers of 88,230 sq. ft. property at cost of approximately $92,642.00.

      Mr. Miho mentioned that based upon the Commission's action a year ago, they entered into an investment venture exploring the possibility of resale. However, as a result of this application before the Commission today, they lost a prospective buyer. A decision approving this application would seriously affect the integrity of the Commission.

   c. Phyllis Shay representing Dr. and Mrs. Edmund Wong. The Wong's purchased 2.3 acres at a cost of approximately $106,000 under an Agreement of Sale in January, 1969. They propose to construct apartments for which drawings are well along the way.

   d. Mr. and Mrs. Masaru Uyeda, purchased 1.5 acres for apartment development which will result in considerable economic loss if a down zoning to residential use is approved.

The public hearing was closed and the matter taken under advisement on motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Rutledge.

The Commission discussed the following points:

1. Publication of legal notices should be simply worded for the average layman to understand.

2. The Commission was disturbed at this matter being brought before them for consideration in view of its recent action a year ago zoning the area to apartment, followed by Council's action approving the same. Unless there is sound reasoning for downzoning, a precedent would be set based on poor judgment.

3. The Commission was also disturbed at the developer's neglect to install improvements which he proposed to do, leaving the land undeveloped and useless for a period of time.

   One reason for the Commission's change to apartment zoning was the dilapidated state of military homes in Ewa Beach. At the time, the Commission felt it was better to terminate "fire traps" and to provide apartments. However, the developer never proceeded with the proposed development.

4. To render a decision now is premature. The entire Ewa area should be re-examined and the staff should submit a proposal.

<u>ACTION</u>: Mr. Yamabe moved, seconded by Mr. Sheehan and carried, that the Commission defer action for two weeks for restudy by the staff relating to the following points:

1. Whether there are similar situations that developed so that the Commission might be consistent in its decision;

2. The extent of improvements made by the developer;

3. Reasons for downzoning;

4. Restudy of the entire Ewa area taking note the relationship of the park to the school and the homes to the school. Also, the relationship between both residential and apartment zoning.

5. The staff submit a report of its recommendations on this issue.

PUBLIC HEARING
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
KAILUA
AREA BOUNDED BY
KAWAINUI DRAINAGE
CANAL, KAWAINUI
SWAMP, KAELEPULU
STREAM AND THE
SHORELINE
PLANNING DEPT.

The public hearing held on June 26, 1969, was closed and the Commission recommended adoption of the Development Plan with the exception of the Kailua Road widening proposal.

The staff reviewed 3 proposals for the Kailua Road widening illustrated on the Development Plan for Kailua. The proposals are:

1. 80-foot widening, no medial strip, 6 moving lanes
2. 90-foot widening, 10-foot medial strip, 6 moving lanes
3. 96-foot widening, 16-foot medial strip, 6 moving lanes

The Commission's discussion related to:

1. The possibility of saving some of the ironwood trees. Mention was made that the trees could be replanted later on.

2. The possibility of an 80-foot widening plus a median and 6 lanes. However, according to City standards, this proposal could not adequately serve 6 lanes.

3. The possibility of 96-foot widening, a median, and 4 lanes. This proposal was discouraged because considerable land would have to be acquired.

ACTION: Mr. Chun moved, seconded by Mr. Brennan and carried, that the Commission recommend the approval of Proposal No. 1 for the Kailua Road widening which is an 80-foot widening with no medial strip, and 6 moving lanes. Commissioners Sullam and Ingleson dissented.

(Mr. Rutledge was excused at this point in the meeting. 6:10 p.m.)

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DLUM & DP (AMEND)
UNIVERSITY
COMMUNITY PLAN
(MOILIILI-UNI-
VERSITY-MANOA)
MAKIKI STREAM
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.

The public hearing held on June 26, 1969 was closed and the Commission deferred action on this proposal.

ACTION: Based upon the Director's recommendations, Mr. Ingleson moved, seconded by Mrs. Sullam and carried, that the Commission recommend the approval of the proposed amendment. Commissioner Yamabe dissented.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
MAUNALUA
MAUKA-KOKO HEAD
(CONT.)

The public hearing was held and closed on June 26, 1969. The Commission deferred action for further study by the Department of Traffic.

The Director reported the receipt of a letter dated July 8, 1969 from Clifford Y. Nohara,

CORNER OF KALANI-ANAOLE HIGHWAY & LUNALILO HOME ROAD COMMERCIAL USE (KAISER HAWAII-KAI DEV.CO.)

Acting Traffic Engineer indicating the peak hour traffic on Lunalilo Home Road from 6:15 a.m. to 7:15 a.m. generating 760 vehicles. The pavement width of Lunalilo Home Road is 64 feet at the affected area and has adequate capacity to handle the traffic in the area. However, since the proposed development fronts Kalanianaole Highway which is under State jurisdiction, the Traffic Department recommends that this request be referred to the State Department of Transportation.

Mr. Herbert Tom, Attorney for Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company, presented a xerox copy of an Agreement between their firm and Bishop Estate which included a condition that the operation will be only as a medical center for 20 years.

The Commission discussed the following points:

1. Whether the existing homes and the proposed clinic are compatible uses. This would be an encroachment upon an area zoned and developed completely with single-family homes. More traffic would be generated creating a hazardous condition for school children. Further, an ambulance siren is not conducive in residential areas.

2. An agreement between two private parties is not binding upon a public agency so that there would be a lack of control.

3. Since there was a variation of traffic count figures at the last hearing between Kaiser and the staff, some clarification is due.

4. The Commission is aware of a proposed library on the adjoining subject site and requested information concerning its development.

5. Whether an alternative site was considered.

ACTION: Mr. Yamabe moved, seconded by Mrs. Sullam that this matter be deferred for further study on the following points:

1. Possible alternative site for the proposed clinic and a letter sent to Kaiser Development reflecting the same;

2. A clarification of the traffic count.

Mr. Brennan moved, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, that the following matters initiated by the Planning Director be set for a public hearing, the date to be determined by the Planning Director:

ZONING I-1 LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DIST.
WAIMALU
MAKAI OF KAM.HWY. & TO THE REAR OF THE CITY'S KALAUAO SEWER PUMP STATION
THEODORE C.B. FARM

1. The applicant proposes to erect a warehouse structure for purposes of storing equipment.

STREET NAMES

The Commission, on motion by Mr. Bright, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, recommended approval of the following street names:

(1) Recommend Deletion of the following street names:

(a) Roadways in the HRA Kukui area in downtown Honolulu which no longer exists:

AALA LANE - Deadend roadway off North Beretania Street in a mauka direction to North Kukui Street and being between Hall Street and College Walk. (In use prior to 1910).

AALA PARK WALK - Concrete walk between rows of ironwood trees along the Ewa side of Aala Park from King to Beretania Streets. (Resolution No. 8, January 29, 1943).

AALA STREET - Roadway off North King Street opposite Oahu Railway & Land Depot, running in a mauka direction to North Beretania Street. (In use prior to 1910).

AKANA LANE - Deadend road off Kamakila Lane to Ewa of College Walk and being between Vineyard and Kukui Streets.

AKIA LANE - Dead end roadway off Beretania Street running mauka to Cockscrew Lane and being between Fort and Queen Emma Street. (Resolution No. 1515, Feb. 10, 1923).

BROAD LANE - Roadway off Buckle Lane running to Kamakela Lane and being between Pahala and Buckle Lanes.

BUCKLE LANE - Roadway off North Vineyard Street and being between Vineyard and Kukui Streets. (In use prior to 1910).

CHRISTLEY LANE	- Deadend roadway off Fort Street running past Pawale Lane and being between Kahua and Kaulana Lanes. (In use prior to 1910).
CLEGHORN LANE	- Deadend roadway off Nuuanu Avenue and being between North Kukui and North Vineyard Streets. (In use prior to 1910).
CUNHA 2 LANE	- Walkway off North Vineyard Street running in a makai direction terminating at Cunha 3 and being between Cunha 3 and Davis Lanes. (In use prior to 1910).
CUNHA 3 LANE	- Roadway off North Vineyard Street running to Kukui Street and being between River Street and Davis Lane.
CUNHA 4 LANE	- Deadend roadway off North Vineyard and being between River Street and Nuuanu Avenue. (In use prior to 1910).
CUNHA 5 LANE	- Deadend roadway off Cunha 4 Lane. (In use prior to 1910).
DAVIS LANE	- Deadend roadway off North Vineyard Street and being between Cunha Lane and Nuuanu Avenue.
EMMA LANE	- Deadend roadway off Queen Emma Street running to Akia Lane and being between Beretania and Kukui Streets.
FORT LANE	- Deadend roadway off Fort Street and being between South Vineyard Street and Christley Lane. (In use prior to 1910).

HALL STREET	- Roadway off North Beretania Street running to terminate at North Kukui Street and being between Aala Lane and Liliha Street. (Resolution No. 1515, Feb. 10, 1923).
INU LANE	- Deadend roadway off Broad Lane and being between Kaluahine and Buckle Lanes.
KAMAKELA LANE	- Roadway off Liliha Street running to North Kukui Street and being between North Vineyard and Kukui Streets. (Resolution No. 1515, Feb. 10, 1923).
KAMANUWAI LANE	- Deadend roadway off North Beretania Street running to Pauoa Stream and being between River and Smith Streets. (In use prior to 1910).
KAPENA LANE	- That portion of roadway running off Nuuanu Avenue situated between Smith Street and Nuuanu Avenue.
KAUMAKAPILI LANE	- Roadway off North Beretania Street running to Kapena Street and being between Nuuanu Avenue and Smith Street. (Resolution No. 1515, Feb. 10, 1923).
KILOHANA PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Emma Street and being between Luna and Gandall Lanes.
KOKIO LANE	- Deadend roadway off Kukui Street running in a mauka direction and being between Peleula Lane and Fort Street. (Resolution No. 1515, Feb. 10, 1923).
LELEO LANE	- Deadend roadway off North King Street running in a mauka direction and being between Webb Lane and Hall Street. (In use prior to 1910).

PAHALA LANE - Roadway off North Vineyard Street running to Buckle Lane. (Resolution No. 1515, Feb. 10, 1923).

PELEULA LANE - Deadend roadway off South Kukui Street running in a mauka direction and being between Nuuanu Avenue and Kokio Lane. (Resolution No. 1515, Feb. 10, 1923).

WAI LANE - Deadend roadway off North School Street running in a makai direction and being between Nuuanu Avenue and Nuuanu Stream. (Resolution No. 145, Mar. 5, 1931).

WEBB LANE - Deadend roadway off North King Street running in a mauka direction and being Liliha and Hall Streets. (In use prior to 1910).

(b) Delete a portion of Waiaka Road with ingress on Kapiolani Boulevard. Waiaka Road has been realigned.

WAIAKA ROAD - A roadway off South King Street adjoining Moiliili (Kuhio School) extending in a Koko Head direction curving to terminate with new ingress and egress at Kapiolani Boulevard.

(2) Recommend extension of street in Makakilo City, Units XVI and XVII, Honouliuli, Ewa:

AKAULA STREET - Extension of an existing street to terminate at Nohona Street.

(3) Recommend correction, deletions and insertions of street names in Mililani Town, Units 6A, 6B, 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B, 10A, 10B, 12A and 12B, in Waipio, Ewa:

Correct ULILI PLACE to ULIULI PLACE as described on Resolution No. 224 approved June 10, 1969, by the City Council.

Delete HINALANI and substitute thereof: IKAWELANI.

Meaning: A Hawaiian name for a star.

Delete IKUWA and substitute thereof: KAHELA.
Meaning: A Hawaiian "people's star" presiding over the month IKUWA.

MISCELLANEOUS COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 239 REQUESTING PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION ON GENERAL PLAN CHANGE RE DIAMOND HEAD

The City Council referred to the Planning Commission for its comments and recommendations, Council Resolution No. 239 relating to a proposed change in the General Plan by changing the land use designation from Residential to Parks and Recreation for certain areas of land situated at Diamond Head.

There was no discussion.

ACTION: Mr. Brennan moved, seconded by Mr. Bright and carried, that the Commission recommend approval of the amendment to the General Plan from Residential and Apartment to Parks and Recreation in the Diamond Head area designated in City Council Resolution No. 239, dated June 20, 1969.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henrietta B. Lyman

Henrietta B. Lyman
Secretary-Reporter II

Special Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
July 17, 1969

The Planning Commission met in special session on Thursday, July 17, 1969, at 8:50 a.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT;

Philip T. Chun, Chairman
Lewis Ingleson
Arthur Rutledge
Fredda Sullam
Thomas N. Yamabe II
James Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Jack Gilliam, Staff Planner

ABSENT:

Edward Brennan
Ed Sheehan

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND
USE MAP (AMEND.)
LAIE TO KAAAWA
HAUULA ADJ.
HAUULA BEACH PARK
BUSINESS USE
(IRIS J. CULLEN)

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Laie, Kaipapau, Hauula, Makao, Kapaka, Kaluanui, Punaluu, Kahana, and Kaaawa (Planning Area No. 26) by changing the land use designation for a 19,890 square foot parcel of land situated on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway, adjacent to the Hauula Beach Park, in Hauula, and identified by Tax Map Key 5-4-01: 33 and 35, from Residential to Business use.

The Director reported that the notice of public hearing was published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 6, 1969. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various civic and community organizations in the Hauula area and to interested parties.

Mr. Jack Gilliam, Staff Planner, presented the following information and proposal:

1. The application pertains to adjoining lots in Hauula with a total area of 19,890 square feet which is being used for residential purposes.

2. Mr. Gilliam oriented the Commission as to location of the property in relation to Kamehameha Highway, Hauula Fire Station, the school and park, playground area, Hauula Beach Park, and the Iris Cullen Resort area.

3. Description of the surrounding R-6 Residential areas was presented as well as access, public facilities, shape and setback requirements for the parcels.

4. The owner proposes to develop these parcels as a restaurant for which she has acquired additional land mauka of Kamehameha Highway for parking.

   a. The mauka side of Kamehameha Highway is zoned residential and cannot be used for off-site parking.

   b. There is an existing single-family dwelling immediately across Kamehameha Highway from this site.

Mr. Gilliam then recommended that the Detailed Land Use Map amendment from Residential to Commercial be denied for the following reasons:

1. The shape of the parcel with its narrow depth cannot be developed sufficiently for commercial uses without parking being located across the street which would create a dangerous pedestrian-vehicle conflict.

2. The granting of the application would be tantamount to the granting of a special privilege to a single owner at the expense of proper planning for the area.

3. There is no justification for commercial designation on the Detailed Land Use Map for these properties. Such a designation would be contrary to existing policies adopted for the City and County and the Hauula area in particular, as follows:

   a. The adopted policy for commercial land use as contained in the adopted General Plan (Ordinance No. 2443, adopted May 7, 1964) is:

(1) 'To provide adequate clusters of commercial land areas in appropriate locations with sufficient pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems, adequate landscaped parking and efficient accessibility;

(2) To serve the shopping and service needs of residents efficiently, conveniently and pleasantly in shopping centers related to residential areas.'

b. The policy for commercial land use in the Hauula area was to maintain all such use on the mauka side of Kamehameha Highway.

The intent of these adopted policies has been carried out in the Hauula Detailed Land Use Map designations. A commercial shopping center has been designated and developed in the area; other areas mauka of the highway have been designated commercial.

The request for commercial designation of the subject parcels would be a violation of intent of the adopted land use policy. It could lead to the future breakdown of land use planning in the area. This request is for preferential treatment through spot zoning and is not consistent with sound area-wide planning.

4. These lots can be used for single-family development without creating any hardship on the owner. To grant a change merely because an owner has made an arrangement for commercial development is not consistent with principles of planning and zoning. Actions of this sort can jeopardize the legal basis of zoning by being arbitrary.

Mrs. Harriet Bouslog, attorney for the applicant, testified for the proposal:

1. The area from Kahana Bay to Hauula is one of the most desirable places to live and for the attraction of tourists in order to keep them on this island of Oahu.

2. The matter comes before the Planning Commission as a result of the recommendation of the Council at its February 11, 1969 meeting when the Committee of the Whole, by a 6-3 vote, recommended that the Planning Director initiate these precedings.

3. Mrs. Cullen acquired the second parcel at the suggestion of the former Planning Director so that she would have at least 20,000 square feet, she now has 19,980 square feet.

4. The parcel would be used as a restaurant facility for which Mrs. I. J. Cullen has a commitment and a letter from Spencecliff Organization stating that they intend to develop such a facility as soon as it becomes possible.

5. There have been 3 or 4 changes in zoning in the various years on this parcel.

6. With the exception of Pats at Punaluu, there is not a single restaurant facility on the water side in that area.

7. The tourists, The Tourists' Bureau, and the Hawaii Visitors' Bureau have all indicated that there should be development on the water side if Hauula and that side of the island is to be a tourist destination area because that is what the tourists prefer.

Mr. Donald Griffin of Daniel, Mann, Johnson and Mendenhall (an architectural, engineering and planning firm who had been asked by Mrs. Cullen to do a feasibility study from the architectural standpoint) explained the kind of plan that is hoped to be developed on that parcel if the necessary zoning can be applied. He also presented considerations:

1. It complements the existing zoning.

2. It will improve the economy of the area by providing jobs.

3. It will expand the tax base and improve property values in the area by raising

neighborhood standards without altering the character of the neighborhood.

It will remain a rural district.

4. Land owners in the area in agreement.

5. Provides the highest and best use of the land inasmuch as the neighborhood is too run down and vandalism is too prevalent to build from a residential standpoint.

6. Resort-Commercial zoning is requested in order to satisfy the Comprehensive Zoning Code Regulations.

7. Off-street parking and off-street loading was discussed at length.

   a. In addition to an area for loading and unloading on the parcels, 40,000 square feet of land is to be furnished by Mrs. Annie Kamalolo. This is the property directly across from the property owned by Mrs. Cullen. The parking area is immediately above that. It is undeveloped property.

   b. The Yuen property (directly across) is available if needed.

   c. Valet parking may be used.

   d. Bus services to be considered.

8. Spencecliff's proposed restaurant operation and areas involved were discussed at length.

9. The sea wall is the zone of wave action.

10. Premises were described in detail.

11. Estimate of cost of improvement and number of people to be employed has not yet been determined.

12. According to the Highway Department, there are no highway plans yet in that area.

13. It was being considered for park expansion, however, Ted Green of the Department of Parks and Recreation has indicated no interest.

Following is a list of those on record (some since 1967) in support of the proposal; by letter, petitions, or personal testimony:

80 property owners and residents of Hauula
Hauula Business Association
Hauula Improvement Association
Doris L. Ray
John L. P. Kahana, Jr.
Roy Maruyama
Mr. Kanakanui
Dan Pires
Mildred F. Montgomery
Annie Kamalolo
Kathleen E. Ogden
Grace Routson
Miss Dolora J. Routson
Dick Routson
Bok Man Kim (acting President, Hauula Improvement Association)

Reasons in support of the proposal were:

1. To create needed employment opportunities.

2. Economic "health".

3. Readiness for tourists expected from all over the world.

4. A desirable project for the community as a whole, for the City and County of Honolulu, and for the tourists to enjoy.

5. Transportation into other areas for which there is none at present.

Against the proposal, for the following reasons, was Mrs. Kamakeeaina:

1. Parking problems.

2. The house is on the seawall.

3. The high water mark and currents on both sides (water reaches up to the windows of the house).

4. Area too small for 40 employees.

5. No swimming, no beach.

6. No schools.

Testimony by the applicant, Mrs. Iris J. Cullen:

1. A resident of Hauula for 20 years.

2. Invested in property and the improvement of the community.

3. The Yuen property was offered but not purchased because advised by Planning Director to buy property next door to make it possible for the Planning Commission to zone area to permit building of a restaurant. (Purchased at $7.00 per square foot--borrowed money--both properties on the beach mortgaged.)

4. A three-page letter from former head of Hawaii Visitors' Bureau, Bob Allen, states the need for development in Hauula with focal point of Cooper Ranch Inn, a 50-year old historic landmark.

5. Mr. Gil Root of Lunalilo Estate interested.

6. Investors want to come in.

7. Spence Weaver willing to erect $250,000 building with 350 to 500 seats.

8. 7,000 cars pass in front of beach property every 24 hours.

9. Possess a liquor license.

10. If change in designation is granted, we would immediately sign completed document so that Mr. Weaver can proceed.

11. Financing standing by.

Mr. Ingleson stated that it would take an amendment to the General Plan across the street in order to use for parking.

There was no further testimony from the public

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon a motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson.

MOTION: In later consideration, Mrs. Sullam's motion to recommend denial of the proposed amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map involving the subject parcel in Hauula was seconded by Mr. Ingleson.

DISCUSSION regarding parking ensued with the following points made clear:

1. Under the existing Comprehensive Zoning Code, the requirements are compulsory that on-site parking be furnished with respect to this particular commercial development.

2. There are cases where parking can be located on another parcel.

3. With respect to off-site parking, it would seem most appropriate that the commercial zoning and the acquiring of another parcel for off-street parking be done at one time.

4. Off-site parking in a Residential district would not be permitted unless it were proposed on an adjoining parcel.

5. Assuming that only this parcel of land is changed to commercial use and rezoned commercial, any application on the type of use on this parcel would require parking - in accordance with the requirements of the Comprehensive Zoning Code.

6. This would probably be B-1 or B-2 zoning.

7. For a restaurant, the requirement for parking is one space for every 100 square foot of floor space or one to every four seats, whichever is greater. Therefore, for 500 seats we would require in excess of 100 spaces.

8. Off-site parking is not allowed in a residential area and it must be within 400

feet of the entrance of the establishment it serves, which eliminates much of the parcels discussed on this site.

9. Mrs. Cullen could not put in off-site parking if the area across the street remains in a residential district. It must go through an amendment to designate it for commercial.

All correspondence in favor of or against the proposal was entered into the records:

1. Letter from Mr. Ted R. Green, Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation, indicating for various reasons it would be against the public interest at this time to encourage or permit the zoning of any of the property in question and, therefore, they do not favor the proposed amendment. (One of the points Mr. Green made is that they are to propose an amendment to the Detailed Land Use Map to permit the acquisition at such time as the project is programmed for funding. In other words, the Parks Department is interested in acquiring the parcel).

2. Grace Routson -- in favor of the rezoning.

3. Dolora J. Routson -- in favor.

4. Roy Maruyama -- in favor.

5. Mildred F. Montgomery -- in favor.

6. John L. P. Kahana, Jr. -- in favor.

7. Kathleen E. Ogden -- in favor.

8. Dick Routson, President of the Hauula Business Association, indicating the association has already gone on record
9. as being in favor of the rezoning change.

9. Doris L. Ray -- in favor.

10. Mr. Kanakanui -- in favor.

11. Annie Kamalolo -- in favor and, further,

that she has entered into an agreement to furnish necessary parking to the owner and operator of the proposed restaurant, Spencecliff Corporation. (Her property is across from the subject area.)

12. Dan Pires -- in favor.

ACTION: A vote was taken and the motion recommending denial was carried unanimously. (Mr. Yamabe was not present at this time.)

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING B-2
COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT
LAIE
NEAR THE POLYNESIAN CULTURAL CENTER
(ZIONS SECURITIES CORPORATION)

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider an application for a change in zoning from R-6 Residential District to B-2 Community Business District for a strip of land totalling 0.85 acres located along the rear boundaries of an existing business lot on Kamehameha Highway and the residential lots off Iosepa Street, near the Polynesian Cultural Center in Laie, and identified as Tax Map Key 5-5-14: portions of Parcels 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32 and 34.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 6, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, and to the Laie Community Council.

No letters of protest were received.

The Director made a staff presentation, oriented the Commission as to the location of the subject property, indicated the expansion of the B-2 District which would then come to the rear boundaries of the R-6 Residential District, and explained the traffic circulation:

1. Two entry ways to the parking lot from Kamehameha Highway.

2. Rear portion for service areas, deliveries, and a utility substation.

3. No other entrances or exits shown on the plan.

4. The applicant owns the surrounding land.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Marvin Stone, representing Zions Securities Corporation, made the presentation:

1. Proposed development of the property:

   Shopping Center
   Service entrance for shops
   Residential areas already built
   Residential areas - permits granted

2. Reason for desiring the extra strip:

   A sewer and water easement goes across the property and in order to effectively construct the building, it should be pushed back as far as possible so as not to bother the existing easement.

3. Exits and entrances. The only change in the plan is that the entrance into the shopping center (previously shown directly across Anemoku Street) has been shifted down several hundred feet toward Kahuku side.

4. An entry other than Kamehameha Highway is not feasible from a safety standpoint as a number of children play along the streets. The rear portion, not yet developed, will remain residential.

5. This same presentation was made two years ago, the tenants were lined up and it was ready to develop, but problems arose. The originally-designed individual buildings became very expensive to build and interest rates have been increasing since 1966.

6. New plans are now complete and are ready to obtain building permits if approved.

It was revealed that Mr. Stone was the original developer of the shopping center but is not developing it now. The developer will be from a mainland firm. Stone's father, who was Manager of Zions Securities, passed away and when young Mr. Stone took over as Manager of Zions Securities, he backed out of the shopping center.

The public hearing was closed and the matter taken under advisement upon motion by Mr. Yamabe and seconded by Mr. Ingleson.

DISCUSSION:

1. Mr. Yamabe felt that the zoning in this matter might be premature in light of the fact that the action of the prior Commission two years ago, of which he was a member, had zoned this large area of land for commercial use none of which has been developed. If rezoning is granted at this time, would there be a commercial development in the future? (The shops in some areas are designed for future development.)

2. Mr. Chun felt that this is not going to be the final plan.

3. Mr. Sharpless didn't like the fact that all exits and entrances are on Kamehameha Highway and that there is a blind curve on the Kaneohe side.

4. Mr. Ingleson felt that the question now is, "If the 0.85 acres were included in the business zone by rezoning from residential to business, could the property be better utilized?"

5. Mr. Chun felt it would be advisable for the Director to check with the applicant as to what they intend to do with the rest of the area shown on the Detailed Land Use Map for Commercial. Also the corner lot zoned for R-6 Residential.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Ingleson, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, the Commission deferred action.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
WAIANAE
LUALUALEI
MAUKA SIDE OF
FARRINGTON HIGHWAY
COMMERCIAL USE
(DR. TIMOTHY WEE
& LILLIAN AKI AS
NANAKULI INVEST-
MENT COMPANY,
PARTNERS)

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Waianae District by changing the land use classification of three parcels of land identified as Tax Map Key 8-7-08: Parcels 11, 65, and 75 at Lualualei, Waianae, from Residential to Commercial use.

The Director reported that the public hearing notice was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 6, 1969, and copies were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community and civic organizations in the Waianae District and to interested parties. No letters of protest have been received to date.

The Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the three parcels of land containing a total area of 152,000 square feet or 3.49 acres, and presented the staff's report giving background information and analysis made to justify the proposed amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Waianae. (The staff's report is filed in Folder No. PA #29, Amend. G.P. Waianae--Aki.) Since the subject parcels are situated within the Waianae Model Cities study area, the matter was referred to the Model Cities organization for consideration and no objections were raised. In recommending the proposed change at this time, the staff recognizes that in conjunction with studies on highway location and further detailed studies through the Model Cities Program, some of the land use boundaries may be changed somewhat.

The Director pointed out (in reply to Mr. Yamabe's inquiries) the mauka boundary of the proposed change is a drainage channel. This boundary is in line with the mauka commercial boundary in the adjoining block.

The applicants are proposing a shopping center development on the site but the plan submitted does not indicate the specific types of structure or facilities to be constructed on the site.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. James Aki, representing Dr. Timothy Wee and Lillian Aki (co-partners in the Nanakuli Investment Company) did not elaborate on the proposed

plan for the area since a copy of the Master Plan Report for the property (prepared by Mr. Thomas H. Creighton, Architect-Planner) has been submitted to the Planning Department.

Mr. Aki expressed their eagerness to get started on the project which they believe is a good plan, has the support of the people, and would be of benefit to the community. He requested that their proposal be approved as soon as possible.

Mr. Aki presented further information on the proposal at the request of the Commission:

1. The development will consist of approximately 40,000 square feet of rentable neighborhood shopping center space of one-story structures.

2. Uses suggested are:

   a. Neighborhood shops and stores such as building equipment, hardware, and general merchandise stores.

   b. Service establishments, such as food, drug, ready-to-wear apparel, small appliances, beauty and barber shops, and restaurants.

   c. Semi-institutional facilities such as savings and loan, insurance, post office and offices.

3. The plan has been discussed with possible tenants who have indicated their eagerness to locate in the area.

4. The large chain stores have not been approached because proper zoning is necessary before negotiating. Interest has been indicated from "feelers".

5. The shopping center development is planned in three increments, depending on availability of financing. Preparations have been made to begin the first increment as soon as zoning is approved.

Mrs. Rose L. Jackman, President of the Nanaikapono Community Association and a member of the Model Cities Urban Planning Committee, reported

that the membership and committee, respectively, voted their support for the Nanakuli Investment Company's request with the firm belief that it would create area improvement.

Mrs. Jackman was especially in favor of a restaurant where Nanakuli residents may take their families. She urged the Commission to act favorably upon the request.

There being no further testimony, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon motion duly made by Mr. Ingleson, seconded by Mrs. Sullam.

In later discussion, the Director confirmed the fact that a letter in support of the proposal was submitted by the Waianae Model Cities Task Force Committee.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, the Commission recommended approval of the proposed amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Waianae District to change the land use classification for the subject parcels of land from Residential to Commercial use.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
WAIANAE
DELETION OF
PROPOSED COLLECTOR
STREET ADJACENT TO
ULEHAWA STREAM
(JOSEPH L. DWIGHT,
SR.)

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Waianae District by deleting a portion of a proposed 60-foot collector street in the area adjacent to and partially occupied by the Ulehawa Stream flood control channel, mauka of Farrington Highway in the Nanakuli-Lualualei area, and identified by Tax Map Key 8-7-35: Parcel 8.

The Director reported that the notice of public hearing was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 6, 1969, and copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to various community and civic organizations in the Nanakuli-Waianae area, and to interested individuals. To date, no written protests have been received.

The Director oriented the Commission to the location of the area under discussion and presented the staff's report giving background information and analysis leading to the

recommendation to delete that portion of the proposed 60-foot road mauka of Farrington Highway and to a distance of 1,900 lineal feet.

The road has not been constructed and the land is vacant and undeveloped. A portion is within the stream channel right-of-way. (Staff report filed in Folder No. PA #29 Amend. 10 Waianae--J. L. Dwight.)

The Director further reported that the owner of Lot 62 (Tax Map Key 8-7-35: Parcel 8) had leased his land to a developer. The owner is negotiating with the State for purchase of a state-owned remnant parcel adjoining his parcel. After this sale is consummated, the developer plans to subdivide the land.

The Director recommended approval of the deletion of the 60-foot collector street from the Detailed Land Use Map and conversion of the area to residential use.

The Director stated that when an over-all study of this area is undertaken, consideration will be given to the need to establish a collector street in this general area.

There was no one to speak either in opposition to, or in favor of, the proposed amendment.

The public hearing was closed and the matter taken under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Ingleson.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission recommended approval of the proposed amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Waianae District by deleting the 60-foot collector street mauka of Farrington Highway and adjacent to Ulehawa Stream Channel in Waianae.

Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, the Commission authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director:

ZONING A-3 APARTMENT DISTRICT MAUNALUA HAHAIONE VALLEY, UNIT I-D KAISER HAWAII-KAI DEVELOPMENT COMPANY	(1) Change in zoning from AG-1 Restricted Agricultural District to A-3 Apartment District, in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Maunalua, for 23.740 acres of land within Hahaione Valley Unit I-D, at Maunalua.
ZONING B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT KEWALO MAKAI-DIAMOND HEAD CORNER OF KAPIOLANI BOULEVARD AND WARD AVENUE ISLAND FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION	(2) Change in zoning from I-1 Industrial District to B-2 Community Business District, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 16,000 square foot parcel of land situated at the makai-Diamond Head corner of Kapiolani Boulevard, Ward Avenue, and Waimanu Street at Kewalo.
GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) KAILUA KAPAA VALLEY INDUSTRIAL USE (H.C.&D., LTD., AND HAWAIIAN TRUST COMPANY)	(3) A proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Kailua by changing the land use designation from Agricultural and Public Facility uses to Industrial use for approximately 2.47 acres of land situated in Kapaa Valley, Kailua.
GENERAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN (AMENDMENT) UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN CLARK STREET AND GRIFFITHS STREET	(4) A proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Development Plan for the University Community area by: a. deleting the dead-end portion of Whitney Street between Clark Street and Lunalilo Freeway and the dead-end portion of Griffiths Street between Dole Street and Lunalilo Freeway; and b. designating a modified T-shape turnaround (20-foot radius) to adequately handle an anticipated high traffic volume created by the surrounding high density apartments at the end of Clark Street.

ZONING B-2
COMMUNITY
BUSINESS DISTRICT
WAIANAE-KAI
MAKAI SIDE OF
FARRINGTON HIGHWAY
SOUTHWEST OF
GUARD STREET
(KAZUMASA AND
FUMIKO TERAMOTO)

(5) Change in zoning from R-6 Residential District to B-2 Community Business District, in conformity with the General Plan, for a 5,883 square foot parcel of land situated on the makai side of Farrington Highway, 50 feet southwest of Guard Street at Waianae-Kai.

ZONING A-2
APARTMENT DISTRICT
PEARL CITY
949 LEHUA ~~STREET~~ Ave.
(MOTOHIKI IGUCHI)

(6) Change in zoning from R-6 Residential District to A-2 Apartment District, in conformity with the General Plan, for an 11,250 square foot parcel of land at 949 Lehua ~~Street~~ Ave. in Pearl City.

ZONING A-3
APARTMENT DISTRICT
WAIANAE
MAKAHA VALLEY
(MAKAHA VALLEY,
INC.)

(7) Change in zoning from R-6 Residential District to A-3 Apartment District, in conformity with the General Plan, for 13.746 acres of land situated in Makaha Valley, Waianae, identified as Tax Map Key 8-4-2: Portion of Parcel 5.

C.I.P.
IMPROVEMENT
REVOLVING FUND
HAUULA PLAYGROUND
SITE

The Commission reviewed City Council Resolution No. 275, resolving to transfer the sum of $7,881.60 from the Improvement Revolving Fund to the Department of Parks and Recreation for the settlement of Civil Cases Nos. 5701 and 5702, Hauula Playground Site, leasehold interest in Parcels 1 and 12. The Revolving Fund will be reimbursed when funds become available in the Capital Improvement Budget Ordinance.

The Director explained that the land is owned in fee by the State of Hawaii and assigned by executive order to the City as portions of the Hauula Playground site. The two parcels of land, comprised of 23,313 square feet and 11,508 square feet, had been held by private tenants under 999-year homestead leases, and in December, 1959, the City filed eminent domain proceedings in Circuit Court to acquire the leasehold interests. The owners have accepted the City's offer to settle their case at the appraised valuation of $6,080 for the first parcel and $2,301.60 for the second parcel. Since $500 was deposited with the court at the time of filing of the eminent domain proceedings, the balance of $7,881.60 is needed to settle both cases.

After a brief discussion on the function of the

Improvement Revolving Fund and the procedures for reimbursing this Fund, the Commission recommended approval of Resolution No. 275 upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mrs. Sullam.

GENERAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN KAILUA

Mr. Ingleson moved that the item previously acted upon by the Commission with respect to the amendment to the Kailua Development Plan be reopened and placed on the agenda of the next Commission meeting for further discussion. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried.

PARK DEDICATION ORDINANCE

Mr. Gilliam reported that a supplemental report on the proposed "Park Dedication Ordinance" will be submitted to the Commission for discussion at its next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie Abbott
Hearings Reporter

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
July 24, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, July 24, 1969, at 1:40 pm., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Edward Brennan presiding:

PRESENT:

Edward Brennan, Chairman
Philip T. Chun
Lewis Ingleson
Fredda Sullam
Thomas N. Yamabe II
James Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Arthur A. Rutledge
Ed Sheehan

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING I-1
INDUSTRIAL
WAIMALU
MAKAI OF KAMEHA-
MEHA HIGHWAY,
REAR OF THE
KALAUAO SEWER
PUMP STATION
THEODORE FARM

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to change the zoning from R-6 Residential to I-1 Industrial for four parcels of land containing a total area of .483 acre, situated on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway and to the rear of the Kalauao Sewage Pump Station, and identified by Tax Map Key 9-8-09: 1, 8, 9, and 10.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 13, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community and civic organizations in the Waimalu area, and to interested individuals. No written protests have been received.

The Director oriented the Commission to the location of the subject area and presented the staff's report explaining the applicant's proposal to erect a warehouse structure on the site for purposes of storing and reconditioning surplus and used machinery and equipment. Other information given were as follows:

1. On the Detailed Land Use Map, half of the subject area is designated for industrial use and the other half for a sewage pumping station.

2. Existing land uses on the subject parcels are single family residential and a junk yard. Industrial warehousing immediately adjoins the parcels.

3. Public utilities are adequate and available.

4. Access to the parcels are over two private easements--a 40-foot right-of-way owned by the Navy

and a 12-foot wide dirt roadway off Kamehameha Highway over and across private property owned by Continental Investments Company, Ltd.

5. The proposed warehouse structure will measure 179 feet by 62 feet, approximately 20 feet high, and contain about 11,085 square feet of floor area. An 8-inch masonry wall will surround portions of the structure.

6. The City will abandon the sewage pumping station operation in the relatively near future. This gives justification for a reevaluation of the designated use.

7. The applicant's proposal meets minimum requirements of the Comprehensive Zoning Code and is in keeping with the future plan of the area.

8. The industrial zoning is reasonable and approval is recommended on the bases that:

   a. The proposed zoning is in conformity with the Detailed Land Use Map; and

   b. These four parcels are the only parcels zoned R-6 Residential in an area which is already zoned I-1 Industrial.

Upon being questioned by the Commission, further facts brought out by the Director were that:

1. There is actually only one access to the parcels from Kamehameha Highway. This is the 12-foot easement off Kamehameha Highway going over and across the 40-foot right-of-way owned by the Navy.

2. The warehouse structure is to be of steel frame, open at the front facing the highway and enclosed on the Honolulu side and Pearl Harbor boundary. On the plan, there is no indication that the 8-inch masonry wall will completely surround the structure.

3. The parcels are located approximately 200 feet from the highway. Uses along Kamehameha Highway frontage are a car wash operation, Primo Brewery, a service station, and other commercial types of uses.

Mr. Brennan expressed concern about aesthetics along the main highway and suggested to the Director that he consider some design standards especially for warehouses structures along the main highways. He did not wish to see a repetition of what is found now along Nimitz Highway frontage.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Theodore Farm, applicant, indicated his desire to develop his property to its fullest value by constructing some small warehouse buildings. He felt it unfair to be taxed under a light industrial rate and not be entitled to utilize his land as such. Since there are no objections, he requested approval of the rezoning.

In the interrogation that followed, Mr. Farm stated that the existing 12-foot access is presently being used by semi-trailers with no difficulty. He did not envision larger vehicles using the access. As shown on the plot plan submitted, a turnaround area for vehicles is being provided on the property. Regarding the building, he stated that definite plans have not been completed but for the record, he would promise to make the wall the full height of the building out of hollow tile.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission recommended approval of the change in zoning from R-6 Residential to I-1 Industrial for the subject four parcels of land situated at Waimalu.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN &
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
WAIAWA TO HALAWA
KALAUAO
ULUNE STREET,
ACROSS AIEA
RECREATION CENTER
PUBLIC FACILITIES
USE (FIRE STATION)

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waiawa to Halawa by changing the land use designation from Park use to Public Facilities use (Fire Station site) for a 5-acre parcel of land situated on the makai side of Ulune Street and across the Aiea Recreation Center, identified by Tax Map Key 9-8-29: 1.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 13, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community and civic organizations in the Aiea and Halawa areas and to interested individuals.

The Director presented the staff's report giving brief background information on the proposal. (A copy of the report is filed in the Planning Department, Folder No. PA #32/Amendment 1.) In general, the proposal involves a change in site of the proposed Aiea Fire Station from its presently designated site on Moanalua Road to the site under consideration. The subject area contains 5 acres and is designated as a neighborhood park, but upon the acquisition of 2.255 acres by the State Department of Transportation for the H-1 Freeway, the area of the park will be reduced to 2.683 acres. The designation of approximately 20,000 square feet

for the fire station site will further reduce the size of the park. The reduced size is inadequate for use as a neighborhood park but will be adequate to meet the requirements of a tot lot. The Parks Department has indicated no objection to the proposal.

The Director's recommendation was approval of the proposal based on the information given.

When questioned by the Commission, the Director clarified that the proposed amendment involves only 20,000 square feet and not the entire area of the park site. Upon consultation, it is the feeling of the Parks Department that a replacement of the neighborhood park at this particular location is not needed because there are sufficient recreational facilities in the immediate area, such as the athletic field of Aiea High School and a park on the mauka side of Ulune Street. Also the reduced park site can be used as a tot lot.

There was no one to speak in opposition to or in support of the proposed amendment.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mrs. Sullam.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission recommended approval of the proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of the Waiawa to Halawa area by changing the land use designation from Park use to Public Facilities use (Fire State site) for approximately 20,000 square feet of land situated on the makai side of Ulune Street in Aiea.

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
MANOA
2642 PAMOA ROAD AND 2730 HIPAWAI PLACE
(DORMITORY USE)
SCOPE CORPORATION

A public hearing, continued from June 12, 1969, was held to consider an application for a Conditional Use Permit by Scope Corporation to construct and operate the following:

1. Three- and four-story dormitory buildings for 850 students;

2. A two-story commons building; and

3. One-half story parking buildings for 252 cars,

located at 2642 Pamoa Road and 2730 Hipawai Place in Manoa.

WAY: It may be recalled that a public hearing was held on June 12 and has been kept open. We have been in contact with the developers and they have indicated that it appears that they will not make the original recommended

time for return of plans and revisions to their program. They have indicated that these plans might be available during the first or second week of August.

In looking at the schedules that is forecast for the Planning Commission, it is suggested that possibly the earliest time this might be considered in light of the applicant's proposal would be August 21. It is suggested that the Commission consider possible establishment of a date when this matter might be reviewed and whatever alternatives or options you may wish to bring up for consideration of this matter.

YAMABE: Did the applicant indicate as to what extent the changes might be on this new proposal that they intend to submit in August?

WAY: They have not indicated any departure in the changes that they had discussed before the Commission at the hearings, which I recall was essentially to change the location of major parking facilities from a site that would be more remote than the site that adjoins the St. Francis Convent School. I also recall the consideration of relocation of dining and kitchen facilities. Essentially I believe those were the possible changes that they had discussed to alleviate some of the problems relative to the traffic congestion.

There were no other proposals discussed since that time with the representatives of the developer; in this case, the architect, specifically.

YAMABE: Since this is an application for a Conditional Use Permit, I feel that if there are any changes to be made other than minor changes, I think a new application should be entertained. I have no objections to continue the public hearing; however, in all fairness to the applicant and other people who testified, I believe that we should have a new application.

BRENNAN: I think that Commissioner Yamabe's point is well taken. It could very well be that this does call for an entire new application, primarily because I think it would be a disservice to everyone concerned if we set up another hearing and then find it was not done properly and then we would have to reset it again.

YAMABE: I move that the public hearing be closed and take the matter under advisement. (There was no second to the motion).

Upon a call by the Chairman for a representative of the applicant, no one appeared to testify.

SAKAI: If this hearing is closed and another one entertained, will it cost the applicant another $100 for the public hearing?

WAY: Yes, it would be a new subject coming before the Commission.

SAKAI: Is this within the rights of the Commission or is this the correct action of the Commission.

BRENNAN: Yes, I think it is the privilege of the Commission to question whether it is considering any longer the same application that appeared or the same proposal. It would seem to me the motion might include that the Director contact the applicant in discussion on this, as there is a strong feeling in view of what has been discussed that there are some entirely new facts as far as the proposal is concerned.

INGLESON: The applicant had stated at the public hearing that they were going to withdraw their plans and my question is when they withdraw their plans, does this also mean withdrawing the application?

A. SATO: I don't know what transpired at the meeting of June 12, 1969, but I think that new matters to be entertained call for an entirely new hearing.

SULLAM: What about the people who testified against? Must they testify again?

BRENNAN: I think if we have a new hearing, "yes", because we would have new factors and facets involved.

SHARPLESS: I think you ought to consider the general subject of when it is an amendment or when it is a new application, particularly in a Conditional Use Permit. Because a Conditional Use Permit is made up of many different elements and a number of them may change and you have already touched upon several of the points, as whether you have to bring people back on a new hearing and put them through something all over again; e.g., what would be the objections in continuing the same application. As an example, if the objection is that there will not be adequate notice on another hearing, supposing there is another hearing on the same application, we will notify them simply by a new advertisement. I'm simply suggesting that you consider long range whether you will permit amendments to the applications and, if so, under what circumstances or if you're going to say this will be a new application and we will dispose of this one and start a new one.

WAY: It seems that the extent of the amendments could be a problem from the standpoint of staff review of the Conditional Use Permit and recommendations that we might have or conditions that we might recommend to be imposed on the developer and I think there is a factor of time in terms of allowing enough time to review any amendments or substantial changes or alterations in the original plan or concept for a Conditional Use Permit.

SHARPLESS: Your point is well taken and certainly if an amendment is permitted, it obviously must be reviewed by the staff before the staff makes a recommendation. It would be equally true if it is a new application.

YAMABE: I suggest that the staff discuss with the applicant to find out how extensive the changes are and then a decision to be made at that time. I have no objections to keeping the public hearing open as long as the people involved, including the witnesses, are properly notified and given an opportunity to express themselves.

BRENNAN: Along this line, if we become involved in permissiveness as it relates to amendments after a public hearing has begun where it sometimes becomes obvious where the Planning Commission is not going to approve it, are we opening Pandora's Box?

WAY: It may very well be.

BRENNAN: I'm just wondering because there are terms and conditions that some times do not fit the bill and then do we allow someone to come back on an amendment basis or should they come in with a new proposal?

SHARPLESS: I don't think that is a question that should be decided in a short notice because there may be several amendments in a Conditional Use Permit.

BRENNAN: I think when we talk about a Conditional Use Permit, we're talking about a certain type of zoning, but yet in my opinion, it does not change the actual presentation that was made for a Conditional Use Permit for a given entity. I know that there are many flexibilities as it relates to the project itself, but I'm also thinking of the fact that we might be bringing people in for a second or third time and I'm wondering if it were possible for the Planning Department to take a look at this prior to the public hearing and see how flagrant the change is before we get underway for a public hearing.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, kept the public hearing open and instructed the Planning Department to consult with the applicant to discuss the revised changes and to have the Planning Department submit its recommendation to the Commission.

ZONING H-1 RESORT HOTEL DISTRICT
MAKAHA
84-325 MAKAU ST.
MRS. MAHEALANI J. FERNANDEZ

The Commission again reviewed a proposal to change the zoning from Class AA Residential to Resort-Hotel District No. 1 (land use zoning classification under the previous code) for a parcel of land containing a total area of 39,057 square feet situated at 84-325 Makau Street in Makaha in conformity with the General Plan.

WAY: This is a matter that has been under discussion by the

Commission for some time. There was a specific request by the Commission to review the minutes pertaining to a previous meeting of the Commission. I believe that these minutes have been distributed to the Commissioners. The specific points to be reviewed, based upon the request of the Planning Commission, was to review the minutes of a previous meeting, last year in fact, of the Commission with reference to the subject and a meeting with the applicant.

The chronology which we have prepared summarizes the circumstances pertaining to the case, and Mr. Chairman, do you think it appropriate to review the location? If not, we will proceed.

The property is situated off of Farrington Highway, this being a portion of the Detailed Land Use Map, park area indicated here, there is a roadway off of Farrington Highway and the subject parcel is situated in this area. This being the ocean side so it does have a portion with frontage on the ocean. The roadway is fairly narrow. It is below the standard for the detailed land use designation for the area, which is resort. At present, most of the area is now in single family residential development. There is a park proposal existing in this vicinity. This is the Hawaiian Telephone Company facility. There is a proposed major highway realignment of Farrington Highway in this location. We have, I think, reviewed the general character of the neighborhood. These photographs illustrate, for example, some of the single family residential uses in the area. Also shown is the Makaha Shores apartment facility which is located in this position approximately 500 feet from the subject parcel towards Honolulu.

The matter, as mentioned earlier, had come up for discussion previously and going back to October 17, 1968, a public hearing was held by the Planning Commission to consider the change in zoning at that time from Class AA Residential to Resort-Hotel District No. 1. The total area is 39,057 sq. ft., situated at Makau Street in Makaha.

A review of the minutes of the public hearing shows that the previous Planning Director did not make a recommendation one way or the other during his presentation to the Planning Commission and the public at the public hearing. I believe I mentioned that copies of the minutes of October 17, 1968 public hearing meeting had been distributed to the Planning Commissioners.

Upon closing the public hearing, the Commission voted to defer action on the application until receipt of more information in connection with a deed restriction affecting the parcel.

On May 8, 1969, the matter was brought to our attention through the Deputy Corporation Counsel, Mr. Jeremiah,

that it would be appropriate to place the subject application on the Planning Commission agenda at the earliest possible convenience of the Director and the Commission to resolve the matter.

On May 15, 1969, the matter of the application was presented to the Planning Commission. At that time, Mr. James Trask, representing the applicants, indicated that they were still pursuing the matter of the restrictive clause that appears in the deed. He indicated that this should not be a matter for deferring action on the application. Deputy Corporation Counsel, Mr. Jeremiah, also indicated that the deed restriction should not be reason for deferral of action by the Planning Commission. The Commission voted to defer the matter pending a site investigation by the staff with reference to public facilities.

On June 5th of this year 1969, in compliance with the Commission's request made during the meeting of May 15, the Planning Director presented his report indicating his findings and recommendations. Very briefly and in summary, we recommended that in view of the lack of the public facilities, especially relating to roads, and in view of increased traffic volumes that would be generated, the application should be denied. During this meeting, Mr. Trask, representing the applicants, indicated that the Planning Director's report was a complete reversal of the report that was made on June 10, 1968, by the staff who recommended that the request be granted. The Commission voted then to defer this matter until a full quorum is present. It was also indicated that there appears to be a contradiction between what Mr. Trask reported and what some of the Commissioners recalled relative to the original staff recommendation on this application. Therefore, the Planning Director was asked to check on the minutes of the October 17, 1968 meeting and to report back to the Commission.

As indicated in the brief recap of the minutes of the October 17, 1968 meeting, no recommendation one way or the other was made by the former Planning Director during the public hearing. It is also clear that no other staff member participated or presented any data or recommendations relative to this application. During the entire chronology of hearings and deliberations on the matter of this application by the Planning Commission, the only specific recommendation ever presented to the Commission involved that of the present Planning Director during the meeting of June 5, 1969.

The minutes of the hearing of October 17, 1968 do not indicate that any report such as cited by Mr. Trask was ever presented at the public hearing. A review of the Planning Department's files indicates that such a report was drafted by a staff member of the department at that time. However, this was an internal document and was never publicly presented by anyone insofar as we are able to determine.

In view of the extended sequence of events of this application, it is recommended that the matter be brought to a conclusion. Upon detailed review of the official records of the public hearing and the subsequent discussions during meetings held since the public hearing, the Planning Director maintains the original recommendation for denial made during the meeting of June 5, 1969. The lack of public facilities, especially relating to the existing roads, resultant increase in traffic in an area primarily used for residential purposes and apparently intended for continued use as a residential neighborhood would indicate that the rezoning is premature, and therefore, the application should be denied at this time.

BRENNAN: Mr. Director, I wonder if you would just recap for me what you refer to when you say lack of public facilities in this area?

WAY: We have specifically indicated roadways and sidewalks serving the area. There also are no public sewers. So, essentially that's it--inadequate roadways, and sewer facilities.

BRENNAN: Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak against the proposal? It's not a public hearing actually. The matter was deferred and the public hearing had been closed.

YAMABE: Mr. Director, if this property is zoned, does this give the applicant the authority to go ahead with the development without subsequently coming back to the Planning Department for approval as far as building permit is concerned considering primarily the two areas of concern expressed by the Director, the sewer and the inadequate road?

WAY: In connection with the sewer situation, it appears that the Department of Health has indicated that they would go along with the Cavittete system. Insofar as the roadway, the property does have access and in answer to the question raised by the Commission Chairman, there is a 40-foot right-of-way existing with a 20-foot asphalt paving with no sidewalks, curbs or gutters. Since it does have access and since the utilities can be accommodated, apparently the State Department of Health will permit the installation of a Cavittete system, it would not appear that there would be sufficient justification for denial of a building permit application if the zoning authorization were granted.

YAMABE: Mr. Chairman, that answers my question but I would like to pose another question to the Director. If the building permit cannot be denied under the Charter, what justification do we have in considering this request as premature for zoning purposes? I was given two primary reasons. It seems to me that they aren't sufficient

reasons. There are other alternatives, to handle this situation, i.e. a Cavittete system to handle sewerage. What I'm trying to get at is do we have anything concrete to say that this is premature?

WAY: I think that, in that connection the traffic aspect is significant here, the fact that normally a 56-foot right-of-way would be required for this type of area with a much wider pavement than 20 feet, the fact further that the predominant character of the neighborhood is of a single family residential nature with traffic being introduced into this neighborhood does, from our standpoint indicate that it is somewhat advanced or premature type of zoning for the area. We anticipate that there would be additional traffic introduced into this predominant single family residential neighborhood and that the roadways themselves are inadequate for this new type of use for the area.

CHUN: Mr. Director, are apartment uses allowed in an R-1 resort?

WAY: No, they're not. This is strictly for hotel purposes.

CHUN: The next question, what other requirements as to accessory uses are required in an H-1 District?

WAY: Parking requirements for the H-1 resort would be 3/4 spaces per hotel room. There are some convenience establishments that would be permitted, say an accessory use such as a restaurant, eating facility. A certain number of dwellings, apartment units would also be permitted in which case, the parking requirement would go up to 1-1/4 spaces, but it would be predominantly of a hotel nature, however.

SULLAM: Would we be creating a bad precedent knowing that an apartment is going to be built in an H-1 resort area?

WAY: Yes.

BRENNAN: I was going to say exactly what the Director was getting at but the objection is based on inadequate facilities for that particular use. Are there any other questions of the Director? Mr. Trask, would you like to come forth?

JAMES TRASK: To supplement what the Director mentioned, the petition was filed in the earlier part of 1968 and this June 10 report was part of the file. The hearing was held October 10. Mr. Chairman, it is true what the Director mentioned that at no time in the public hearing was this particular report mentioned. However, it is part of the record and it mentions this: "It is recommended that this matter be processed for rezoning on the basis that 1) it conforms to the Waianae DLUM, water is adequate and available, Cavittete sewer system will be installed and the development plan complies with the resort-hotel district no. 1 regulations." Now, however, going back

to the record, this matter was deferred not on any technicality but on the premise that there was a restrictive clause which was later brought up that had no consideration as far as rezoning was concerned. And your attorney mentioned the fact that that is true, that it should never have been deferred. We have come in the earlier part of '68 so that we might be able to beat the deadline of your CZC. You see it went into effect January 1 and we had plenty of time. On the matter of traffic--I went over to the Traffic Division and contacted a Mr. Stanley Shishido. There is no objection on file in the Traffic Division where they mention the fact that this might create a traffic hazard, that it might increase, that the area is not conducive to this particular type of development. Another feature, is that there are two ingress and egress in this area. Our original proposal to the Public Works Division was that we would widen the road from Farrington Highway to the property and put in the improvements at our own expense. They said, no. However, they do not object to this property being rezoned for this particular use. Your record would show that there is no objection on the part of the Public Works Division and the Traffic. This deferral, on the premise of this legal question of the covenant, has put Mrs. Fernandez, the property owner, in a very, very uncomfortable position. Yet, the Director mentions the fact that the report made by the staff, although in the record evidently was not given any consideration. However, the mere fact that it was not mentioned does not make this report null and void. If this report was followed as recommended, we wouldn't be here today. I see no reason why, absolutely no reason why this petition should not be granted. It is unfortunate that at the time the motion was made for deferral, the question of whether the restrictive covenant should be a part of the consideration, but who suffers by this?--the petitioner. We have amended the original plan to comply with this report and this report was used in the discussion with the members of the staff, and now to say that it is not a part, that it was never referred to in the minutes, I don't think it's fair. And if it is not part, that if it was just a typewritten report never meant to be used, why would it be in there? There seems to be some confusion in this particular case. Mr. Chun mentioned in the last meeting, "I thought the staff recommended denial." Mr. Trask mentioned that there is a report on file that recommended that it be granted. Now, here is the report, signed, Bob Tsunoda, a member of the staff. Gentlemen, I hope you can see clear, in fairness to Mrs. Fernandez who had filed her petition in plenty of time that this matter be resolved favorably.

BRENNAN: Are there any questions of Mr. Trask?

CHUN: Mr. Trask, who is that report addressed to?

TRASK: It says application, subject, location, tax key and a recommendation. There's no address. It's part of, just a report.

BRENNAN: Mr. Director, Mr. Trask calls attention to the fact that the applicant here made known that they would like to take care of a portion of the road. Could you enlighten us on that? What specifically are we talking about?

WAY: I think the specific discussions on this centered around the possibility of widening or providing for additional right-of-way immediately adjoining the applicant's property to, something in the order of 56 feet rather than a 40-foot right-of-way. There may have been other discussions relative to the roadway but I don't recall any of the specifics on that. Possibly, Mr. Trask may have something he might want to add on that, but essentially, that's my recollection on it, Mr. Chairman.

BRENNAN: Was this in the form of a formal representation to your department?

WAY: No, these were discussion meetings with the representatives of the applicant.

YAMABE: Are there any additional setbacks?

WAY: No, there is not. Not for future widening.

YAMABE: I thought Mr. Trask had mentioned that there was a setback.

WAY: He is willing to provide a setback as I recall, but there is no specific general plan widening for this roadway.

YAMABE: Mr. Trask, were you talking about the right-of-way that your client is willing to set aside and pave which involves only your property?

TRASK: No. We contacted the other two, Mr. Shingle and Mr. Aiken, who live above Mrs. Fernandez's property toward Farrington, and they are willing to go along with the idea. Now, in your minutes, number five, the possibility of improving the existing road from Farrington Highway to the subject property was discussed with the owner. The Department of Public Works recommended against such an approval at this time and instead recommended leaving the present pavement width in its present condition and using the shoulder area for walking. Now, in talking to Albert Dung at the Public Works Division today, he mentioned improving.....

YAMABE: Excuse me, now when you talk about paving, are you talking about the area already set aside, the width here, or are you talking about taking further in, allowing for a larger setback than 56 feet.

TRASK: Whatever the requirement would call for we would provide. I mean if you're saying it should be over and above the setback line as it exists now.

YAMABE: Only your client's property?

TRASK: No, Aiken's and Shingle's lot, right up to the highway. You see there's 200 feet from the highway to Mrs. Fernandez's property.

YAMABE: Now, if the staff says that they would be needing a 56-foot right-of-way would Mr. Shingle and Mr. Aiken, including your client, be willing to set aside 16 feet...

TRASK: That is correct.

YAMABE: And pave that area?

TRASK: Whatever the requirement would be.

BRENNAN: Mr. Director, I wonder if we could pursue this. In the event, as stated by Mr. Trask, that the applicant and his two neighbors agree to give up 16 feet of their frontage on this abutting road from the area to the highway, would that change the opinion of the Planning Department if they agree to widen, pave, and give up 16 feet? If your answer is no, I wonder if you would tell us why.

WAY: Mr. Chairman, in terms of existing land use in the area indicated by the photographs and inspections we made, we feel that the area is still predominantly a residential development, that the character would, at this time, be substantially altered by the introduction of this type of facility into the residential property. The matter of additional traffic in a residential neighborhood is one of the considerations we have irrespective of the fact that they might provide a portion of the roadway paved to appropriate standard for a hotel-resort type of use. I think, basically, it is a land use question insofar as that aspect is concerned. We are also concerned with the traffic and the road improvements but I think that it is unfortunate for that residential area to have this kind of development proposed for the area at this time.

BRENNAN: Mr. Trask, do you know what type of structure you have in the area next to Mrs. Fernandez' property?

TRASK: Makaha Shores has presently a unit there. This is also resort here now, abutting this spot here. They have one unit finished, they are starting the next unit right over here.

BRENNAN: Mr. Director, what happens to the accesses and egresses for that property that Mr. Trask is referring to?

WAY: They are on Farrington Highway. I think that Mr. Trask is referring to parcels in here. I would question the matter of the exact, whether or not they in fact do abut the Fernandez property. I just raise the question for clarification.

TRASK: The shoreline fits in over here. This whole area will be developed by Makaha Shores, Francis Wong, I understand that they are moving in on the next property.

BRENNAN: What do you have in here?

WAY: That's single family residential and single family residential properties virtually all along this area as well as in the internal portions of the block and I think pretty well shown here with some vacant parcels along Farrington Highway and possibly one or two vacant parcels in the interior portion of the block.

INGLESON: From what I understand of the reports that we have, the applicant proposes to build apartments on the property? Is that correct?

BRENNAN: Hotel-apartment if they are apartments, I imagine because it's H-1. Mr. Trask, what is your applicant proposing to build on the site?

TRASK: The application originally came in requesting zoning from residential to resort-hotel district. Because the matter was deferred and the CZC is in effect, the area is now designated for hotel use.

BRENNAN: Do you intend to build a hotel there?

TRASK: That's right. We have no other alternative.

BRENNAN: You're suppose to build a hotel?

TRASK: We came in for it, we have no other alternative but....

INGLESON: Based on LUI 64 in the CZC, he could theoretically build up to 130 hotel rooms based roughly on 300 sq. ft. per room, however, I am sure that this kind of efficiency cannot be achieved. It could be in the neighborhood of a 100 though. Based on the parking ratio as required by the CZC for that, that would mean that they would require 75 cars, that's 3/4 car per room on a 100-room hotel. That's about a little more than 53 apartment units.

WAY: Using the LUI of 63, you get about 90. I think we calculated roughly 88 units on this site.

CHUN: Mr. Director, in lieu of your recommendation as to the prematureness of this application, does the department concur at this time to initiate action to change the DLUM?

WAY: The background on this is that the Planning Commission's recommendation did not envision this area for resort use and that the City Council designated the area for resort use. I feel that it would be appropriate to propose to the Commission and to the Council a reconsideration of the DLUM designation for the area.

SULLAM: Do the Waianae District Council and the Model Cities Task Force still feel the same way as they did at the public hearing on October 17?

WAY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have no further word from them on this insofar as their position is concerned.

CHUN: I move that we take this matter under advisement.

YAMABE: Second.
(Vote taken and motion carried.)

In later discussion of the matter, the following took place.

YAMABE: I feel that on this subject matter, we have to take couple of actions to be consistent if we recommend denial. I think we should move to redesignate this area from its present use to some other more appropriate use. If this is not going to be done then I think we would be creating confusion here. I don't think one action could be taken without the other.

BRENNAN: Are you recommending two separate actions, Commissioner Yamabe? We are dealing with a request for rezoning.

YAMABE: Mr. Chairman, I recognize the request.

BRENNAN: Then you are making the recommendation on a motion here Mr. Yamabe?

YAMABE: No, I just made a statement.

BRENNAN: All right, Mr. Yamabe made a statement, Mr. Chun. Mr. Yamabe recognizes the fact that if we are going to take an action for declining the action then, at the same time, we should be thinking about putting the area back where it belongs as far as the land use is concerned. It's resort right now but yet in reality it's resort in an area where for all intents and purposes for many years to come lends itself for residential and it's not going to lend itself to a hotel operation.

CHUN: I move that this Commission deny the request for H-1 resort zoning and further the Director be requested to initiate a change in the DLUM to reflect a proper use of the land involved.

BRENNAN: There has been a motion made by Commissioner Chun that the applicant's proposal be rejected and further that

there be a change made in the DLUM taking this area out of resort and put into residential. Is there a second to the motion?

INGLESON: Second.

BRENNAN: It's been moved and seconded, is there any discussion?

CHUN: The basis for my motion is that since the time of the original public hearing, I feel that the members of the Commission present at that time had indicated and attempted to deny the application but the public hearing was kept open for the applicant to present further information to this Commission upon which to hang his hat to grant a favorable decision on this matter. Since that time nothing has been forthcoming. The basic factors and principle facts pertaining to the application are the same. There is no indication that resort development will be developed in the area. On that basis I had recommended denial.

BRENNAN: Is there any further discussion? This does bring a point, Mr. Director, that I think is extremely important. If in fact that there does exist other areas that the Planning Department is aware of that we might be confronted with sometime in the future, would not this be the time for the Planning Department to take action to bring forth to the Commission, either upzoning or downzoning, on an area basis rather than on a spot basis. In summary that the Planning Director specifically look at areas where such a condition exists and rather than wait for an applicant to come forth, he could, number one, put back into focus what the land actually is worth. It would be in the best interest of the community if the Planning Department took action to take a look and appraise, inventory areas that now exist so that we can avoid this.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, voted to recommend denial of the application and further requested the Planning Department to initiate a change in the Detailed Land Use Map, to redesignate the area from resort use to residential use.

GENERAL PLAN & DLUM AMENDMENT EWA BEACH-IROQUOIS POINT FORT WEAVER RD. & KIMOPELEKANE ROAD (RESIDENTIAL USE)

At the request of the staff, the Commission deferred further consideration of a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Ewa Beach-Iroquois Point by changing the land use designation for certain areas of land situated on the mauka side of Fort Weaver Road at Kimopelekane Road from Low and Medium Density Apartment uses to Residential use.

A public hearing was held on July 10, 1969, and after closing the hearing, the Commission had requested additional information and material from the staff.

The Director reported that the staff had not completed compiling all the requested data and requested a deferral. When the report is ready, the matter will be placed on the Commission's agenda.

GENERAL PLAN
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
KAILUA
AREA BOUNDED BY KAWAINUI DRAINAGE CANAL, KAWAINUI SWAMP, KAELEPULU STREAM AND THE SHORELINE

At the request of Commissioner Ingleson, the Commission again discussed the proposed Development Plan for Kailua, Lanikai and Waimanalo, for the area bounded by Kawainui Drainage Canal, Kawainui Swamp, Kaelepulu Stream, and the shore at Kailua.

A public hearing on this matter was held on June 26, 1969, and the Commission had taken action to recommend approval of certain features of the plan and to modify the proposal for Kailua Road widening as recommended by the Director.

INGLESON: I've asked that this matter be brought up again because of my concern, of doing away with the ironwood trees along Kailua Drive both going to town and out to the beach park. I feel quite strongly that the existence of those trees is what lends character to Kailua town. If the trees are destroyed, it would tend to destroy the character of the town and make it just another residential subdivision. I have asked that this be reconsidered also because of my inexperience on the Commission and perhaps I did not ask the questions that I would have like to ask particularly of the Traffic Department. I would like to ask if someone from the Traffic Department is here. I have several questions.

GEORGE MORIWAKI: My name is George Moriwaki, I am from the Traffic Department.

INGLESON: When were the traffic counts taken?

MORIWAKI: The counts were taken on May 28 of this year.

INGLESON: Is that before or after school?

BRENNAN: That's before school lets out, I think.

INGLESON: Just that one day?

MORIWAKI: Actually it was taken in the morning when we wanted to reflect the volume of the temporary access road to Kalanianaole Highway.

INGLESON: What were the hours you took the count?

MORIWAKI: The counts were taken, I guess, sometime around 6:30 to 7:30, within that neighborhood. I don't know the exact time. I can check and let you know later on.

INGLESON: So you took a count for one hour or one hour and a half within a two hour period?

MORIWAKI: I think it was little over an hour that they took the count.

INGLESON: At the same time, was a traffic count taken on Pali Highway going out of Kailua Town?

MORIWAKI: No, those counts were not taken.

INGLESON: I would like to ask you for, I don't know whether this would be an opinion or a fact, Pali Highway, from what I remember is four lanes, two lanes in either direction with a medial strip going out of Kailua town.

MORIWAKI: Yes, that's correct.

INGLESON: Do you have any idea what the traffic count or what the capacity of that highway is?

MORIWAKI: To explain a little bit further, you see, that highway has somewhat different characteristics from the street network in Kailua. For a highway of that sort, the capacity would run something like 1500 vehicles per hour. This is the maximum that you can run under ideal conditions without too much congestion.

INGLESON: Can you give me an opinion or do you have the facts on what the traffic capacity is on Kalanianaole Highway between Hawaii Kai, say between this end of Hawaii Kai and Aina Haina?

MORIWAKI: I'm sorry I cannot give you that answer. Now, the only way I can answer is in this fashion--a highway of that type would run approximately 1500 vehicles per hour.

INGLESON: That highway also? Is that four lanes?

MORIWAKI: That highway is somewhat different in that there are traffic signals so the capacity would be somewhat less. That portion has limited access which again would tend to increase the capacity, whereas, in the other streets the abutting driveways can feed directly into the streets.

INGLESON: How do you interpolate from the number of vehicles per hour to the number of lanes required? What sort of guide do you use?

MORIWAKI: We use a figure of 400 vehicles per hour. In taking Kalanianaole Highway or Pali Highway, we do not include the signals. Whenever a signal is installed or a stop sign is put in, under normal conditions, assuming that the streets feed in and the intersection is given a right of way equal to both streets, you would then split that in half. So assuming 1500 vehicles per hour, which is quite high for this type of street you do not use a figure of that sort, so assuming that you would have used 1500 vehicles per hour, then your capacity per hour under normal conditions would be half of that or somewhere in the neighborhood of 750 or thereabouts, so when I say

400 vehicles per hour, I mean 800 under comparable conditions.

INGLESON: When you say 400 vehicles per hour, is that for the entire moving two lanes or whatever number of lanes?

MORIWAKI: For that particular lane, 400 vehicles per hour per lane unobstructed.... obstructed, 800 vehicles....

INGLESON: Would you consider Kailua Road, particularly between the intersection of Wanaao and Kailua Road, would you consider that an obstructed type of street?

MORIWAKI: Yes, it is.

INGLESON: Could you go through the figures previously of the traffic count again for me? I would like to know first, what you counted, and also secondly, what is your projection when the development plan, the detailed land use map plan is ultimately achieved.

MORIWAKI: Over at the Keolu Drive access road going into Kalanianaole Highway, we measured 551 vehicles per hour at that end.

Over at Kailua Road, we measured 711 vehicles. This is the intersection in question with Wanaao Road. Coming out of Wanaao into Kailua Road, we measured 581.

At Kailua Road going into Wanaao and Kailua Road intersection, the figure there was 126 vehicles per hour.

In projecting the future volumes, the method we used is a conventional one used by all traffic engineers. The factors we arrived at was one car ownership per dwelling. Then we took the number of units which we felt was reasonable, that is, which can be added in the reasonable future and in designing streets and highways, we used a figure, anyways between 20 to 25 years as the life of that particular street so our projection is made accordingly. For the Enchanted Hills-Keolu Hills area, we estimated that there would be something in the neighborhood of 4,630 units. Then over at the other side coming in from Lanikai area and abutting portions, we estimated 1,308 units. Then we used the figure of 60% as our generation. In other words, instead of having all vehicles coming out, we estimated that it would be in the neighborhood of 6/10 of a vehicle per dwelling that would be converging at that critical period. Using these figures, we came out with the forecast as follows:

Coming out of Enchanted Lake area, 2,778 vehicles during the peak hour and from the Lanikai....

INGLESON: The 2,000 coming out from Enchanted Lakes, is that onto one road or all together?

MORIWAKI: All together. And again from Lanikai and abutting areas, 785 vehicles during the peak hour. I think a question was raised as to the peak volume on Kailua Road between Wanaao and the beach. Now that peak doesn't occur during the normal period. The peak occurs on Saturdays and Sundays. I think it was, if I recollect correctly, somewhere in the neighborhood of 4:00 p.m. and thereabouts, and that volume was about 400 vehicles per hour which exists right now. Now I mentioned this to explain the distortion. In our projection, we did not use that 400 vehicles per hour because the maximum volume will not coincide with the maximum volume coming out of the Enchanted Lake area and the Lanikai area. The maximum would be in the morning peak hour and in the evening peak hour, week days and not during the week ends. Going further, if the existing road system, as it is right now, were to be used you will find that we would, this is an estimation, we would estimate that at the Kalanianaole Highway end, you will have a terrific congestion since there are only two accesses to the whole area, and something like 1800 vehicles per hour trying to get out of Keolu Drive access.

INGLESON: You say that your future projections are somewhere in the neighborhood of 2800, and 1800 would be coming out of Keolu? That's your future projection?

MORIWAKI: Yes. Now, I think to really get the picture, I would have to explain further. Assuming that no improvements were made and later assuming that improvements were put in, now, as I explained, this would be with no Hamakua Road connection. There's another connection proposed, I don't know the name of it, but it's toward Kalanianaole Highway leading into Kailua. Now, if those two streets were not built, then we would estimate that something like 1800 vehicles would try to get out to Kalanianaole Highway and there'll be something like 1200 vehicles trying to get out from Kailua Road.

INGLESON: If those two connections were not made?

MORIWAKI: Yes. Now, assuming that those connections were built--both Hamakua Drive and the other street--we arrived at 1200 by using 972 of the 2,778-plus another 285 coming out from the Lanikai area. If you recall, I said that we projected 785 vehicles coming out of the Lanikai area but not all those vehicles will be coming through Kailua Road. It's split, 500 going down Kalaheo and 285 coming from the Kailua Road direction. That's how we got the 1200 vehicles. With 1200 vehicles, you would need six lanes. That's three in each direction. If the roads were built, we estimate that the following distribution would take place: Kailua Road, we feel will still carry about 1200 vehicles but the access road from Keolu Drive into Kalanianaole Highway is projected at 900 because this is the capacity at that intersection. 900 vehicles is all that it would carry so we put 900 at that intersection. That's Keolu Drive extension. Then we distributed the

remainder which was 906 between both Hamakua Drive and the other road. This is why we recommended that Kailua Road should be six lanes.

INGLESON: How about the Hamakua Road. I think it is part of the planning of the street system. I'm still a little bit confused with some of your figures. What I'm trying to get at is if Hamakua Road were built, what would you project as the traffic count on Kailua Road between Wanaao Road and town?

MORIWAKI: Assuming Hamakua Road was built, we feel that the volume would remain substantially in the neighborhood of 1200. There would be an overload, well, there might possibly be an overload unless that other road is built also because we still have 906 vehicles to take care of, assuming we had loaded Keolu Drive to capacity, which is 900.

INGLESON: How wide is Keolu Drive being built to?

MORIWAKI: I think that's 80-foot right-of-way which would be six lanes.

INGLESON: Because of signals there?

MORIWAKI: Yes. It's actually a "T" intersection with the major movement being on Kalanianaole Highway. That is the reason why there is that difference in capacity.

INGLESON: So your 400 does not count in this instance? It's less than 400?

MORIWAKI: Yes.

INGLESON: So even with Hamakua, you still feel that the 1200 on Kailua....

MORIWAKI: Yes, and if the other road isn't built, there may be an overload someplace. In fact, this 1200 might be a little higher and also Keolu Drive may be congested a little bit more because there is 906 vehicles to be taken care of and again, Kailua Road is a major facility. Hamakua Road is going into Kailua Road and the geometry at that intersection is very bad, so that again will detract from the capacity.

INGLESON: In your figures of the section of Kailua Road between the beach park and Wanaao, did you consider also the adequate capacity of Kalaheo?

MORIWAKI: Yes, we did.

INGLESON: I know that there was no destination count or destination study taken. There was also no count of cars on Pali Highway?

MORIWAKI: No.

INGLESON: Are there future plans for widening of Pali Highway?

MORIWAKI: The State I understand is planning to build the H-3 which would be coming across the Koolau and feeding into Kaneohe Marine Corps Air Station. I think the feeling of the State is that construction of that facility would take some of the volume off Pali Highway.

INGLESON: With the H-3, that would probably indicate the widening of Kalaheo?

MORIWAKI: No, I doubt it.

BRENNAN: Are there any other questions that any of the members would like to ask the Traffic Department?

SHARPLESS: George, if Hamakua Road were built and I live in the Enchanted Lake area and I work downtown in the City, which route would I be apt to take--Hamakua or Kailua?

MORIWAKI: Most probably you would, depending on where you live in Enchanted Lake..if it was more towards Keolu Drive, most probably you would take Keolu Drive since that leads you directly into Kalanianaole Highway and that can....

SHARPLESS: I'm posing the choice between Hamakua and Kailua. I live in an area of Enchanted Lake where I can theoretically go on Hamakua Road or Kailua Road.

MORIWAKI: In that case, sir, you would most probably take Kailua Road because the length may be a little longer but it's a much easier drive.

SHARPLESS: What do you mean by easier?

MORIWAKI: The problem would be at the intersection of Kailua Road and Hamakua.

SHARPLESS: Are you saying that that would be a more difficult intersection to get through than the intersection of Kailua and Oneawa?

MORIWAKI: Yes, sir.

CHUN: George, what is the capacity of Waimanalo junction, Kalanianaole Highway and Pali Highway, as far as cars making a left turn coming into Honolulu.

MORIWAKI: I would have to guess but I would guess that the left turn movements would be in the neighborhood of about 400 or 500 vehicles per hour, but it would be less than a thousand I guess. But, the understanding that I had was that eventually, they'd probably build an interchange here to take care of the volume. We know that at the junction of Kam Highway and Pali Highway, there will be an interchange there, they would most probably have to build another one here at the Waimanalo junction.

BRENNAN: Are there any other questions of George? Thank you George.

Mr. Ingleson, is there any one else you would like to come forth to discuss this thing?

I wonder if I could make this recommendation if we're not going to use any further testimony. Could we proceed with our regular program and then discuss the information that's been conveyed here by the Traffic Department later?

INGLESON: That would be fine.

ACTION: Mr. Ingleson's motion to reaffirm the action taken at the previous meeting was seconded by Mr. Chun and carried.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) MAUNALUA KALANIANAOLE HIGHWAY & LUNALILO HOME ROAD (COMMERCIAL USE)

The Commission deferred for two weeks, further consideration of a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Maunalua by changing the land use designation from Residential use to Commercial use for 2.77 acres of land situated at the mauka-Koko Head corner of Kalanianaole Highway and Lunalilo Home Road in Maunalua.

A public hearing was held and closed on June 26, 1969, and the Commission had deferred action and requested the staff to make further studies for possible alternative sites for the proposed medical clinic that is proposed to be constructed on this parcel. The staff has not completed its studies.

Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director and authorized the Director to set the dates of the public hearings:

ZONING B-3 BUSINESS RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT CENTRAL HONOLULU DISTRICT 1020-1022 S. KING STREET DR. KIYOSHI INOUYE

(1) Change in zoning from B-1 Neighborhood District to B-3 Business Residential District for 21,553 square feet of land situated at 1020-1022 S. King Street in the Central Honolulu District.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) WAHIAWA KUNIA ROAD (MEDIUM DENSITY APARTMENT)

(2) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Wahiawa by changing the land use designation from Commercial use to Medium Density Apartment use for 2.265 acres of land situated on Kunia Road between Wilikina Drive and the Wahiawa Reservoir in Wahiawa.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
WAIANAE
NANAKULI VALLEY
(SCHOOL USE)

(3) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for the Waianae District (Planning Area 29) by changing the land use designation from Residential and Agricultural uses to School use for 76.5 acres of land situated at the terminus of Nanakuli Avenue in Nanakuli Valley, Waianae.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
WAHIAWA
ALAWAINI WAY
(PARK USE)

(4) Amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Wahiawa by closing Alawaini Way between Holua Way and Hoe Way, and designating it to park use as part of the adjoining Alahula Park, for approximately 5,250 square feet of land in Wahiawa.

CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT
MANOA
2215 KAMEHAMEHA
AVENUE
(DORMITORY USE)
CLIFFORD K. F.
KONG

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, accepted withdrawal of the application made by Mr. Clifford K. F. Kong for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a 4-story student dormitory at 2215 Kamehameha Avenue in Manoa, within an R-4 Residential District.

The Commission had previously authorized the calling of a public hearing to consider this application.

ZONING H-1 RESORT
HOTEL DISTRICT
KAHUKU
KUILIMA POINT
DEL E. WEBB
CORPORATION

Change in zoning from R-6 Residential District to H-1 Resort Hotel District, in conformity with the General Plan, for 43.5 acres of land situated at Kuilima Point, Kahuku.

Since the applicants were present, the Commission decided to review the proposal before setting the date of the public hearing.

The Planning Director made the presentation as follows:

WAY:

The request concerns a zone change from R-6 Residential to H-1 Resort. The location is at Kahuku, Kuilima Point; land area involved is 43.5 acres. The General Plan Detailed Land Use Map has been amended, both by the recommendation of the Planning Commission and adopted by the City Council that the area be designated for resort use. This amendment was effective July 16, 1969 and had been approved by the Planning Commission and transmitted to the City Council. The ordinance was adopted with the stipulation that the density be limited to a maximum of 20 dwellings or lodging units per acre. The State Land Use District is Urban. The subject request concerns a portion of land 43-1/2 acres in size out of a total of approximately 15,000 contiguous acres owned by the Estate of James Campbell. The total ownership has a small sugar plantation mill in town and some beach cottages. The upland areas are used by the U. S. Army for training purposes and, in addition, there is an abandoned radio station the Kahuku Golf Course, two cemeteries and a number of small "kuleanas" in the area.

For reference, we draw your attention to the illustration on the board and indicate that this is Kawela Bay,

Kuilima Point and Kahuku Point. This is the present alignment of Kamehameha Highway. This being Kahuku Town just off the map. This is the abandoned Kahuku airstrip. Here is a future limited access highway realignment indicated here. This map also illustrates the proposals with reference to recreation and park facilities. The area in green indicates that there would be recreational facilities provided. We had discussed earlier the fact that this proposal indicating an accessway and a regional park tying into Kawela Bay is on the present Detailed Land Use Map for the area. Also the shoreline park just makai of the existing landing strip is also indicated as park on the Detailed Land Use Map. The larger green area here is for a golf course as proposed by the developers. This area with reference to the hotel at Kuilima Point, has been proposed as what is referred to as a surfer's park. The red dots indicate that there will be provided by the developer, the usual or typical hotel-recreational facilities. The green areas indicate that there will be sufficient recreation facilities for the residents of each area. Now, the areas indicated with the "J" designation--J-1, 1-a, 1-b, 2, 3 and 4,-- are proposed for a condominium type of development--horizontal condominium--generally. Relatively low density and, in fact, in the order of about 10 families per acre density as indicated on the plan. The specific zone change request covers the 43-1/2 acres of Kuilima Point. The proposal is for a hotel being developed at that point. There has been prepared a more detailed site plan indicated and some modifications to the plan previously presented to the Planning Commission. Essentially, the hotel, with 410 rooms, remains in the same approximate location. These are 40 cottage units indicated here, 50 cabana units indicated in this location with some modifications in terms of placement and location of the site. This gives them a total of 500 units proposed in the initial stage of development. A future stage indicates another hotel on the order of 500 units giving them a total of 1,000 units within the 43 acres; however, at some future time, there is proposed that the site be expanded to a total of about 50 acres, thereby giving the 20 units per acre density overall for the development of the site. Further indications are for future golf course cottages. They will be located in this "A" area adjoining the golf course. Essentially, I think that these are the two principal additional and somewhat modified in the case of site plan of exhibits that the developer has proposed. As I recall, the developer did present a schedule indicating the time table of completion at a previous meeting of the Commission of this matter, and I think that this pretty well brings the matter up-to-date with regard to the current proposals. I would also add that these illustrations were presented to the Public Works Committee of the City Council and they were aware of them and took them into account in their deliberations before final action of recommending the Detailed Land Use

Map change. Essentially, this is our report Mr. Chairman. Possibly, the representatives of the developer might wish to elaborate further on this.

BRENNAN: Are there any questions of the Director.

SHARPLESS: At the Council's Public Works Committee, was there any discussion on the method of acquisition of park land?

WAY: The discussion, as I recall, was along the lines that public recreation areas would be dedicated to the City for the term of the lease specified by the developer; representation made by the developer of a lease of 75 years.

SHARPLESS: I was just interested as to whether or not there was any discussion before the Public Works Committee.

WAY: There was.

BRENNAN: I wonder if someone representing the developer would be nice enough to come forth? Mr. Kuentz?

FRED KUENTZ: I realize, Mr. Chairman, of course that this is not a public hearing. We appreciate your taking your time and making this a semi-public hearing.

BRENNAN: Yes, it is semi. We are doing this because we feel that when the public hearing does come, there's going to be so many questions that we could possibly get now and not become involved in a long drawn out meeting and probably give better service to you and the community.

KUENTZ: Excellent. In light of the fact that you do have two new members on your Commission since we appeared before and there has been a lapse of time, if the Commission desires, we are prepared to recap the history of this development. This is entirely up to you. We have all our exhibits and developments today.

BRENNAN: If you can do it rapidly and then move into this phase, yes.

KUENTZ: I have a two part deal. You don't have to worry about my feelings. If it takes too much of the Commission's time, I would just as soon pass it.

BRENNAN: Perhaps, I think the two new Commission members are fairly well settled. Just by looking at the overall and I think as we pursue it, they would have a pretty good idea prior to the public hearing.

KUENTZ: All right. So you want me to skip the....

BRENNAN: Yes.

KUENTZ: As part of that, I believe we are fairly well on track, as far as I know, with all the governmental agencies except that we do have to resolve the situation as you were discussing with Mr. Sharpless and Mr. Way on how we go about the acquisition and designation of the beach parks. Towards that end, so that we attempt at least to make a move towards any legislation, we prepared a letter to you and the Commission on a specific proposal of how we might handle this acquisition and, if I may, I'd like to take the liberty of reading that letter.

BRENNAN: Fine, can we have a copy of that letter?

KUENTZ: I have enough copies for each of the members.

YAMABE: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that it be handled in such a manner, that this be incorporated as part of the record of the public hearing.

BRENNAN: Fine.

KUENTZ: (Reads letter addressed to the Commission. Copy on file in Folder No. 69/Z-43)

BRENNAN: Thank you. Are there any questions of Mr. Kuentz?

SULLAM: Where are the rights-of-way to these beaches by those who live in the community or anyone who lives on the island may want to get at?

KUENTZ: (By pointing out on map) This one is automatically taken care of because it has a direct access 200 feet long to the beach at Kawela Bay. This one would be accessible over one of these access roads and supplementary secondary roads within the development itself. Now, we have had this question asked, I believe in the past, if this is to be a private road. Everything we are designing will be staged so that, eventually, we would be able to dedicate the roads and we are working on the dedication standards, but that is some time off according to our discussions with the City. In the interim, we will, in writing, stipulate that there will be no loss of access to this park. In other words, these roads, for all purposes, would be public roads. This park is reached by a road that I believe is a dedicated road at this time. Is that right? It is not? It would be maintained as a public access on Campbell Estate property so you have direct access to each of the green areas.

SULLAM: This area here?

KUENTZ: That is our hotel.

SULLAM: In other words, it would be open to the public? That beach park portion?

KUENTZ: Not specifically, no. This is basically private property as is the hotel.

BRENNAN: I think, perhaps, what Mrs. Sullam is referring to is access to the water's edge.

KUENTZ: At the moment, there is no restriction of any kind for parking, walking over and utilizing any beach facilities. We don't visualize any such restriction any more than anybody has restrictions of any kind of beach park, or walking through any hotel in Waikiki. If we wanted to, we could, but it would be an impossible situation.

CHUN: Mr. Kuentz, I wonder if you would point out the recreational areas which you will retain yourself.

KUENTZ: It would be all the areas in red and green dots. The dots represent an approximate 10% of the acreage involved in that area. For instance, here is 21 acres. We would reserve approximately 2 acres in that area, provide recreational facilities for the people in that area. The developer would maintain it and that would be true of all the other areas.

CHUN: How about that large parcel along the beach?

KUENTZ: This area and this area are proposed for sale to the City. Now, if I may bring out another thing, at one of the meetings, we had at one time, at this location, said we would at our expense put in about a 26-car parking, surfer location. A small surf park, parking facilities, developed and maintained at our expense for public use. This is proposed then as an alternate.

BRENNAN: What is the size of that?

KUENTZ: It's 3 acres. This is 19 acres; this is 15 acres; this is 30 acres. This ties in with what I understand, is an existing stream-park development.

INGLESON: What are the red dots?

KUENTZ: The red dots are in the hotel areas. The green dots are the residential areas, a typical condominium living facilities.

BRENNAN: What are your plans for sewage treatment?

KUENTZ: Sewage treatment will be done in accordance with a sewage pond at this location according to city standards. All of this is a temporary situation.

BRENNAN: How many units will that service?

KUENTZ: 1500 units--we will have a choice of building a permanent sewage disposal plan or tie in with one of the City's.

YAMABE: Mr. Kuentz, I'm interested in the formula that you have here for the condemnation procedure that you are recommending. This question is in reference to this section here where you discussed or recommend the condemnation of public facility areas. I just want to check with you whether my interpretation is correct. You are allowing the City two years from the time of zoning or this date to make it known to the property owner that they wish to acquire the land?

KUENTZ: Taking out the legal phraseology, what we attempted to say was that the effective date prior to the rezoning, that we for two years will give the City an option to pick up any one of those parcels of land based on the price that exists from the date prior to the zoning.

BRENNAN: Will you point out the area?

KUENTZ: (Point out on map) It's this area, this area and this area. Two year option to the City, at any time, to acquire those properties. The price would be that prior to the date of the rezoning. They must acquire within the two years to take advantage of today's price.

YAMABE: I see.

KUENTZ: And after two years, it would be reappraised.

YAMABE: I see. In other words, if acquisition does not take place within two years, then it would be the normal condemnation procedure like any other in determining value at that time? Now, does this two years hold true for the rest of the development starting from the day you had applied for the zoning? For example, you are applying for 43 acres right now for zoning, so we are talking about--as a matter of fact, we are not talking about any of the other parcels at this time.

KUENTZ: No, we are not.

YAMABE: So this two years hasn't started as yet?

KUENTZ: That's right.

YAMABE: When you come in for the other portion of the plan and only at that time when it includes this three areas as shown, then the two-year period would start at that period?

KUENTZ: The way it's written, it says that you have two years from the date that we obtain zoning of the 43.5 acres, and during that two years, we would be coming in for the others. It doesn't say that you have two years....

BRENNAN: Mr. Davis has a comment on that, Mr. Kuentz.

DAVIS: May I just add this comment. As far as payment of the park is concerned, I'm sure we can arrange for a long year term.

YAMABE: I see. This is what I wanted to get at. In other words, the payment can come later if the City decides to condemn the land. The exercise of its option is merely an indication to you people of this need for the park area.

DAVIS: We were hopeful that the City could come to a decision as to whether or not they wanted those properties within two years because we have the price established as of the date before upgrading of the 43 acres of the upzoning, arrange for payment of the purchase price over a period of years.

YAMABE: In other words, if the City should indicate interest in the three parcels today, if they should indicate this today, then everything you state here would take effect, however, you would allow the City time to actually pay for the properties which might be in the next six year capital improvement program or pro-rated a number of years, etc.

DAVIS: That might be arranged at a mutually satisfactory arrangement.

YAMABE: I see. Also, you state here, if I might direct this question to any one who cares to answer it, that you are virtually agreeing to the areas shown on our general plan. Now, I assume that if there be subsequent changes to this general plan, for example, if the City would require or request that more park areas be designated, this would be part of their master plan as agreed on?

DAVIS: It's difficult for us to make a commitment on something that distant. We have something before us now which is in the approved detailed land use map, so we tried to come up with something definite that we can make a definite commitment on.

YAMABE: I understand this, and I think this is only right; however, if there's any other changes to the actual plan and agreed upon by all parties, then you are speaking of the final approved plan by all parties.

DAVIS: I would think that....

BRENNAN: Excuse me, Mr. Yamabe, are you referring to other than the areas now designated by the applicant for park, surf, and etc?

DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, I think the answer to that would be that we would have to conform to whatever alternates in effect at that time or else we couldn't proceed with further development.

KUENTZ: Mr. Chairman, I think one of the members was asking and it is difficult, it's not kind of a fair question, but I'd like to try and answer it. One of the problems, I think we had before in our discussion on this, was that there were no guidelines that we could cite really any

specifics of what they are talking about, whether a 500 acre park or a half acre park, so what we did, we went back to what was established for, I guess 10 or 12 years, added this because this was the point of interest when we appeared before the Commission and tried to set some ground rules so we would all be talking about the same subject, but we did use the work in our letter "substantially" in location. With Mr. Davis' concurrence, I would say that if we did some shifting and some in and out of a minor nature, we would be more than agreeable to sit down and discuss it.

YAMABE: Mr. Kuentz, I think this should be discussed in all fairness to you people as well as anyone else. As I said, this is purely hypothetical and it may not happen at all. However, today we have just 43 acres presented to us and, I should keep my discussion to this confine; however, recognizing that you'll be coming in for other areas, there might be some adjustments, might be additiona requests.

BRENNAN: Are there any other questions of Mr. Kuentz?

INGLESON: What is the zoning of the area now, outside of this 43 acres?

BRENNAN: Agriculture.

KUENTZ: Under the State zoning we are urban up to about here and the rest is in agriculture.

INGLESON: The park areas under discussion are outside of the 43 acres?

KUENTZ: That's right.

INGLESON: So what kind of increase in value are those properties going to have by the rezoning of the 43 acres? Are they going to go up that much?

BRENNAN: Our experience has been, for example, if there is a shopping site established, the periphery area becomes more valuable either for homesites or additional commercial site, and therefore, if this is a resort area and developed with a golf course which is planned for the area, and hotel, you can foresee some fairly substantial increase of value of the adjacent lands.

INGLESON: I agree that in the total development, I'm now relating the 43 acres....

KUENTZ: You feel that the closeness of this will...

INGLESON: That's correct. In other words, the day after the re-zoning of the 43 acres, it places land down at the far end of the map here, that much more....

KUENTZ: Maybe I can help answer that a little. It ties in with the two year period. I personally feel that, perhaps not zoning, but the day we start construction, active development, that this whole area will accelerate in value. But, there is a remote possibility that, I think you're talking about, that's why we gave two years because within that two year period, we hope to be back in here for some changes and rezoning of all the other areas.

YAMABE: Mr. Kuentz, I take it that you are giving an alternative when you speak of a two-year period. In the meantime, you will use the park area as park without the purchase of same?

BRENNAN: No, that's not my interpretation. We have, as I understand it, two years to pick up an option as it exists now of the areas set aside--L-2, three difference areas, and for two years the price would be fixed at today's market price. After that they would be based on fair market value.

YAMABE: So your dedication for the life of your lease is in keeping in terms of...

BRENNAN: That's the inside park sites, Mr. Yamabe, that are marked in green and red--are those that would be handled by the developer--10% of the approximately area, as I understand it. Is that correct?

KUENTZ: Roughly.

BRENNAN: Would be set aside for recreational facilities for the people that live in that particular area and the sites themselves would be kept up by the developer.

INGLESON: Is that the life of the lease?

BRENNAN: Yes.

SAKAI: How large are those park areas and the estimated cost based on pre-zoning?

KUENTZ: (Point out the three parcels on map). L-1, this one here is 31-1/4 acres. The appraised value is $262,308. L-2 is 3 acres and the appraised value is $142,703. L-3 is 34 acres and its value is $1,251,770, because of the extension of the beach park. The total is 68-1/4 acres, the total money is $1,656,781. It works out on an approximate average acreage price of $25,000.

BRENNAN: Are there any other questions of Mr. Kuentz?

DAVIS: On the matter of values, they had been established on the basis of appraisals made about a year or a year and a half ago. They represent values which are incorporated in our deal with Inscon and Prudential trying to obtain these prices for the land.

BRENNAN: I see.

DAVIS: The land value, as I said, is based on appraisal on the part of Inscon.

CHUN: Is the appraisal of these lands based on agricultural values?

YAMABE: Mr. Chairman, the question is not related to this development, but if I may, I would like to pose a question to Mr. Davis in reference to, that is, if he is prepared to give us an answer, in reference to what tax advantage or what tax problem that he might be facing in dedicating land for park or condemnation?

BRENNAN: You mean what tax problems would the Campbell Estate be encountering? Is that what you want to know?

YAMABE: Yes. is there a tax problem or is there an alternate way it can be handled and maybe this suggestion here is the best way to handle it, simply because I want to relate this to this other item that is on the agenda for park dedication?

DAVIS: I didn't quite get the question.

YAMABE: Mr. Davis, if you are prepared to answer, in reference to the taxing of your income from sale of land relating to what's on the agenda today, the park dedication piece of legislation which we will be taking under consideration, I would like to know from your knowledge, your wisdom, as to which would be the best approach, or is there a tax problem? I assume there is.

DAVIS: We tried to cover it, Mr. Yamabe. Strip condemnation, that would also help us on the tax matter as far as the income tax. One thing also which has been overlooked and I would like to put on record here is, this proposal here, we are making, is all subject to approval in anticipation that the court would approve it, but we expect and probably will want to go....

BRENNAN: Excuse me Mr. Davis. Inasmuch as the property in question is being offered for sale, why would you anticipate court approval? I could readily understand if you were giving this property away which is the property of the Campbell Estate, but why would you consider court approval necessary?

DAVIS: Because we are protecting you for two years on price for land undoubtedly the value of the land will be higher.

BRENNAN: I see, the terms and conditions are what you refer to. Thank you.

YAMABE: Mr. Davis, following up on my question, is that the reason why you recommend that the sale, no matter when it's consummated, be shown as sold prior to rezoning or some-

thing? You are requesting that there be an agreement with the City?

DAVIS: Subject to court approval, we're going to recommend, as we are proposing in this case, and hope that it will be approved because we have reasons for recommending it. We are committing ourselves to a price by pegging it to a date of value on a day prior to the actual zoning of the 43 acres. We are committing ourselves to a sales price that should you delay in exercising your option to purchase for a year or two, the value of the property undoubtedly would be substantially more than the price you would have to pay.

YAMABE: Mr. Davis, if the City should adopt or enact an ordinance or legislation, where it is mandatory for the Estate to set aside land for park use, what implications might this have here as far as your tax status is concerned?

DAVIS: I imagine it would be helpful. We feel that we have voluntarily come forth with something that should be attractive to the City. We are very anxious to get ahead on this. We are afraid of the situation prior to where the money market is concerned, as far as the commitment on this property is concerned. Forty million dollars has been appropriated for it assuming we get favorable action on all of these things.

YAMABE: Is there a possibility that if a large estate, such as the Campbell Estate, say voluntarily dedicates land, they might have better tax treatment because of the fact that it was...

DAVIS: That's one of the unfortunate part of the Campbell Estate. It's not like a corporation where they do have tax benefit. Campbell Estate cannot.

YAMABE: I see. There is a possibility in a case of a corporation where they voluntarily dedicate, they have a better treatment, instead of dedication.

DAVIS: Individuals can donate and get a real benefit. Also a corporation depending on the rate of tax they happen to be in.

YAMABE: This doesn't apply to you?

DAVIS: No.

BRENNAN: Gentlemen, we are going to continue this for just about 4 or 5 minutes more. Are there any other questions?

INGLESON: I'm trying to ascertain what kind of bargain this land is. In this letter it states the fair market value the day prior to rezoning. Who is to determine what the fair market value is on that day?

BRENNAN: I wonder if I could explain this and I think I'd be explaining it properly, this is merely a format to work from and I think when the time comes for setting down the metes and bounds, we would then get into that, if we saw fit, pursue this, the formula for arriving at, we would then possibly sit down together and make a determination. Is that correct?

DAVIS: Yes.

BRENNAN: I would like to remind you gentlemen that the basic reason for all the discussion now is because this is coming up for public hearing, so you can have a couple of weeks to think about the ramifications of acquisition and the overall General Plan and thus be able to sit down two weeks from now and be able to dig right in for a decision. Mr. Director?

WAY: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the developer prepare an exhibit that would indicate rather specifically the three areas, the one on the Kawela Bay side, the mid point surfer beach area and the one at the air strip with acreages shown on each, as well as dollar value and unit price per acre or per square foot. I think this would be of some help at the public hearing for the understanding of the general public, and then in addition, in effect, it would be a modification of the map that you have there, and it would not, for example, show the golf course in the same pattern or tone as the areas that are up for question in terms of their being acquired by the City. Just additional information.

BRENNAN: Thank you very much Mr. Kuentz. Gentlemen, I think it's proper at this time to make a motion.

ACTION: The Commission authorized the calling of a public hearing to consider this application for a change in zoning from R-6 Residential District to H-1 Resort Hotel District.

Prior to consideration of this item, Commissioner Ingleson declared a conflict of interest and left the room.

URBAN RENEWAL KAULUWELA PROJECT NO. HAWAII R-7 (MODIFICATIONS) HONOLULU REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

The Commission reviewed a request from the Honolulu Redevelopment Agency to modify the approved Urban Renewal Plan for the Kauluwela Project No. Hawaii R-7 by permitting the construction of a high-rise, 173-unit housing for the elderly. The approved plan limits the dwelling unit density for high-rise apartment development to 73 units per acre.

WAY: This is with reference to the urban renewal project for Kauluwela Project No. R-7. There are some modifications in the urban renewal project plan proposed and Mr. Gilliam of the Planning Department staff is prepared to discuss these, in addition, we have representatives from the Honolulu Redevelopment Agency for any questions that the

Commission might have. Mr. Gilliam, if you would please review this matter for the Commission?

GILLIAM: Primarily, this is a change in the plan text that was approved back in 1965. I have pulled out those sections of the plan which they are requesting a change in the text. Primarily, this involves one portion of the Kauluwela Project in which a proposal is made for a 173-unit housing for the elderly. In the original plan it was proposed that this be a regular apartment project. Subsequently, they have changed from the project, regular apartment to housing for the elderly, the result being a decrease, that is, the size of the units in the approved plan. They have limitations for high density apartments, a maximum of 73 units per acre and here is where their regulations in the plan differ from the zoning regulations in that we do not regulate the density per acre. These basically are all related to the changes of this unit per acre and adding an addition which would permit housing for the elderly to go up to a maximum of 125 units per acre. This project falls well within the limitations of the Comprehensive Zoning Code. The floor area they are developing is about 60 percent of the maximum project. They have readjusted some of the boundaries as indicated on Item No. 2--the previous approval showed a 7-1/2 acre parcel for school and playground. They have separated this out, adjusted the boundary out to a mall area, a separate school, a separate park, a 4.9-acre school site, a 2.4-acre park which is 2/10 of an acre less than the total and this has gone into a mall system for the project in toto. The density has been added in No. 3, with the wording "housing for the elderly, maximum 125 units per acre." Originally it was just high rise apartment structure, maximum 73 units per acre. Here they repeat this in the final sentence after No. 3 in the appendix: "Despite the foregoing limitations, the maximum limitation for housing for elderly persons shall be 125 units per acre." They have made two changes in Item No. 4 relating to off-street parking. For this project they have added in the sentence, "by the redeveloper thereof at his own expense", making sure that the redeveloper will be providing the parking space at his expense. Furthermore, they added one more sentence at the end of the parking section providing for "further modifications at the discretion of the Agency (HRA) may be made in the area used for housing for senior citizens or elderly persons". We, as the Department have objected to this sentence being added in that we do have in the Comprehensive Zoning Code a separate section on parking for housing for the elderly and in addition a variance has been granted on this particular project on the parking and we do not feel that further modifications should be made at the discretion of the Agency.

CHUN: With respect to parking, you said a variance has already been granted to this project with respect to parking?

GILLIAM: That's correct.

CHUN: Does the CZC apply to all projects within the HRA developments?

GILLIAM: The CZC does have an exception for approved projects depending on what the approval was. In their approval, and we've had some problems in this area with them as to what really was approved in these projects, they do approve a land use plan and we have accepted that land use plan. In some cases they spell out requirements, some the say these requirements shall be according to other City regulations, and then sometimes the uses over a period of time changes within the plan, but basically our requirements do apply.

CHUN: This last sentence which is included within their plan and we recommend approval of this modification that determines the means where the Agency at its discretion may eliminate off street parking completely from housing for the senior citizens or elderly projects.

GILLIAM: We would interpret that it has no effect I think because this was approved after January 2 which is the date of the exemption so I think from our standpoint it is moot whether they have this in or not but we prefer not to have it in. Mr. Izutsu is here from the HRA and he has indicated to me, that they have no opposition to deleting this sentence.

CHUN: In Item No. 1 they speak about elimination of the words "exceeding five stories in height". Is there any height restriction anywhere with respect to these projects?

GILLIAM: No.

CHUN: Is there any meaningful meaning?

GILLIAM: No, in this particular area we have a 350-foot height limitation so this is straightening out some of their wording regarding further definitions in their project as to what is high rise and what is not high rise.

YAMABE: It was my understanding that all renewal programs must meet the CZC requirements unless the request is made and approved by this Commission or by a body of authority for any deviation.

GILLIAM: Right. This is a deviation from the approved project and HRA in this case thought this was not a major deviation from the approved plan. However HUD felt that it was and referred it back to the Planning Department and Commission for their approval to make these modifications.

YAMABE: As I correct to understand, therefore, that for any renewal program if there's any major deviation, they have to come back to the Commission and until such time they have to conform to the CZC?

GILLIAM: Basically yes, but where they have made up their own rules prior to January 2, they are contending then that they are exempt from the CZC on everything. We are having discussions with HUD on this, but something not approved prior to January 2 will have to conform in toto.

CHUN: If this project has already been approved prior to January 2 and we at this time make a modification of a plan approved prior to January 2, what is the effective date of the modification?

GILLIAM: This is a technical part. This project conforms with the old and the new CZC other than the variance they got for parking. Actually, the variance was from the previous Code. Building bulk and everything else does conform.

YAMABE: Does it create any problem because of the position taken by the Redevelopment Agency?

GILLIAM: Problem in which...

YAMABE: The fact that they contend that any action taken prior to January 2 is in fact the actual plan.

GILLIAM: Yes it has presented a problem.

YAMABE: It has? Is this the reason why we're going through this?

GILLIAM. No. This particular project is no problem. This is really a HUD requirement that they come in with this density count modification. This one conforms. There is no problem on this particular project. Their only problem is with HUD on granting final approval on this. This one is ready to go.

CHUN: Then HRA has no objection in eliminating that last sentence?

IZUTSU: (HRA STAFF) HRA has no objection to eliminating the last sentence. We have been in contact with Jack and will go along with the staff's recommendation.

YAMABE: I move that we recommend approval of the proposed modification in the new plan covering the Kauluwela Project with the elimination of the last sentence as recommended by the staff.

CHUN: Second. (Vote taken and motion carried.)

PARK DEDICATION ORDINANCE:

BRENNAN: This relates to park dedication, a very important topic, very important subject and it has many ramifications. I would like to suggest, inasmuch as we are rapidly approaching the point in our development of the island here that we're going to have to determine a policy that can be followed or obtaining dedicated area. This discussion might take into consideration various types of subdivisions,

businesses and otherwise, which might be affected. Mr. Director, do you have any opening comments that you'd like to make along this line?

WAY: Mr. Chairman, we have developed for referral and possibly discussion purposes this afternoon, some notes and standards in connection with dedication of neighborhood park lands in subdivisions. Additionally, we have a copy of the ordinance that was discussed and introduced previously. The few points that we would make are, first, that we do intend to continue research on this subject. We are developing additional information from various reference sources. The attached, which we have passed out to the Planning Commission, includes excerpts from subdivision ordinances showing formulas adopted by various cities and counties for fixing the amount of park land dedication to be required in a subdivision. It's unfortunate that only a minimal amount of information, type of information we were seeking was found in these ordinances. With the exception of the model ordinance suggested by the League of California Cities, all were from relatively small cities requiring only, somewhat simplified dedication formulas. Our job, we feel, is substantially of a larger nature and will require some further in-depth analysis and research. On the California ordinance, in fact, we see some problem. The standards suggested in their ordinance for neighborhood recreational facilities does not happen to be the same as that proposed in the ordinance that we have. For example, in California, it is proposed that there be a minimum of 4 acres per thousand persons. In Honolulu, the standard is 1-1/2 and 2 acres per thousand persons. The standard adopted by the City Department of Parks and Recreation for neighborhood parks requires 1 to 1-1/2 acres per thousand persons. The General Plan for Oahu calls for one acre per thousand persons so there does appear to be some discrepancy and we wanted to point that out. The 1-1/2 to 2 acre per thousand persons standard included in the proposed ordinance appears to be a compromise and it was based upon a request of the City Council. The initial proposal to the City Council was 3 acres per thousand persons for single family and low density apartment districts and 1-1/2 acres per thousand persons for medium and high density apartment districts. With specific reference to apartment districts, another reference source, FHA has suggested that they should be dependent upon a sliding scale appropriate for the anticipated density rather than the fixed percentage of land area and there is an attachment covering this point. We suggest that we might use guidelines that have been developed in other areas but the appropriate direction to go is to follow the course which we feel is most important to Honolulu. We might just briefly touch on some standards that had been indicated, for example, Colorado Springs, Colorado, requires land dedication of 4 percent of the area of the subdivision or in lieu of land a cash value donation in the amount equal to 4 percent value for single family areas. For high density areas the require an additional 4 percent area allocation, additional open spaces suitably located of an adequate size for parks.

playground and recreational purposes. Now, no specific guidelines appear to be spelled out in this case. For Village of Scarsdale (18,000 population):

Land Dedication: Required to allocate up to 10% of the subdivision area.

In Lieu of Land: Accepts amount substantially equivalent to 10% of the value before subdivision of land.

Town of Bedford, New York

Land Dedication: Two acres of land for every 100 families.

New Rochelle, New York (76,812 population)

Land Dedication: Ten per cent of total area of subdivision. Minimum area acceptable 3 acres. Consideration is given subdivider for open space reserved for property owners of subdivision.

City of Raleigh, North Carolina (93,931 population)

"..... subdivider required to reserve open spaces for parks, schools, fire stations, and playgrounds ..."

No mention is made in ordinance for mandatory dedication.

Marion County, Oregon

Land Dedication: Not less than 6.25 per cent of the gross area of subdivision.

In Lieu of Land: Pay into a park acquisition fund a sum equal to $82.00 per gross acre for each acre in the subdivision.

Torrance, California

At the time of approval of the final map of any subdivision of more than four parcels there shall be paid to the City of Torrance, as a fee for such approval, the sum of $100.00 per gross acre of subdivided land. Said fee shall be placed in a special fund to be known and designated as the "Park and Recreational Facilities Fund."

Pensacola, Florida

Land Dedication: At least 5% of the gross area of subdivision.

In Lieu of Land: Sum of money equal in value to 5% of the gross area of subdivision.

Tacoma, Washington

Due consideration shall be given by the subdivider to the allocation of suitable areas for schools, parks and playgrounds to be dedicated for public use or reserved for the common use of all property owners within the subdivision by covenants in the deeds.

Modesto, California

At the time of approval of the final map of any

subdivision of more than four parcels there shall be paid to the City of Modesto, as a fee for such approval, the sum of $100 per acre of subdivided land exclusive of public streets, alleys, or other rights-of-way shown on such subdivision map.

From this you can see there is a substantial diversity of approach and concept to the acquisition, requirement for deeding of lands to park and recreation purposes. The principal trust seems to be within the neighborhood type of facility and it has not been brought to our attention, in terms of precedent, that parks other than of a neighborhood character would be required of a subdivider in terms of dedication. We would also want to point out that it is possible under the Charter to set up an improvement district concept to acquisition of park lands. This might be more appropriate to the more intensively developed areas of the City. Then we do have the ordinance which we would suggest might be reviewed at your pleasure and at future meetings of the Commission. In the meantime, the Planning Department staff will be undertaking further research and evaluation of this matter.

YAMABE: I am sure the staff wants to consider this; however, just to satisfy myself, I would like to request the staff to more specifically consider the difference in land ownership here. I think this would be the key to the whole thing here. I don't think we can merely pick up a formula developed by some other states, they might have different conditions and I think land ownership is a very important part in this decision. And also, we should not lose sight of the fact that we do have quite a bit of lease lands. I don't know how these leases can be handled. We are talking about acquisition and dedication but I would like to have the lease possibility considered as well. And also the difference between the large estates, tax advantages and disadvantages, in relation to corporations and individuals.

BRENNAN: The point is well taken, Commissioner Yamabe. I wonder if I could pursue with the Director specifically. There's one aspect that is extremely interesting and that is the improvement district, and to the best of my knowledge, I think what you say is correct, in a neighborhood proposition, but I can see where it can be provided in other areas as well. It just becomes a question of making the hat fit the head. I think that if the City Council and the City and County saw fit to set aside a parcel of land or request a parcel of land and thus introduce an improvement district which would fall upon the developer.

WAY: And also in connection with the existing areas, assessments could be made for the benefit of, within the service area of that open space facility.

BRENNAN: I wonder, Mr. Director, when we talk about dedication or using an improvement district concept, for example, if we can target in on the subdivision of any nature, for example, it takes 50 acres or 70 acres, where would the land come from to create the improvement district? How would you obtain it? Would you use the law of eminent domain and turn around and get your money back by creating an improvement district?

WAY: Yes, that would be the usual procedure.

BRENNAN: What has happened in the past years? Has other than lands been dedicated directly to the City and County?

WAY: I can't think of any of the neighborhood park facilities we've acquired actually even though we have indicated them on the General Plan within the past 6 to 7 months or so. There has been, I think you are aware of two dedications, two outright dedications,deeding if you will, to the City by developers. More often but not the problem comes up right to the Finance Committee of the City Council and the problem of course is one of funding, monies not being available immediately for that purchase. As I said, I can't recall within the past six months where the City has been able to obtain a neighborhood park even though it may have been indicated on the General Plan. Funding is the principal problem.

INGLESON: For obtaining of land in existing areas where it is already built?

BRENNAN: Anywhere in reality. I wasn't pinpointing undeveloped or developed areas; any areas.

INGLESON: I feel, we got a glimpse a few weeks ago of the Waikiki DLUM and I didn't see a speck of green anywhere so that the aspect of an improvement district made.....

WAY: That was the concept behind the mini park approach, one of the means by which we might actually obtain park land. Additionally there is an appropriation for acquisition of one parcel, a portion of an area originally designated for park purpose.

BRENNAN: Is that the triangle area you're referring to? I remember that quite well. There's no question, especially in view of the fact that we are extending development outside of the general area, in the Leeward and the North Shore areas, that time has definitely come to have some kind of policy.

CHUN: I think on the last question as to tract record, I think the only record that we have at the present time is that in the areas of new development in the larger subdivisions that we have the Planning Department and the Public Works Committee require developers to set aside an area for park purposes, school purposes and public facilities. I think perhaps the reason for that is the fact that we have not had before us an ordinance such as this. I don't feel

that I am quite ready to discuss the substance of the ordinance. What I would like is getting someone to inform us of the proposal. I think this is a starting point. I think with a little elbow grease this Commission can come up with a recommendation to the City Council within the short period of time it has to report. I think definitely that we do need a formula which can be applied directly to a small developer, a large developer, anyone who intends to subdivide. I think perhaps within this ordinance itself there may be a section pertaining to improvement districts in areas they want to develop and which require additional playground. In our Central Honolulu District, numerous neighborhood playgrounds are indicated on the General Plan, of course without any thoughts given to actual financing or acquisition of those playgrounds. That I think is where an improvement district comes in.

INGLESON: Mr. Director, this ordinance, approximately what is the standard set for acreage per thousand?

WAY: It varies actually by the, in terms of density or the zoned district that pertains. For example, apartment district higher density because it has a greater percentage or proportion of planned area allocated to the.....

INGLESON: Don't these figures reflect so many acres per.....

WAY: Oh, approximately, here is an example. For single family residential, it would be 2 acres of park per thousand people and then for A-1 Apartment District about 2 acres per thousand people based on 2.2 persons per dwelling. In other apartment districts we go up 1-1/2 acres per thousand of population or about 1.7 persons.

SULLAM: I have a question. In the improvement district where you have, in which by eminent domain you acquire the land, who pays for that?

WAY: The City in part and the property owners could be assessed against for park purpose.

SULLAM: Which property owner? The people who play in the park or the people in the entire area?

WAY: I don't believe that a park improvement district has ever been initiated by the City and maybe there's some question as to who is benefitting. Now in a usual situation of improvement of streets, water or sewer lines, something like that, there's no question as to who benefits because it goes right pass your property. There is yet to be determined, I think means of apportioning the cost.

BRENNAN: I take this almost, when you say who benefits, I think very often about the roadway that goes through, some say don't put it in not only don't I benefit but I don't want the cars but I think we are faced with something entirely different. It's been a paradox because very often the creation of bridges or new highway don't necessarily benefit

those that abut the new highway or new road and the overall performance and benefit accrued to the general area but it's one of the weaknesses, I suppose, in our system. But I think we are talking about park acquisition and I get the kind of feeling, talking about the overall benefit. Now, I don't know that we might not be able to obtain through eminent domain an area in a given subdivision before it ever becomes, gets complete approval and then relate the improvement cost back to the developer again. I mean it's entirely possible and he would then again have to relate this to the cost to the consumer. But the method by which you arrived at it, the formula, in my opinion, will almost be something along this line. If we are going to obtain the land that we are looking for in a particular geographic area that best suits our need but there can be no question, the biggest problem we have in the City and County today is funding. We just don't have it. Not getting enough from the State, can't keep raising real property taxes to do it, so the subdivider just like a businessman has to tie in the cost of shipping. I think in the future it's going to mean that he would have to tie in his cost of acquisition if he's going to move in this direction.

INGLESON: Does the Park Department have certain standards and guidelines as to what, acquiring park land, how do they arrive at their standards?

WAY: Yes.

INGLESON: What they finally get may not necessarily meet what they would like to get.

WAY: That's true.

INGLESON: At least, there must be some standards as far as shade, topography, standards as far as the numbers of families to serve by that particular park.

WAY: Yes. We indicate, for example, that the current standards, with reference to neighborhood parks, the City Department of Parks and Recreation calls for 1 to 1-1/2 acres per thousand persons although the General Plan calls for 1 acre per thousand persons. This doesn't necessarily mean that there's a conflict. The Department of Parks & Recreation has recently updated some of these planning standards and taken a look at an overall basis of the island.

BRENNAN: I think also in the case of developers that are providing park facilities and recreational facilities already within the metes and bounds of their own development are already taken care of which I think you would almost have to compare what we're just talking about for the same thing here. The only difference is, if I might use the one that's on the board here, if the developer here is using 10% for example, to set aside for recreational purpose and he is undertaking the cost, the upkeep of the area, then aren't we talking about the same thing. We are talking about servicing people, it's not really private, because I would

put it the other way, we are talking about density, if the developer didn't put it in there then it might be necessary for us to move in again and allocate land, by eminent domain or some other method, to provide recreational facilities for those people.

INGLESON: He may develop a very luxurious type of development around the park. This becomes private only to those people who live adjacent to it and perhaps the rest of the residents are....

BRENNAN: I think he is serving the needs of the immediate community.

INGLESON: I'm not talking about this.

BRENNAN: No, I'm not talking about this one either. I get the feeling though, if we are going to be able to establish some kind of formula, there's going to be some little weaknesses to it, so to speak, there'll be some vacuum, but I'm thinking in terms of taking an overall area and supplying the necessary service facilities, recreational facilities, and the question is how do you get it, more specifically, how do you get it for the least amount of money.

INGLESON: I would think that encouraging private developers to develop private parks would be much better.

BRENNAN: Exactly.

CHUN: My feeling is that if we are going to develop parks, why are we developing parks other than to serve the needs of th people surrounding that park, who would use that park.

BRENNAN: That's right.

CHUN: I think if we're talking about regional parks or State parks, then we are talking about a horse of a different color.

BRENNAN: Yes, we are.

INGLESON: I notice in this ordinance the fact that they excluded decorative parks and scenic parks as well as beach parks. Beach parks and golf courses I think are also something we should consider. I wonder about decorative and scenic parks being excluded. For example, they say in the definition here, ball fields, paved courts, gymnasiums, in fields, tot lots, community centers. How about walking parks and projects designed primarily for the elderly? That's a decorative park.

BRENNAN: You know, recently in New York, I noticed a number of, little larger than mini parks, but that were primarily being used by elderly people who were sitting in that park, benches, water fountains and what not, maybe for reading, and they had kind of a nice place.

YAMABE: Is it possible for the staff to distribute this draft to organizations, such as the contractors, developers, community associations.....

CHUN: At this time, I would refrain from that. I think there's plenty of time for that when the public hearing is held.

BRENNAN: I think probably Commissioner Chun has a point. He wants to keep you alive.

I'd like to recommend that this Commission give consideration to the subject that we are discussing here. I think we have gone as far as we can possibly on it right now without being redundant.

YAMABE: Realizing the magnitude of this subject matter, I'm not sure that there shouldn't be more than one way to handle this matter also we have to consider the rising cost of development itself because of the mandatory requirement.

BRENNAN: You're absolutely correct, the cost, whether it comes from one side or the other, either from the tax base or from the developer. The point you make I think is excellent. We have some very fine minds in the community and seriously, if we open this up a little more I think we could end up with some very fine suggestions as they relate to this and not necessarily referring to the developer because he's not a bad guy, don't misunderstand me, but I think he has a direct contact and you might not get what you're looking for, but even then, I would certainly welcome anything that comes. But, I mean, the general community itself might come up with some very fine recommendations, some of the business people for example. If there's nothing further you would like to discuss on that, I would like to suggest that someone move to close this meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie Abbott
Hearings Reporter

ma/jg

Special Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
July 31, 1969

The Planning Commission met in Special Session on Thursday, July 31, 1969, at 8:40 a.m. in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Edward Brennan presiding:

PRESENT:

Edward Brennan, Chairman
Philip T. Chun
Lewis Ingleson
Arthur A. Rutledge (arrived at 8:56 a.m.)
Fredda Sullam (arrived at 8:55 a.m.)
Thomas N. Yamabe II
James K. Sakai, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

PUBLIC HEARING (69/Z-17) PROPOSED ZONING B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT (ISLAND FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN)

A public hearing was held to consider a request for a zone change from I-1 Light Industrial to B-2 Community Business District for a parcel of approximately 16,000 square feet located makai of Kapiolani Boulevard and Diamond Head of Ward Avenue and Waimanu Street, identified as Tax Map Key 2-3-03: 73.

The notice of a public hearing was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 20, 1969. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to interested parties and adjoining property owners. No written protests or comments had been received to date.

The Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the parcel which is zoned B-2 Community Business District for a 100-foot depth parallel to Kapiolani Boulevard. The remainder of the parcel, which extends to Waimanu Street approximately 80 feet, is zoned I-1 Industrial District.

The Staff Report distributed to the Commission members indicated generally:

1. The request for the zone change for 16,000 square feet is only a portion of a parcel of land containing a gross area of 38,008 square feet.

2. The 1964 adopted General Plan reflects Commercial for the block.

3. Although the Detailed Land Use Map, Planning Area No. 13, Ala Moana-Kewalo, Section B, has not been adopted yet, preliminary plans indicate Commercial use for this entire block.

4. There is no Development Plan. However, the West Kewalo Improvement District, which is scheduled for construction in 1971, will widen Waimanu Street from 40 feet to 56 feet and construct curbs, gutters, and sidewalks.

5. Ward Avenue and Kapiolani Boulevard are considered adequate in width and in excellent condition with curbs, gutters, and sidewalks.

6. Applicant's Development Plan shows accesses on each of the three streets. A drive-in teller window will be off Waimanu Street.

7. A variance to permit the operation and construction of a savings and loan institution within the I-1 Light Industrial District was granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals at a public hearing on March 27, 1969. (Reference 69/Z-49)

8. Permission by the Federal Government to move the firm's main office from 1856 Kalakaua Avenue to its present site expires in August 1969.

9. Because a zoning change could decidedly cause a delay in construction, it was decided that a variance would be requested first -- if it were granted a subsequent request for a zone change would be made.

10. With the approval of all pertinent government agencies, a building permit (No. 68623) was issued on April 2, 1969.

11. Construction is almost complete at this date.

12. A staff study indicates that the request is reasonable and should be granted on the following basis:

a. Request conforms with and implements the General Plan.

b. Utilities and street facilities are available and adequate to support the use.

13. Investigations indicate that there would be need for compliance with the Comprehensive Zoning Code requirements with reference to a 5-foot planting strip required on all street frontages and, further, that no parking be permitted in the setback and yard areas off Waimanu Street.

14. Sign permits are necessary for the structure that now exists.

The Director stated that the aforementioned constitutes the report and recommendations of the Planning Director and Staff on this subject matter.

No one spoke in opposition to, or in favor of, the proposal.

Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission approved the request for the change in zoning.

(Mrs. Sullam and Mr. Rutledge were not present during this public hearing.)

PUBLIC HEARING (69/Z-24) PROPOSED ZONING B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT WAIANAE-KAI (KAZUMASA AND FUMIKO TERAMOTO)

A public hearing was held to consider a request for a zone change in Waianae from R-6 Residential District to B-2 Community Business District of 5,883 square feet of land located makai of Farrington Highway and 50 feet north of the intersection on Guard Street, and identified as Tax Map Key 8-5-11: 23.

The public hearing notice was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 20, 1969. Copies of the notice were sent to applicable governmental agencies, to various civic and community organizations in the area, and to nearby property owners. To this date, there have

been no protests received in writing in connection with this matter.

The Director oriented the Planning Commission as to the location on the Detailed Land Use Map.

1. With reference to the Development Plan, there is proposed a 10-foot setback line along Farrington Highway fronting the property.

2. The parcel is presently occupied by a nonconforming store structure. There are at least 12 other nonconforming business uses within a 750-foot radius of the subject parcel.

3. There is a pattern of business development established in the area.

4. The existing land use in the immediate area is in single-family residential uses.

5. It is anticipated that the proposal to build a new hollow-tile, 2-story business building will improve the appearance of the area and would permit the applicant to legally continue the business operations.

The Director reported to the Commission:

1. The request is in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for the area.

2. The proposal conforms to, and implements, the Detailed Land Use Plan.

3. Utilities are adequate to support the use.

4. The parcel has adequate access.

The Director, therefore, recommended to the Commission the adoption of this proposal, subject to (1) compliance with the Comprehensive Zoning Code requirements; (2) requirements with reference to curbs, gutters, and sidewalks when applying for a building permit; and (3) adherence to the 10-foot setback line along Farrington Highway.

(Mrs. Sullam entered at 8:55 a.m.)

The question of parking was clarified.

Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, the public hearing was closed and the matter taken under advisement.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, the Commission approved the request to change the zone from R-6 Residential to B-2 Community Business.

PUBLIC HEARING
(PA #14)
WHITNEY STREET
DEAD END
CLARK STREET
TURNAROUND

Mr. Philip T. Chun declared a conflict of interest on this hearing, and disqualified himself from participating in the deliberations.

A public hearing was held to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Plan and Development Plan for the University Community area by deleting the dead end portion of Whitney Street between Clark Street and Lunalilo Freeway, and the dead end portion of Griffiths Street between Dole Street and Lunalilo Freeway, and to further designate a modified T-shaped turnaround at the end of Clark Street.

The notice of public hearing was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 20, 1969. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to applicable governmental agencies to interested parties and nearby property owners. No protests had been received in writing.

The Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the subject areas via the wall map -- designated as portions of Tax Map Keys 2-8-08 and 2-8-12.

(Mr. Rutledge entered the meeting at 8:56 a.m.)

The amendments described above were the results of a joint study by the Department of Public Works, Department of Traffic, and the Planning Department.

The proposal is to (1) delete portions of two streets that are now dead end rights-of-way at Lunalilo Freeway. These are Whitney Street, the dead end portion between Clark Street and Lunalilo Freeway, and Griffiths Street, and the dead end portion between Dole Street and Lunalilo

Freeway. The deletions were recommended on the basis that with the construction of the freeway, the rights-of-way culminate in dead ends and do not service either side.
(2) Designate a suitable turnaround to handle anticipated traffic volume created by the density apartment areas at the end of Clark Street.

Interrogation of the Planning Director by the Commission brought out the following points:

1. Disposition of the parcels after they are no longer streets is a matter still to be determined. Would like to delete and put into the appropriate land use (in this case, apartment designation) at this point. May be sold to adjoining property owners or retained for some other public purpose by the City.

2. Under some lease arrangement, the area could be used for auto parking or for mini-parks which is particularly needed in this high density area.

3. The modified turnaround would be constructed under the University Apartment Area Improvement District Program. Recognizing the high density character of the area, a subsequent amendment would be necessary to widen Clark Street from 40 feet to 56 feet. However, it is considered premature at this time to consider such an undertaking and that the immediate provision of a turnaround area for Clark Street, although not the most ideal solution, would be most appropriate.

4. It would not be advisable to consider the Clark Street turnaround an overall amendmend to the development plan. It is a matter of urgency in connection with the continuation of the department's program.

Department of Public Works indicated that they presently are working on the street improvement plans for the University Apartment Improvement District.

Letters of protest were presented and read by the Planning Director. At Mr. Yamabe's request, the addresses of all protestors were obtained, entered into the record, and placed on file with the letters. (PA #14, University ID):

1. Beatrice H. T. Luke and Hoy Luke with signatures of 13 other individuals.

2. Mrs. Leocadia H. Raymond on behalf of her grandmother, Mrs. Tai Lin Shee.

3. The fourth was not a protest but a plea indicating interest in acquiring the abandoned portion of Whitney Street from Patrick F. Tuohy, Attorney at Law, representing Mrs. Lillian G. M. O'Toole and her son, Philip O'Toole.

Upon motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission closed the public hearing and the matter was taken under advisement.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, the Commission approved the two amendments for deletion of portions of Whitney and Griffiths Street. However, they did not concur with the Planning Director's recommendation for a turnaround on Clark Street. (They felt it would be more fair to property owners to consider it simultaneously with the widening of the street, which will have to be done eventually because of the high density proposed.

PUBLIC HEARING (69/Z-11) PROPOSED ZONING A-3 APARTMENT DISTRICT (KAISER HAWAII KAI DEVELOPMENT COMPANY)

Before proceeding with the meeting, Mrs. Sullam disqualified herself from any participation in the deliberations because of a conflict of interest.

A public hearing was held to consider a request for a zone change from AG-1 Restricted Agriculture to A-3 Apartment District for 23.74 acres of land located north of Hawaii Kai Recreation Center extending to Hahaione Street and identified as Tax Map Key 3-9-08: 1.

The notice of public hearing was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of July 20, 1969. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to applicable governmental agencies, interested parties and adjoining property owners.

The Director presented the proposal by first giving a brief background history:

1. February 5, 1969, Hong and Iwai, Attorneys-at-Law for Kaiser Hawaii Kai Development Company, requested a rezoning of the land in Maunalua, Oahu, Tax Map Key 3-9-08: 1 from AG-1 to A-3.

2. Present conditions of the site are that the land is vacant.

3. Detailed Land Use Map for the area is medium-density apartment.

4. Utilities and facilities are adequate to support the proposed development.

5. The request is in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map.

The following description of the parcel and the applicant's proposal was presented by the Director to the Commission. Pointed out were:

1. Subject parcel.

2. Proposed freeway through the area.

3. Existing Hawaii Kai Drive.

4. Proposed shopping center, school and park site.

5. Proposed subdivision of 23 acres into 8 parcels.

6. The 8 parcels to be sold to the developers.

7. Six parcels to be developed into 15-story, 20-story, or more-story apartment buildings.

8. Lots 7 and 8 to be 4-story apartment buildings.

9. Parking separate from buildings and toward hillside.

10. Areas to be served by Hahaione Street extension, terminating at Hawaii Kai Drive and will have a 56-foot right-of-way.

11. The lots are intended to be subleased to individual developers who will develop their area in conformity with the criteria

set forth by Kaiser Hawaii Kai Development Company. This will insure a harmonious development.

12. Proposed high-rise buildings to be located on the Diamond Head side of Kualanui Ridge at 160-foot elevation.

13. Detailed Land Use Map indicates single-family residential use above the subject parcel at approximately the 400-foot elevation.

14. Because of its location at the base of Kualanui Ridge, the proposed high-rise buildings would not present a major obstruction of view to the surrounding development. However, if the buildings are allowed to be built 20 stories or more, the panoramic view of the ocean from the proposed residential area on Kualanui Ridge may be obstructed.

15. The Kaiser Hawaii Kai Development Company has submitted a request to amend the Detailed Land Use Map from Resort to Medium-Density Apartment for that parcel located south of Hahaione Valley Unit I-D development. This has relationship to the consideration for apartment use in the area.

16. The area between Diamond Head and Koko Head presently has three high-rise buildings. With this proposed development, there will be a total of nine high-rise buildings within the area. The Hawaii Kai Detailed Land Use Map designates other areas for medium-density apartments and there appears to be a need for apartment uses in the vicinity.

17. A height limitation of high-rise buildings to be built at the base of mountain ridges should be determined to assure that the view of the mountains and the ocean will be maintained and that there would be a harmonious development of high-rise blending into the hillside.

It is recommended that the request for the change in zoning from AG-1 Restricted Agriculture to A-3 Apartment District be granted since it is (1) in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map, (2) utilities are adequate to

support the proposed use, and (3) restricted agricultural uses within this area has been virtually phased out.

Discussion brought out the following information:

There have been no specific adopted height limitations established for Punchbowl which could be used as a measuring stick for Hawaii Kai.

The developer brought in additional plans which were not available to the Planning Staff for review prior to the meeting. (It is not required of the applicant to provide details, plans, etc.)

Prior to today, there had been no protests received in writing. Many communications addressed to Mr. Soares of the 17th District just arrived in opposition to the proposal.

The Director was asked, "In your opinion, what effect will construction of 15-story and 20-story or more-story apartment buildings have visually and aesthetically on that neighborhood in that area?"

The Director replied: "There are not specific plans showing precise location of buildings and structures. It is difficult to evaluate. However, we felt that structures above 20 stories could impose problems in relation to appearance and to the land itself. The developer proposes to lease out parcels to other developers who would construct buildings. There is an indication from the applicants that they will provide certain measures of control. We do have another plan that just came in today that may help to clarify some questions with reference to the appearance and location of structures relating to the area."

The elevation of the ridge directly behind the property to the east is approximately 800 feet. The property itself has a 160-foot elevation.

When the Plan was adopted in March of 1966, no consideration was given to future mass transit possibilities, no separate fixed transit line system. Buses, primarily, would use the roads serving the area.

Chairman Brennan requested that the relationship of the Detailed Land Use Map to the Zoning should be explained for the benefit of the people testifying.

The Director so explained:

"The Detailed Land Use Map is actually the General or Master Plan for a given area. This is a longer-range proposal for the use of land and for highways to serve the area.

"The General Plan of Oahu, which was adopted in 1964, set forth a pattern of land use that was to be the objective for 1985--approximately a 20-year forecast of the land use requirements and needs for Oahu based upon studies of population, economic conditions, trends, social and governmental development. These are some of the specifics that are spelled out for us in the Charter as to what a General Plan should be.

"The Detailed Land Use Map constitutes a portion of the General Plan and is a more elaborate, more detailed examination of the land uses and proposals of the General Plan. Following the adoption of the 1964 General Plan then, the Planning Department went into studies of some 38 planning areas throughout the island to develop these Detailed Land Use Maps. Hawaii Kai was one of these and, as mentioned, the adopted plan was officially enacted on March 1, 1966. This is only two steps in the planning process, the adoption of the General Plan and Detailed Land Use Map. The third step, the one under discussion here today, is that having to do with Zoning. Zoning implements the General Plan, the Detailed Land Use Map for an area. Until the zoning is enacted, the plan still represents a policy for the development of an area. Zoning specifies more detailed regulations and requirements that must be followed in the development of the land.

"To sum up then, zoning is the means of actually providing for the development. Both the Detailed Land Use Map and Zoning Ordinance must be adopted by law. They represent, as stated in the Charter, the City Council's policy for the use of land on the island."

Density projections at the time of the adoption of the Detailed Land Use Map, prior to the

adoption of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, would probably be on the order of higher density than we now have, of 100 to 150 units per acre.

A-3, medium-density apartment zoning, now would permit about 70 dwelling units per acre. For the 23-plus acres (70 x 24) there would be a total of approximately 1,680 maximum units permitted there.

There is a slight difference in density between A-2 (50 units maximum per acre) and A-3 (70 units maximum per acre).

Three or four public hearings held by the Commission and Council in 1964 and 1966 to adopt the General Plan and Detailed Land Use Map for the area were prior to the development of the community and, therefore, residents present today were not in the area at that time and, therefore, not aware of these proposals.

In addition to the required legal notice, special notice was directed to the five community associations in that area.

TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSAL:

(1) Mr. George Patterson, a representative of the steering committee appointed by the residents of Hahaione Valley, and the original founder and President of Hawaii Kai Association:

> "Investments of each family of $50,000 minimum.
>
> Increased traffic.
>
> Education - will be forced to private schools.
>
> Understood that the area would all be residential.
>
> Previous changes did not appear to jeopardize our investments."

(2) Jacquelin N. Miller, President of Hahaione Elementary School PTA, representing Principal Yoshida who is on the mainland:

"Education - crowded schools, no expansion provisions. Total expansion available at present is 28 classrooms."

(3) Mr. Henry Smith, member of the steering committee:

"Invested in a home - single-family. Uncrowded area, safe place, overcame the red dust, planted trees and lawns. Now the image is threatened, character of the Valley has changed, there will be 20 floors above the backyard, traffic congestion, forced to live against our will or move out...Did not know of high-rise prior to, or after buying."

(4) John T. McCarthy, a member of the steering committee:

"High-rise in the middle of a single-family residential area. No objection to apartment designation area in a large undeveloped area as long as made known to me."

(5) Donald N. Wood, President, Niu Peninsula Community Association:

"Traffic congestion. Overcrowded schools - will be forced to schools in other areas. Integrity of entire concept of Planning - the entire island will be of concrete."

(6) Miss Pat Davis, Realtor, resident of Hawaii Kai since 1963, and responsible for the sale of over 100 homes in Hawaii Kai area:

"Demography - Education - Automotive. Was aware of duplexes only in that area."

(7) Mr. Fred Rohlfing, State Senator 8th Senatorial District, representing the people who couldn't be present:

(Submitted exhibits, articles and letters from Kuliouou Improvement Association)

"Transportation problems, Education, and Zoning (Regency, Kahala Towers, Kahala Hilton). A moratorium of this area should be declared on high-rises.

Housing is more important than mass transportation. For multiple dwellings we should look toward the agricultural areas and develop with lots of green."

(3) Mr. Wilfred "Buddy" Soares, Representative 17th District, Chairman of Hahaione Home Owners Citizens' Committee, and a resident of Hawaii Kai:

(Presented a letter from Acting Chief of Police, William P. Sheather, in opposition to the high-rise because of traffic and highway conditions.)

(Presented a letter from Benjamin J. Webster, Adjutant General, Director of Civil Defense, in opposition because of situations other than flooding and tsunamis such as mass evacuation from brush fires, etc.)

(Presented a petition protesting the rezoning request signed by 640 residents of Hawaii Kai covering the areas of Hahaione Valley, Marina and Koko Head Terrace.)

"Schools - residential versus high-rise, and overall planning."

TESTIMONY IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL:

Mr. Tim Yee, Vice-President and General Manager of Kaiser Hawaii Kai Development Company:

"In 1959, Henry Kaiser started with dedication and guts, to plan and build a new community, economically feasible to carry out, and not just another subdivision or series of unrelated pieces. It was Master Planned, and to be built according to the plan.

The Master Plan was prepared in conjunction with many people:

City and County Planning Commission
General Plan adopted by City and County
Fire Department
City and State Agencies

Federal Agencies
Bishop Estates
Architects
Engineers
Schools and parks (will be owned by the City)
Four sites (given to the City)

Costs and risks are great. Not an eleemosynary group. Building a community, not one or two houses.

Hawaii Kai Marina Bridge which provides access to the highway and the ocean, will be given to the City at a cost to us of $800,000.

Large developer dedicated land for parks at our cost.

Recreational facilities, swimming pool.

Sewer systems, pumping station, treatment plants.

The area under discussion today is only one-half of 1% of the total package.

The project is considered important--people need housing.

Pioneered the condominium concept.

Freeway alignment.

Frontage road across the pond. The State had no funds so we built it and gave it to the State.

We have done all of these because we were led to believe that this Master Plan would ultimately be implemented.

The need for housing is very great - population is growing. The economy is good. Home ownership in Hawaii is very low.

Unreasonable rents in Honolulu. High ratio of rents, doubling up more than any other State.

We are making homes available at competitive prices. We create all types of residences. That's the basis of the Master Plan.

We are asking for medium-density, not high-density.

Should not down-zone the area of Hahaione.

Construction costs are high, land is high, need new ways to develop - and that's high-rise.

On the map, 4-story buildings and open spaces.

Parking will require 2-1 and deck parking if necessary. We are very cognizant of this. On the moorings area 3-1 parking requirements.

Total of 24 acres - will take 18 months to 2 years. To complete 1,200 units, it may take 6 to 7 years.

Cars will not all be on the highway at once.

This is 10 percent of the land area of the valley.

It will not protrude above the hillside.

It is set off by the street area, shopping center, and drainage canal.

We feel it is part of a balanced community. We plan 2-bedroom and 1-bedroom instead of the previous 3- and 4-bedrooms. There will be less school children.

Mr. Barry Okuda, Chief Engineer, went to the map and explained the traffic and school situations.

Interrogation of Messrs. Yee and Okuda by the Commission revealed:

1. Three schools should be sufficient, based

upon the Department of Education's projections, even with this apartment area.

2. An additional area was set aside in Kamiloiki Valley for schools at the time the Detailed Land Use Map was approved in 1966.

3. Two additional schools at the Queens Beach site are shown on the Detailed Land Use Map.

4. If there is need for an additional school site, it will be found in Hawaii Kai. The Kaiser Hawaii Kai Development Company works closely with the Department of Education on a continuing basis and it was presumed that because additional land was not requested, it was not required.

5. If this zoning is denied, the Hawaii Kai Development Company will request the next highest zoning, which is A-2.

6. Since it is not possible to place any conditions on zoning, Mr. Yee was asked to explain briefly some of the conditions he had placed on the building pending rearranging, parking space as required under the Comprehensive Zoning Code, etc., generally in the contract.

7. One of the conditions requires height limits. Also have minimum sizes of units. Minimum of 5,000 square feet landscaping and sprinklers. 2-1 off-street parking required. Requirements far in excess of City requirements.

8. An architectural committee works full time for Hawaii Kai Development Company in conjunction with Bishop Estates on the plans.

9. Although the eight separate lots may be sold to individual developers at Hawaii Kai, the Kaiser Hawaii Kai Development Company will prepare a development plan and control the development for the individual developers; and are willing to bring the plans in to the Planning Commission; and will enforce it.

Hawaii Kai has prepared a timetable with respect to other high-density uses under the Master Plan:

a. Several to be developed over the next 10 years.

b. Some on the water, some in Hahaione Valley.

c. Would like to zone some for 3-5 years from now.

d. Would like to zone large areas and Master Plan.

Mr. Rutledge pointed out that in view of the assumptions made by the people who bought homes in one-story residential areas, it might be well for Kaiser Hawaii Kai Development Company to embark on a job of communicating their plans to the Community Association.

Mr. Brennan asked the Kaiser Hawaii Kai Development Company if they had available plans showing timetables and how soon they can plan to implement it, since the residents testified they had no knowledge of high-density or medium-density plans.

Mr. Yee felt that the word was getting around since there have been articles in the newspaper, as in the Star-Bulletin, as long back as 1964 when they were granted zoning for high-rise.

Mr. Ingleson added that fairness is not only on the part of the developer, but also on the part of citizens being involved in the planning process.

Mr. Brennan stated that he felt everyone was aware of the great number of funds expended by Mr. Yee's company but the residents just expressed the feeling that they didn't want to live with high-rise next to them.

To Mr. Yamabe's question as to whether or not they considered requests from the staff, Mr. Yee replied that the whole Master Plan was conceived and agreed with by the entire Planning Department staff.

Upon motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission deferred action for two weeks in order to:

(1) Read and study the new information placed before them during this meeting.

(2) Study the developments of Kaiser Hawaii Kai Development Company plan leading up to the adoption of the zoning for the area.

(3) Read the letters from the Department of Education and others.

(4) Give the staff time to prepare reports of chronological meetings, happenings, hearings, etc.

ZONING
(69/Z-19)
B-2 COMMUNITY
BUSINESS DISTRICT
LAIE
(ZIONS SECURITIES
CORPORATION)

This is a request for zoning change from R-6 Residential District to B-2 Community Business District at Laie near the Polynesian Cultural Center for 0.85 acres designated as Tax Map Key 5-5-14: portions of Parcels 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32 and 34.

A public hearing was held and closed on July 17, 1969. The Commission deferred action for further information.

ACTION: The Director recommended the matter be deferred in order to gather more information.

PROPOSAL NO. 1
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE MAP
(AMENDMENT)
KAIPAPAU
PLAN AREA NO. 26
MEDIUM-DENSITY
APARTMENT
(JONATHAN MANOR, INC.)

The Planning Director initiated the request and recommended that a public hearing be authorized to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map by changing the land use designation from Residential and Commercial to Medium-Density Apartment. The parcel is presently zoned B-2 Community Business (2.0 acres) and R-6 Residential District (0.7 acres), Tax Map Keys 5-4-04: 22 and 5-4-19: 53.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, the Commission authorized a public hearing.

PROPOSAL NO. 2
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE MAP
(AMENDMENT)
KAIPAPAU
PLAN AREA NO. 26
COMMERCIAL
(KAHUKU SHOPPING
CENTER, LIMITED)

The Planning Director initiated the request and recommended that a public hearing be authorized for a General Plan Detailed Land Use Map amendment to change the land use designation from Residential to Commercial use, 2.4 acres described as Tax Map Key 5-4-18: 59. It is proposed to establish food facilities for tourists and residents, as well as other unnamed business activities.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, the Commission authorized a public hearing.

CONDITIONAL
USE PERMIT
(69/CUP-9)
MAKIKI
(CHINESE CENTER)

Before proceeding, Mr. Ingleson declared a conflict of interest and disqualified himself from any participation in the deliberations concerning this matter.

This is a request for issuance of a Conditional Use Permit to construct and operate a 3-story convalescent home consisting of 64 rooms with a total of 120 beds, in Makiki, at 1516 Nehoa Street and 1905 Makiki Street on an area of 44,875 square feet and described as Tax Map Key 2-5-01: 9 and 10.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, the Commission authorized a public hearing.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie Abbott
Hearings Reporter

Special Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
August 6, 1969

The Planning Commission held a special meeting on Wednesday, August 6, 1969 at 8:40 A.M. in the conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT:

Philip T. Chun, Chairman
Lewis Ingleson
Mrs. Fredda Sullam
Thomas N. Yamabe II
James K. Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Leonard Moffitt, Staff Planner

ABSENT:

Edward Brennan
Roy R. Bright
Arthur A. Rutledge

PUBLIC HEARING
(69/Z-13) ZONING
A-2 APARTMENT
DISTRICT
949 LEHUA AVENUE
PEARL CITY
(Motohiki Iguchi)

A public hearing was held under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu to consider a request for a zone change from R-6 Residential to A-2 Apartment District for 11,250 sq. ft. of land situated at 949 Lehua Avenue approximately 1-1/2 blocks makai from the intersection of Kamehameha Highway and Waimano Home Road and further identified as Tax Map Key 9-7-21: 28. The development proposal is the construction of two apartment buildings. The building on the front portion of the property is proposed to be 3 stories containing 4 units and ground level used for off-street parking. The second building on the rear portion of the property is proposed to be 2 stories containing 3 units.

The public hearing notice was published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser of July 27, 1969. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, Pearl City Community Church, Pearl City Community Kindergarten, Pearl City Community Association, three property owners, and interested civic and community organizations.

No letters of protest had been received to date.

The Director oriented the Commission with the use of maps and plans and the following information:

1. The parcel is within the area designated for medium-density apartment use on the Detailed Land Use Map for the Pearl City-Aiea area.

2. At present there is no proposal for widening the nearby streets.

3. The Board of Water Supply indicates that the water supply is adequate.

4. The Public Works states that sewers are available and adequate for the development.

5. Lehua Avenue has an 80-ft. right-of-way with a pavement width of 56 feet. The condition, as described by the Department of Public Works, is fair. Curbs and gutters are installed but there is no sidewalk.

6. At the present time, Lehua Avenue is a State Highway.

7. The State Highways Division reports that they have no objection to the change of zoning but comment that sidewalk construction along Lehua Avenue is not scheduled for the foreseeable future.

8. Lehua Avenue will be transferred to the City under Phase II of the implementation of the State Highway System.

9. In indicating the parking, the plan as presented by the applicant, shows 10 parking spaces. The CZC requires 1-1/4 parking stalls for each unit, or a total of 9 stalls for the 7 units proposed.

10. A small recreation area on the site is proposed between the two buildings totalling about 1400 sq. ft.

It is the recommendation of the Planning Department Staff that the application be approved for rezoning. We have not received any objections or protests in writing in connection with this case.

No questions.

No public testimony against the proposal.

No public testimony in favor of the proposal.

Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the public hearing was closed and the matter taken under advisement.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, the Commission approved the request for change in zoning from R-6 Residential to A-2 Apartment.

PUBLIC HEARING
(68/Z-113) ZONING
B-3 BUSINESS-
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
CENTRAL HONOLULU
DISTRICT
1020-1022 S.King St.
(Dr. Kiyoshi Inouye)

A public hearing was held under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu to consider a request for a zone change from B-1 Neighborhood Business to B-3 Business-Residential District for 21,553 sq. ft. of land situated between Young Street and King Street, 203.35 ft. Diamond Head of Victoria Street, and further identified as Tax Map Key 2-4-02: Parcel 31. The applicant proposes to construct a multi-story development with commercial facilities on the ground level and dwelling units above.

The Notice of Public Hearing was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser of July 27, 1969. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, civic and community organizations, Medical Arts Building, Ltd., Francis T. Kaneshiro, M.D., Lincoln School, McKinley High School, and Central Honolulu Community Association.

The Director presented the proposal with a brief background:

1. The parcel is within the Makiki, Kewalo, Ala Moana Central Honolulu District. The Detailed Land Use Map for this area has not yet been adopted.

2. A preliminary Detailed Land Use Map which was approved by the Planning Commission and transmitted to City Council proposes commercial use for the area.

3. The zoning for the parcel was Restricted Business District which is now, under the Comprehensive Zoning Code, B-1 Neighborhood Business District.

4. Parcels immediately Waikiki and Ewa of the subject property are also zoned B-1 Neighborhood Business Districts.

5. The property is situated along King Street, it is actually a through parcel between King and Young Streets, having frontage on both roadways. (Streets and landmarks in the area, Victoria Street, Pensacola Street, Thomas Square and Honolulu International Center were pointed out on the map).

6. The water and sewer facilities are adequate to support the proposed use in the area.

7. King Street has a right-of-way of 65 feet and a pavement width of 51 feet.

8. The preliminary Development Plan indicates a 15-ft. widening for King Street.

9. Under the B-3 Business-Residential District, the applicant proposes to construct a multi-story development with commercial units located on the ground levels of the building and dwelling units located above. We do not have a specific proposal or site plan or plot plan of this development.

10. On January 7, 1960, Ordinance No. 1782, Bill 113, changed the parcel of land located immediately Waikiki of the subject parcel from Hotel and Apartment District B to Restricted Business District. A 4-story structure now exists on this parcel. This is the Waikiki side.

11. On September 9, 1964, Ordinance No. 2498, Bill No. 82, changed the parcel of land located immediately Ewa of the subject parcel from Hotel and Apartment District B to Restricted Business. This is the Medical Arts Building. An 8-story building now exists on this parcel of land.

    These buildings were built under the old zoning ordinance which allowed structures to be built as high as the building code permitted. Since the enactment of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, any structure to be built within a B-1 Neighborhood-Business District is subject to a maximum height limitation of 25 ft.

12. In view of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, the properties located immediately Waikiki and Ewa of the subject parcels and their structures would be considered nonconforming under the CZC.

13. The parcel and the abutting B-1 zoned lots are completely surrounded by an A-4 Apartment zoned area. A B-2 Community Business District and an R-6 Residential District are located Waikiki and makai of the A-4 Apartment zoned area respectively.

It is recommended that the request to rezone a portion of the area from B-1 to B-3 be approved based upon the facts that we have presented and, further, that under the Comprehensive Zoning Code the existing uses located immediately Waikiki and Ewa are considered as nonconforming. Further, we would like to recommend that the parcels on both sides of the subject property be amended to B-3 Business-Residential upon adoption of the zoning map for this area. This then would bring all of the parcels within this area into the B-3 Business-Residential classification.

There have been no protests received in writing on this case.

The Commissioners asked questions of the Director with the following results:

The property is presently occupied by a one-story structure which is being utilized as a doctor's office. The effect of rezoning the abutting properties is that it recognizes they are really not appropriate in B-1.

In relation to the subject property, they would be allowed to develop a little bit more intensively on their property under the B-3 than at present.

The parking requirement for B-3 depends on the specific use. If it were apartment, it would be 1-1/4 space per unit; if commercial, it would be floor area ratio basis depending upon the type of commercial facility. One stall per 300 sq. ft. in certain instances and 1 stall per 400 sq. ft. in others.

No further questions.

No public testimony in opposition to the proposal.

TESTIMONY IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL:

Mr. Roy Fukuda, representing Dr. Inouye, pointed out that there is a one-story medical office building on the property now. Also, in the area about a block away there is a multi-story apartment building and a commercial building. Ewa of

that there are coming up two more condominium apartment buildings.

He also mentioned that there is adequate green area space around the Thomas Square, Honolulu International Center and the McKinley High School.

Commissioner Yamabe asked Mr. Fukuda if the intent of the applicant was primarily to develop a combination of business and apartments.

Mr. Fukuda replied, "Not right now." He explained that Dr. Inouye's former office was condemned by the City and this piece of property is to be used for only a few more years and then be developed to the fullest and best use. Because of the doctor's age, it would be impractical to make improvements at this date.

Commissioner Yamabe asked if plans had progressed far enough so that there might be drawings, schematics, etc. But there are none at the present time.

Mr. Fukuda expressed thoughts along the line of combining offices, commercial and apartments in one large complex which would conform to the general area and the manner in which it is presently being utilized.

There were no further questions.

It was moved by Mr. Yamabe and seconded by Mrs. Sullam that the public hearing be closed and the matter taken under advisement. Motion carried.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, the Commission deferred the matter until a full Commission were present and at the same time the staff would make further study and send a report to the next Planning Commission meeting.

GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
KAILUA
VARIOUS
KAPAA VALLEY AREA
(HC&D, LTD. AND
HAWAIIAN TRUST CO.)

A public hearing was held under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu to consider the proposal for a change in the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Kailua involving several changes as follows: (1) from Agricultural and Public Facility to Industrial use (2.47 acres); (2) from Industrial and Open Space to Public Facility use (72± acres); (3) from Agricultural and Open Space to Park use (1,018± acres); and (4) the designation of the

existing Quarry Road as a public way.
The applicant, the H.C.&D., Ltd., proposes to develop a concrete product manufacturing facility in an area approximately 27 acres, of which 2.1 acres are designated now as agricultural and .37 acres designated as public facility. The location is the Kapaa Valley joining the Kawainui Swamp of Kailua and identified as Tax Map Key: Portions of 4-2-15 and 4-2-16.

Public notice was given in the Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser of July 27, 1969 and copies of the notice were sent to the applicant, Mr. R.L. Muller, Pres.; Hawaiian Trust Co., Ltd.; Lani-Kailua Outdoor Circle; Kailua Improvement Assn.; Hui-O-Kailua; Kailua Comm. Assn.; Windward Citizens Planning Conference; Maunawili Improvement District; Olomana Comm. Assn.; Kukanono Tract Assn.; and to applicable governmental agencies.

Two letters of protest had been received: (1) Mr. J.P. Russell of Jenks, Kidwell, Goodsill & Anderson representing their clients Messrs. Henry H. Wong and Henry L. L. Wong and the executors of the Estate of H.K.L. Castle, Deceased; (2) Mr. Ted R. Green, Director of Parks and Recreation, City and County of Honolulu.

The Director oriented the Commission as to the general areas involved and shown on the Detailed Land Use Map. He then provided the following background:

The State Land Use designation for the area is Urban.

The City and County zoning in the area is R-6 Residential and Conservation.

H.C.&D. and Hawaiian Trust Company, on April 10, 1969 requested an amendment of the Kailua Detailed Land Use Map, for the area of approximately 2.47 acres situated in Kapaa Valley, from Agricultural and Public Facility to Industrial.

In the process of the Staff Analysis of the project, the Planning Department concluded that the additional land use designations within the same area should also be amended approximately 72 acres of Industrial and Open Space to Public Facility an area of approximately 1,018 acres from Agricultural and Open Space to Park and the further designation of the quarry road as a public roadway.

H.C.&D. has operated a quarry, crushing plant, and other facilities in the Kapaa Valley since late 1950. Original operations were extended to the present 480-acre leaseholdings early in 1962. The Lease of the new site will expire in the year 2012. On June 10, 1968, the City and County instituted condemnation proceedings to acquire a major portion (almost 76 acres) of the area designated for industrial use on the Detailed Land Use Map to construct an incinerator. The City is presently ready to purchase this land. The State Department of Transportation, after they developed their alignment for the H-3 roadway through Kapaa Valley, would take approximately 53 acres from the 480-acre parcel of H.C.&D. and this is the 53-acre parcel or section for the H-3 Highway through the quarry site.

The H-3 roadway is scheduled for completion in mid-1975 and the Mokapu saddle road junction in the vicinity of the quarry is scheduled for completion in mid-1975.

The H.C.&D. Company wishes to develop a concrete product manufacturing facility in the area of approximately 27 acres of which presently 2.1 acres are designated as agricultural and 0.37 acres are designated as public facility.

The City is attempting to obtain the public right-of-way on the improved quarry road to provide access to the City's incinerator site which will be also located in the general vicinity.

The Department of Parks and Recreation is scheduled to prepare development plans for Kawainui Regional Park (a total of approximately 1,020 acres) in 1970-71.

Based upon the foregoing, the analysis by the Planning Department indicates 1) the amendment constitutes a rather minimal increase of industrial use, 2) the establishment of an industrial plant with this increase is economically desirable close to the source of raw materials (the quarry rock), 3) the location is within the mountains and should not be objectionable from the standpoint of "view", 4) the applicant would plant trees if the site can be seen from the H-3 Highway or portions of Kailua, 5) it is also necessary to designate the location of the City incinerator site on the Detailed Land Use Map, 6) to designate boundaries of the Kawainui Regional Park for which the City and County is presently seeking Federal funds, and 7) the quarry road

should also be designated as a public roadway since it will be the major access to the City incinerator site.

Based upon the analysis and aforementioned reasons, the Director recommended that the Kailua Detailed Land Use Map be changed as follows:

To amend the land use designation of 2.47 acres from Agricultural and Public Facility to Industrial;

To amend the land use designation of an area of approximately 72 acres from Industrial and Open Space to Public Facility;

To amend the land use designation of an open area of approximately 1,020 acres from Agricultural and Open Space to Park;

To designate the alignment of the quarry road.

No protests were reported to have been received in writing. However, this statement was corrected by Mr. Russell in his testimony.

The Commissioners questioned the Director as to locations of various sites and proposed sites, contemplated facilities at this site such as pre-stressed concrete products, noise, dust, traffic pattern for large trucks, the planting of trees, etc., and were shown slides of aerial views of the property indicating present quarrying operations and location of the proposed plant.

After seeing the slides, the Commission realized that the new facility will be quite visible from the H-3 Highway when it is built and that there will be traffic problems coming out of the area of the new facility on to the Pali Highway with major, slow-moving vehicles and in a relatively hilly terrain.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY AGAINST THE PROPOSAL:

(1) Mr. J. P. Russell, Attorney at Law, representing property owners in the vicinity namely, Messrs. Henry H. Wong and Henry L.L. Wong who own substantial property in the area, and the Executors and Trustees of the Castle Estate.

Mr. Russell first corrected the statement by the Director that no protests had been filed as he

had delivered a Letter of Protest dated August 4, 1969, to the Director's secretary at 8:30 A.M. on August 5, 1969. As requested by Chairman Chun, Mr. Russell read the letter to the Commission. (See File PA#25 AMEND TO GP (H.C.&D.)

The only objection to the proposal, which Mr. Russell had, involved the 1,018 acres in Item 3 which he illustrated on the plan. He saw no need to: expand the present 750-acre park into privately-owned areas which are now being used to run livestock; obviously might be developed as residential; no appropriations have been made to acquire the land for park use; the value is downgraded as soon as it is designated for park use; and prospective buyers or lessees would comtemplate filing law suits. "A protest against exactly the same proposal was filed on November 15, 1966 and given up. Now it is being revised," said Mr. Russell.

Mr. Russell further stated that it is a serious thing to property owners to have planners put a blight on their property by saying, long before they have any idea of condemning, "This is set aside for park purposes -- don't touch". And that is exactly what they are asking, "Would you freeze the land for department use, so that some day we can acquire it." Mr. Russell felt this was a rank injustice and that if this were going to be seriously considered, they would like an opportunity for further hearing to present the full facts.

Mr. Ingleson requested that Mr. Russell present to the Commission within a week the development plans which his client has for this area. Mr. Russell agreed to do this.

(2) Mr. Robert Muller, President of H.C.&D., the applicant, testified against Item 3 of the proposal. They would like to see the 1,018 acres left out of the park designation because, as operators of the quarry, they are using it as a sanitary fill area at the present time. They have asked Capital Interests to reserve the area for overburden until it makes a usable area which would take about 15 years. Previously, the overburden from the old plant went out into the swamp but after the City took it over they couldn't do this any more and they need a place to put overburden.

TESTIMONY IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL:

(1) Mr. Robert Muller, President of H.C.&D., the applicant, felt that his original application had been augmented until he didn't recognize it. He, therefore, went up to the map and explained how the little incremental acreages came about.

For the benefit of the Commission, Mr. Muller also explained:

The H-3 Highway alignment.
Their new operation along the swamp.
The taking of their valley area which could have been used for overburden.
The access given to them to get across the highway.
An underpass which substituted for an on-and-off ramp for the H-3.
Condemnation for incinerator site.
City left area for concrete products but took the rest of it including crushing plant site.
Operating under "Grandfather" rights until 1972.
Ready-mix operations and quarry operations.
Pre-stress work on H-3 alignment-Koolau Range.
The incomplete new rock plant.

The major part of the site is designated Industrial now under the Detailed Land Use Map. The little incremental acreages came as a result of tearing up the land.

Mr. Muller assured the Commission that there will be no problems with dust or noise or an ugly view.

(2) Mr. Delos Seeley from the Department of Parks and Recreation testified in favor of the proposal. Mr. Seeley immediately cleared the question of the site proposed for expansion of the 750-acre park, which is desired by H.C.&D. for deposit of their materials. He said this would present no problem because the 1,000-acre park development plan extends over 10 to 20 years so that it could wait the 15 years required for overburden.

In answer to Mr. Muller's question regarding financing, Mr. Seeley stated that they were filing, this morning, a letter transmitting a brochure which was prepared in 1967-1968 for the park project, which is a major one -- probably the most significant one of this generation as far as the public park system of this City and County is concerned. It was developed as part of their long-range program for the entire island and is

programmed in their Capital Improvement program for the next several years.

Mr. Seeley had a question for the Commission: "Does the applicant have a conversion plan for this property after the quarrying has been completed and the industrial use has been terminated?"

Then he went on to say that of the 1,000-acre park site, 750 acres were acquired for flood control of which 600 acres must be reserved for flood control purposes. They are combining this with park potential -- a unique opportunity, a one-in-a-lifetime type of park proposal -- and they really need the backup area that is being requested.

Mr. Seeley made the statement that they had planned to allow H.C.&D. the opportunity of continuation of use of this property in any way they see fit for quite some time and were willing to agree to an understanding, agreement, or contract between the Park Department and H.C.&D. allowing the operation. Their only request, at this time, is that the total concept of the park be recognized.

The Commission asked Mr. Muller if he thought the type of arrangement mentioned by Mr. Seeley would be satisfactory to H.C.&D.'s operation.

Mr. Muller said it would be but that they would want it in writing.

Mrs. Sullam asked Mr. Muller how long into the future the quarrying operations were to last, and he stated that there is enough rock there to last 100 years.

Mr. Muller was asked by the Commission if it would jeopardize their development area if the decision were delayed in any way. He said it would because he didn't realize when he applied for zoning that the Detailed Land Use Map would also have to be changed and they will have to wait another 3 months before they get the zoning. However, if Item 3 only were deferred, it would not bother them.

Upon motion by Mrs. Sullam, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission closed the public hearing on Items 1, 2 and 4 and were taking the matters under advisement. On Item 3, the public hearing was kept open and deferred action.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mrs. Sullam, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission decided to keep the public hearing open on all items until such time as the staff comes up with certain answers.

PUBLIC HEARING
(PA#29) PORTION
GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMEND.)
WAIANAE TO SCHOOL
NANAKULI VALLEY
(DAGS FOR DOE)

A public hearing was held under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan in Waianae to redesignate land from residential and agricultural to school facilities for an area comprising 76.5 acres situated in Nanakuli Valley at the terminus of Nanakuli Avenue and covered by Tax Map Key: 8-9-07: Portion of 2, 3, 4, and 5. The proposal is for a new kindergarten-through-twelfth grade school complex. The applicant is the Department of Accounting and General Services for the State Department of Education.

Public notice was given in the Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser of July 27, 1969 and copies of the notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, fifteen property owners, and interested civic and community organizations.

No protests had been received in writing.

Mr. Leonard Moffitt, staff member of the Planning Department, reviewed for the Commission the significant features of this proposal:

"The proposed school complex is in the upper Nanakuli Valley on Hawaiian Homes land. There is one correction in the information you have at hand that we must clarify now. We have people from the Department of Education and the Department of Accounting and General Services who can answer further detail questions, but the one clarification is that the two areas of the one site together total 100 acres, not the 76 listed which was for a portion of it."

The proposal they have made is for both the elementary and intermediate high school complex. This perhaps is a departure from previous school planning proposals that you have had to deal with in that the concept is to have the complete integrated school system from kindergarten, or pre-school actually, through twelfth grade all in one site and probably under one administrative head -- one Principal -- for the whole complex.

This is a replacement, in effect, of previously proposed area for intermediate and high school in the Detailed Land Use Map as it stands now. There is an area of slightly over 30 acres which is considered insufficient for a complete school system as the Department of Education and the Department of Accounting and General Services now plan it. Also, there is the question of where the future highway alignment might go which might cut through and further decrease the amount that has been proposed on the Detailed Land Use Map now. The proposal is to put it up in an area which is now vacant, has lots of space, the opportunities for development give them greater flexibility in coming up with a very first-class, very progressive, form of site plan. The precise boundaries have yet to be firmed up.

Mr. Moffitt then oriented the Commission as to the locations on the map of all involved areas: The old school site, the new school complex, the vacant Camp Andrews, residential-planned areas, etc.

A study will have to be made for a plan to serve the traffic needs which will be generated by the new school site.

The proposal for the school does not include a public playground area.

TESTIMONY IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL:

(1) Mr. Teuane Tominaga of the Department of Accounting and General Services testified in favor of the proposal:

"We are pushing for a September 1970 opening of the school -- the first increment of the high school -- and we would appreciate your expeditious action on this. We understand that the change in Detailed Land Use Map must be approved before we will be allowed a Building Permit and, therefore, urge that you take favorable expeditious action on this matter."

Questioned by the Commission, Mr. Tominaga explained:

1. This is a 15-year development proposal.

2. The first of 7 buildings (a 20-classroom building).

3. There is a proposed Plot Plan.

4. The first increment completion date late 1970, the balance by 1971.

5. There are no plans for the makai area (elementary school) but there are final drawings and have already advertised for bid.

6. Will continue to build at the school to accommodate the rest of the students now located at Nanaikapono and Waianae High.

TESTIMONY IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL:

(2) Mr. Domingo Los Banos, District Superintendent of the Leeward Area:

Mr. Los Banos reiterated Mr. Tominaga's request for expeditious handling of the change in land use, and answered questions by the Commission:

1. They have worked closely with the PTA, Executive Board of Nanakuli High and have made many presentations to the general public.

2. For many years, the Department of Education has been concerned about the educational problems in this area.

3. The needs have been recognized through the Act of Legislation - #299.

4. Nanaikapono School, housing 2,200 youngsters, has been designated as the Model School.

5. The new site would:

   a. Alleviate problems of education, alienation, etc.
   b. Move 2,200 youngsters away from the highways.
   c. Bring the community and school closer together.

6. The question of a park adjacent to the school site:

   a. Camp Andrews available and considered 5 years ago.

      (1) Other agencies stepped in.
      (2) It would not provide for elementary.
      (3) Within hazardous area for tidal waves.

b. No attempt was made to get together with the City and County of park area adjacent to school.
c. Since there was a lack of park area, it was felt they should obtain enough land to provide play areas open to the public.

7. Boundaries for the new cluster:

Kahe to Maili
(Makakilo attending Campbell now - will have own later.
Maili attending Waianae now
Part of Lualualei Valley attending Nanakuli
Nanakuli and Nanaikapono to be phased out.)

8. Also plan joint public and school library.

9. Discussion re traffic, parking and turnaround area. It was decided that if additional areas for parking abutting the subject parcel were found necessary, it would be an entirely new matter, calling for a new public hearing.

Upon motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the public hearing was closed and the matter taken under advisement.

Mr. Yamabe informed Mr. Tominaga that he personally would like to see a closer working relationship with the development of schools so that all amenities that come with school development might be considered. For example, the policy adopted that the Commission would try to set aside parking in conjunction with the schools for various reasons -- economic, aesthetic, functions, etc.

ACTION: Mr. Yamabe moved, Mr. Ingleson seconded, and the Commission approved amending a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Waianae by changing the land use designation from Residential and Agricultural to School and at the same time initiate the planning and designation of park areas adjacent and abutting this piece of property.

GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMEND)
PORTION MAUNALUA
CHANGE DESIGNATION
COMMERCIAL
(Kaiser Hawaii-Kai
Development Company)

A public hearing was held on June 26, 1969 and closed after considering a proposal to construct a branch clinic of The Kaiser Medical Clinic at Maunalua - mauka-Koko Head corner of Kalanianaole Highway and Lunalilo Home Road designated as Tax Map Key 3-9-40: 40 and involving

2.77 acres of land. The Commission, at that time, deferred action for further study.

ACTION: Today, the Director reported that the applicant has requested an additional two-week deferral to bring in the information requested for further studies in connection with alternative site location.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT: (69/CUP-10) (PACIFIC CONCRETE & ROCK COMPANY, LTD.)

The applicant has operated a quarry for over three years in this area on a land license from the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands. The Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance for a five-year period to expire in 1970. Under a new State law, the applicant was able to have its license extended 20 years effective July 1, 1968.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission authorized the Director to initiate a public hearing to consider the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit as set forth under Section 21-401 of the Comprehensive Zoning Code to allow the operation of a quarry and rock crushing, and batching plant at Waimanalo covering an area of 33.34 acres and designated as Tax Map Key 4-1-08: 3.

ZONING B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT - LAIE NEAR THE POLYNESIAN CULTURAL CENTER (Zions Securities Corporation)

A public hearing was held on July 17, 1969 and closed after considering a proposal to change the zoning from R-6 Residential District to B-2 Community Business District for a strip of land totalling 0.85 acres, located along the rear boundaries of an existing business lot on Kamehameha Highway and the residential lots off Iosepa Street near the Polynesian Cultural Center in Laie identified by Tax Map Key 5-5-14: Portions of Parcels 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32 and 34. At that time, the Commission deferred action for further information.

ACTION: The Director advised the Commission that the matter was still under study.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM:

Bill No. 105, CIP Supplementary No. 1.

The Director oriented the Commission with the following background:

This is a request in connection with the Capital Improvements Supplementary. At yesterday's meeting, the City Council passed on second reading a Bill

No. 105, Supplementary No. 1 which would amend the Capital Budget Program by appropriating $1,046,000 for Park and for four public works projects. Three of the projects were scheduled for last fiscal year but the lowest bid for each exceeded available funds. It was agreed by the Administration and the Council that the 1968-69 fiscal appropriations would be lapsed and that additional funds would be made available in the first supplementary to the 1969-70 Capital Budget in order to award the contract.

The Director briefly reviewed the extent of overages on some of the construction items.

The projects are:		Short of Funds
$735,000 --	1. The Ewa Branch Trunk Sewer for which $735,00 would be appropriated in Bill No. 105. The low bid on this was $1.15 million and City funds came up $35,000 short of the required amount to award the construction contract -- a very small percentage above the total estimated cost.	$35,000.00
$130,000 --	2. Kaimuki Avenue Relief Drain The low bid received on that was $122,000 which was $27,191 more than the $95,000 available for construction of the project.	$27,191.00
$ 73,000 --	3. Numana Road Bridge (over Kalihi Stream) The original estimate on this was $32,000. The excess of $36,663 over this amount based upon the low bid. The amount of $73,000 will provide the funds required to award the contract to the low bidder and to also provide inspection funds in the amount of $4,300. The Public Works Committee of City Council recommended approval of that request. This is an overage on the estimated construction cost of something over 100%.	$41,000.00

$ 38,000 --	4.	Restoration of parks of Koko Crater site formerly used by the Air National Guard. The sum of $38,000 (the amount given to the City by the Federal Government as part of its settlement of the license agreement for use of the Koko Crater site) has been requested for the Parks Department to remove any unsafe materials left on the site and to restore the area to its original condition.	----------
$ 70,000 --	5.	Construction of a bridge on Waipahu Street over the Kahoo drainage channel. An appropriation of $70,000 has been requested for the City to enter into a one-third joint venture with private developers to construct the Waipahu Street Bridge.	----------

Essentially, the problems for the three specific bid items are those having to do with overages on the bids received for construction. The other two items are new projects.

The Director recommended the Commission's approval to the Capital Improvements Supplementary No. 1, in view of the prior approval of the Planning Commission of three of the projects contained in Bill No. 105 and the merits of the other two projects.

However, after a lengthy discussion, it was decided to defer this item until a representative of the Public Works Department, an Engineer, could be present to answer questions, particularly on the Numana Road Bridge over Kalihi Stream.

A representative of the Public Works Engineering Division appeared at the meeting and on the Commission's questions as to the bids coming in so high, he stated:

"On this particular job -- the Numana Road Bridge -- the assumption was that we were going to build just a very moderate facility to accommodate the temporary needs of traffic in that area until such time as a general street improvement could be provided for the entire Numana Road section. However, because of the rain and the flooding that occurred earlier this year, the bridge was

damaged to the extent that our department had to go in and, on full time, remove the planking and divert the traffic so that the bridge would not be used. After all the field data was completed, it was found that a more substantial facility was required and a new design for a new bridge plan, improvements to the bridge approaches, replacement of the original piers of the bridge span, and a separate 4 foot wide sidewalk for pedestrian travel was added.

The new estimate and bid compared very favorably. The low bids came out to $68,000 and our estimate was $70,000."

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission approved Bill No. 105, Capital Improvements Program Supplementary No. 1

DISCUSSION ON SIGN AMENDMENTS

There was a discussion on the City Council considering amendments to the Comprehensive Zoning Code relative to the sign portion.

It was mentioned by Mr. Ingleson that the Commission should entertain a resolution requesting that the City Council allow the Commission opportunity to review such revisions.

The status of the amendment was reviewed by the Director--several amendments were being discussed by the Public Works Committee.

Mr. Yamabe was then appointed by Chairman Mr. Chun as liaison between the Council and the Commission to arrange discussion on the proposed sign amendments.

INFORMATION COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION CONFERENCE

The Commission was apprised of the County Planning Commission Conference of which the Honolulu Commission and Honolulu Planning Department were hosts.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:46 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henrietta B. Lyman

Henrietta B. Lyman
Secretary-Reporter II

Special Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
August 14, 1969

The Planning Commission held a special meeting on Thursday, August 14, 1969, at 8:45 a.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Edward Brennan presiding:

PRESENT:

Edward Brennan, Chairman
Roy R. Bright
Philip T. Chun
Lewis Ingleson
Arthur A. Rutledge
Fredda Sullam
Thomas N. Yamabe II

James K. Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

George Moriguchi, Acting Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING H-1
RESORT-HOTEL
DISTRICT
KAHUKU
KUILIMA POINT
DEL E. WEBB
CORPORATION
(FILE #69/Z-43)

A public hearing was held to consider a change in zoning, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, from an existing R-6 Residential District to H-1 Resort-Hotel District for land containing approximately 43.5 acres located at Kuilima Point, Kahuku, and further identified as Tax Map Key 5-7-01: portion of Parcel 20.

The notice of public hearing was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of August 3, 1969. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to applicable governmental agencies and to interested parties.

No protests had been received in writing.

The applicant proposes a development of a resort complex of three structures containing 410 hotel rooms; 50 cabana units; and 40 cottages and related accessory uses.

The Acting Director oriented the Commission by reading the staff report and pointing out the subject location and related areas on the maps.

The staff's evaluation indicated that the request is reasonable, and it was recommended that the zoning change be granted because of the following reasons:

1. Conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map.

2. Availability and adequacy of utilities.

3. The request is only the first of several related increments proposed for a resort development which will encompass 930+ acres, development of which will project into 1989.

4. Since there are no major resort developments located on the North Shore and the area has a scenic coastline and fine climate, a development such as the one proposed can relieve some of the congestion in the Waikiki area.

Subject to the following conditions:

1. Compliance with Comprehensive Zoning Code requirements, including Article 13 relating to setback from zone of wave action, upon application for building permits.

2. Installation of water and sewer facilities according to City standards.

3. Compliance with Ordinance No. 3437 relating to the stipulation that the density be limited to a maximum of 20 dwelling units or lodging units per acre.

4. Provisions be made for public rights-of-way to beach and recreational areas.

The Commissioners had several questions of the Acting Director concerning the report, which resulted in the following clarifications:

1. The stipulation in Ordinance 3437 that there be 20 units per acre is a condition that the developers themselves included.

2. The General Plan and Detailed Land Use Map were changed from Agriculture to Resort and officially adopted by the City Council as Resort for the subject 43.5 acres. Today, the involvement is the rezoning from R-6 Residential to H-1 Resort-Hotel.

3. An outlet in Kahuku would give relief to Waikiki in the total pressure of tourists.

4. There are no plans to improve Kamehameha Highway until there is more activity in the area.

5. With the possibility of traffic circulating between Waikiki, the North Shore, and Makaha, inquiry will be made of the Traffic Department as to when they intend to widen Kamehameha Highway.

6. It was unofficially indicated that the H-1 Resort-Hotel District will allow more than 20 units as proposed by the developer.

7. Kahuku airstrip, the property of Campbell Estate, is not up to standards but with maintenance, it could be used as an airport.

8. The staff recommends that the provisions for public rights-of-way to the beach across the 43 acres be made -- the immediate area of concern.

9. The proposed Park Ordinance, introduced in the Council regarding dedication of land, was referred back to the Planning Department for additional research and will be before this Commission within the next two meetings.

10. The new Ordinance is not ready for the Council yet. However, since this matter is before the Commission, the staff recommends resolving the public rights-of-way to the beaches and recreational areas prior to the completion of the Ordinance to assure that some form of access to the beaches is resolved for this particular rezoning request.

11. There is nothing formal on the proposal made by Mr. Davis of the Campbell Estate that the City purchase some land for $1,200,000 which the Commission talked about possibly getting for free.

12. Actual identification of areas needed for parks should be resolved at this meeting since it may be months until an Ordinance is adopted, and the developer may agree to areas to be set aside as park or rights-of-way.

Testimony in favor of the proposal:

(1) Mr. Fred P. Kuentz, General Manager of the Del E. Webb Corporation, covered some salient points:

1. 20 units per acre is still what they will abide by.

2. All of the sewer, water drainage, etc., improvements will be provided at the developer's expense.

3. As written to the City Council, all recreational facilities and needs created by the development will be developed and maintained by their organization.

4. They are complying with the desired goal in dispersal of resort facilities from Waikiki.

5. They will be able to provide employment in an area which will have an immediate unemployment problem.

6. A substantial amount of time and money has been expended.

7. They have no intention of closing the road or any access to the beaches, whether it is legal or not, and even though the road initially will not be dedicated. It is a moral obligation.

8. They would rather stipulate that certain areas of the hotel were off-limits such as the swimming pools, etc.

9. They have no objection to setting aside rights-of-way within this 43-acre complex.

10. As stipulated in a letter, they would be agreeable to whatever ordinance is passed or whatever agreement the Commission might come to and this would be honored and adhered to even at a later date.

11. They propose that the Commission not worry about the parks at this point on the zoning of the 43 acres because as they come in for each of the other areas, the beach parks involved in the specific zoning areas requested would be considered at that time.

12. On the proposal of selling some of the land to the City, Mr. Kuentz pointed out the three park areas on the map:

L-1 =	31-1/4	acres --	$ 262,308.00
L-2 =	3	acres --	$ 142,703.00
L-3 =	34	acres --	$1,251,770.00
			$1,656,781.00 = $25,000 per acre

(Average apartment site is 25,000 square feet.)

13. As to shoreline setbacks, there is a Gentleman's Agreement of 150 feet but not a rigid 150 feet. Their agreement with the State Land Use Commission in changing this to urban provides for a sawtooth or zig-zag pattern -- the same effect as a setback area.

14. They have a lease on 883 acres from the Campbell Estate and an agreement to purchase some portion of it, not exceeding 50%, in fee.

Commissioner Sullam requested an outline of the program to train Kahuku plantation workers for hotel work. Mr. Kuentz referred the request to Mr. Dale Seiders who will be the Manager for the hotel:

(a) There is already an Adult Education Program in Kahuku for the training of waitresses.

(b) The Manpower & Training & Development Act provides for additional programs in cooperation with the hotel at any time.

(c) There is available in Honolulu a 21-month training program for cooks.

(d) There will be a large need for a groundskeeper-type employee which has a direct relationship with the plantation-type worker.

(e) The training of maids, housemen, etc. will be an easy transition for the present employees at the plantation.

Regarding "housing" of employees, Mr. Seiders felt potential employees could come from as far as Wahiawa; the whole northeastern corner of Oahu has some 36,000 residents already living there; roughly 14,000 are available for employment; they anticipate a need of only 500 employees for this one hotel site; they do not feel that there is going to be a great deal of housing necessary, but

they will provide it in one manner or another should it become necessary. As far as "housing" being one of the contingencies, Mr. Seiders advised that he was in no position to make such a statement but that he believed in the principle of it.

Commissioner Yamabe thought there should be a more specific date mentioned in the official communication to be fair to all:

> ".....for a period of two years from the date hereof and subject to notice from the City and County of its intention to exercise its rights of eminent domain with reference to such lands needed for public facilities....."

Mr. Kuentz could not give an accurate date; Mr. Davis thought it should be two years from the date of zoning; Chairman Brennan, from the time the City Council passes it; and Commissioner Sharpless, that the matter is a proposed contractual arrangement between Campbell Estate and the City, and the only one in the City who may take action is the City Council. This body (Planning Commission) may make a recommendation.

Commissioner Rutledge wanted it understood that while he was not opposing the rezoning or the request by Del Webb, he was interested in the possibility of the City and County acquiring land from the larger developers (or the owners of the land which the developers want to develop) and at this time thought the Estate should be willing to deed to the City a portion of this 1,000 acres.

Mr. Davis of Campbell Estate said that (1) The Trustees do not have the power. If they sought Court approval, it would take such a long time before that decision would be rendered that this project would be under the table; (2) The matter before the Commission today is merely the rezoning of the 43 acres in which there is no park site involved; and (3) He doubted that the Prudential Insurance Company would hold $20 million available for years on this project.

Chairman Brennan asked if the Trustees of the Campbell Estate might agree with a statement such as, "We think it is a good idea" and then depend upon the Court to sanction same, and Mr. Davis referred to their letter which states they will

abide by whatever legal ordinance is adopted and can give no more assurance than that.

Chairman Brennan then asked if he were correct in assuming that Campbell Estate was standing on their original proposal of $1,600,000, and Mr. Davis stated that acting on legal advice, they cannot go any further than they have gone as Trustees of the Estate.

Testimony in favor of the proposal:

(2) Mr. Allen Wilcox, Vice President of Alexander & Baldwin (majority owner of Kahuku Plantation Company), represented his company, but more accurately the employees of Kahuku Plantation. Alexander & Baldwin will be out of business by 1971 and although a number of their 200 employees will be retired by that time, a great number wish to remain in Kahuku and will be seeking employment. He felt the plantation employees could easily adapt to hotel work and that the Del Webb enterprise would most certainly help their employees.

Testimony in favor of the proposal:

(3) Mr. Eddie Tangen, representing the ILWU members and their families in the Kahuku area, endorsed Mr. Wilcox's statement regarding the concern for the plantation employees. He felt that the Campbell Estate and the Del Webb Company had both complied with present and even future requirements, and urged that this petition be acted upon favorably and immediately.

When asked by Commissioner Rutledge what the ILWU policy is toward the dedication of park lands to the City, Mr. Tangen said he would be very happy to give their position on that matter when it comes before the Commission.

Chairman Brennan interrupted the meeting:
"The Chair would like to say, as it relates to whether the question of dedicated park land belongs in this particular meeting or not, I would appreciate if the members who are testifying would keep in mind that when the Commission undertook the complete project, we were thinking in terms of environmental planning and the fact that Campbell Estate is coming in at this time for 43 acres, doesn't in reality knock out the possibilities of discussing park lands dedication."

Testimony in favor of the proposal:

(4) Mr. James K. Kama, President of the Hauula Community Association, stated that the association strongly recommends approval of the request for reasons of employment, economy, housing, traffic, and possibility of the use of the landing strip.

Testimony in favor of the proposal:

(5) Mr. Eileen Weberg represented the Sunset Beach Community Association. They endorse the development wholeheartedly for economic reasons but are concerned about the height of the hotel and the drainage problem which they had hoped would be taken care of in the hills in back of the development rather than in the streams.

Testimony in favor of the proposal:

(6) Rosamund K. Victorine spoke in behalf of the Hauula Community Action Program and read a letter addressed to the Planning Commissioners stating that on August 6, 1969, the Area Council moved and approved to recommend to the Planning Commission immediate approval for the zoning request of the hotel site for the Del Webb-Prudential Division Development.

Testimony in favor of the proposal:

(7) Mr. Robert Orr, an insurance agent in Kahuku, pleaded approval of the project which would mean a boost in the economy from Wahiawa to Kaaawa and that perhaps later on there may be a compromise on the park situation. The citizens were concerned that the approval of the project has taken so long.

Chairman Brennan asked Mr. Orr how he felt about the Campbell Estate dedicating a park site. His reply was that when he speculates he likes to make money and he thought there should be a little more consideration, financially, toward Campbell Estate,

Testimony in favor of the proposal:

(8) Mr. Lindberg S. H. Ching, President of the Kahuku Shopping Center, Ltd., dba Kahuku Super Market in Kahuku for the past seven years, was in favor of the request for a change in zoning and hoped the Commission would act favorably.

There was no further testimony in favor of the proposal and no testimony against the proposal.

On the motion by Commissioner Yamabe, seconded by Commissioner Rutledge, the Planning Commission closed the public hearing to take the matter under advisement.

ACTION: Commissioner Rutledge made a motion that the Commission approve the zoning request to H-1 Resort-Hotel District with the recommendation to the City Council that (1) they give consideration to asking the developer to supply sufficient housing for the employees, (2) they attempt to acquire at actual original acquisition cost to Campbell Estate, or by deeding without cost, the lands discussed today (the 63 acres or more depending upon the need), (3) they include within these 63 acres of park land some very specific rights-of-way to the Kuilima Point for easy access to the beach by all individuals, and (4) they obtain from the Planning Department, at that time, recommendations on accesses. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Yamabe and carried.

Note: The Commissioners agreed that although these 63 acres has nothing to do with the subject 43 acres, it should be incorporated in the motion.

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL
USE PERMIT
MAKIKI
MAKIKI AND
NEHOA STREETS
CONVALESCENT
HOME
THE CHINESE
CENTER
FILE #69/CUP-9

Prior to consideration of this application, Commissioner Ingleson declared a conflict of interest, filed the necessary papers, and left the room.

A public hearing was held to consider an application for a Conditional Use Permit, under Section 21-501(c)(5) of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, to construct and operate a convalescent home on two parcels of land containing a total area of 44,875 square feet, located at the mauka-Diamond Head corner of Makiki and Nehoa Streets in Makiki within an R-6 Residential District, and identified as Tax Map Key 2-5-01: Parcels 9 and 10.

The public hearing notice was published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of August 3, 1969. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community and civic organizations in the area, and to the applicant. Five written protests have been received to date.

The applicant proposes to construct a three-story structure containing 64 rooms for a total of 120 beds and the necessary service facilities area. Off-street parking will be provided at the rear of the property and on an adjoining parcel.

Mr. George Moriguchi, Acting Director, oriented the Commission as to the location of the subject area and read the five-page staff report of July 17, 1969, recommending approval subject to twelve conditions listed in the report.

The Commissioners questioned the Acting Director as to access, height regulations, traffic on Makiki and Nehoa Streets, and off-street parking.

Testimony in favor of the proposal:

(1) The Reverend Dr. Theodore T. Y. Yeh, Executive Director of the Chinese Center and a Minister of the Episcopal Church testified:

He operated a 125-bed convalescent hospital in Hayward, California for several years.

His wife is a registered nurse.

They were residents of California from 1956 to 1969. They were residents of Honolulu from 1950 to 1956.

There is a critical need for nursing homes in Honolulu.

The project will be financed by FHA and the Episcopal Church at a cost of approximately $1 million.

There will be mainly inpatients and very few physical therapy outpatients. It is a profit-making venture.

They plan to emphasize on rehabilitation supervised by a Physical Therapist; recreation supervised by a Social Director in the games of Chinese Checkers and Mah Jong; and restoration so that they may be discharged for home. Other services are religion, a barber shop, shopping tours and walking outdoors.

These objectives have been approved by the Department of Health in Honolulu.

Off-street parking will be necessary for only 15 cars of employees and very few spaces for visitors.

The building will be beautiful with adequate landscaping.

When it is necessary to bring patients in by ambulance, there will be no sirens as they are not emergency cases.

The project will create employment.

Testimony in favor of the proposal:

(2) A young woman spoke at length in favor of the proposal. However, she did not come forward and her testimony was not heard from the back of the room.

Testimony against the proposal:

Five letters of objection had been received by mail:

(1) Mr. Richard W. L. Lau
1930-B Ualakaa Street
Honolulu 96822

(2) Mr. and Mrs. Bond S. P. Lau
1526 Nehoa Street
Honolulu 96822

(3) Mrs. Eva Frandsen)
) Joint Tenants
(4) Miss Sophie M. Frandsen) 1921 Makiki Street
) Honolulu 96822
(5) Mr. Earl F. Frandsen)

Testimony against the proposal:

(1) Mr. Peter H. Searl, attorney, of 157 Kalalau Street, represented the Hanahauoli School which opposed the granting of this conditional use permit for reasons of:

Traffic problems.
Exceeding the height limitation.
Lack of aesthetic qualities.
Dividing line between multi-family and single family structures.

Mr. Searl urged that Nehoa Street be held as the dividing line and that the petition for the conditional use <u>not</u> be granted.

The Commission requested Mr. Searl to provide statistical information, which he later did:

Students -- approximately	185
Staff ----------	18
Parking facilities ------	11 for staff
	5 for visitors

Testimony against the proposal:

(2) Mr. Wilfred H. Humphries of 1923 Makiki Street opposed the request for reasons of:

Drainage canal and fence prohibits walking.
Traffic problems.(morning and late afternoon)
Parking problems.
Aesthetic standpoint.
Changing the character of the neighborhood from a quiet area where you can hear the birds to a commercial development with noise of service trucks, etc. and the pressure of larger properties to be developed into condominiums.

Mr. Humphries requested that the Commission give very serious consideration before any approval is granted.

Testimony against the proposal:

(3) Miss Gertrude A. Humphries of 1923 Makiki Street, sister of Mr. Wilfred H. Humphries, spoke against the proposal:

Their property, mauka of the proposed development, was owned by their recently deceased mother. It is now theirs with an Aunt who has a life interest in the property.

There will be a wall 70 feet wide and 27-1/2 feet high, twenty-three feet within their boundary with eight bedrooms across the width, two levels of bedrooms and parking underneath.

Noise and cutting-off of the breeze.
Parking will not be underground.
Landscaping and shrubbery.
No outdoor garden for the convalescents.
Primarily a residential district, is now proposed for a profit-making institution.
Creeping-up of more institutions.
Taxes.
Patients will have to get out on the street to reach the nearest park and cross Nehoa or Makiki.
The Makiki Stream runs through the property.

Testimony against the proposal:

(4) Mr. Norman Len of 1911 Makiki Street, represented his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence T. S. Len, who wrote a letter dated August 9, 1969, with nine points of objection. He also stated that you can not turn into Nehoa from there.

Commissioner Chun moved that the public hearing be closed and the matter taken under advisement. Commissioner Rutledge seconded the motion and it was carried.

ACTION: Commissioner Chun moved for a deferral of two weeks on the application for a Conditional Use Permit. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Rutledge and carried.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
KAIPAPAU
PLANNING AREA
NO. 26
MEDIUM-DENSITY
APARTMENT
JONATHAN MANOR,
INC.
BY: DONALD K. IWAI
(PROPOSAL NO. 1)

On July 31, 1969, the Commission authorized a public hearing to consider a request to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map by changing the land use designation from Residential and Commercial to Medium-Density Apartment. The parcel is presently zoned B-2 Community Business (2.0 acres) and R-6 Residential District (0.7 acre), Tax Map Keys 5-4-04: 22 and 5-4-19: 53.

The Acting Director informed the Commission that the applicant had verbally withdrawn their request. A letter is forthcoming from Mr. Donald K. Iwai, Attorney-At-Law, representing the client, Jonathan Manor, Incorporated.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
KAHUKU
PLANNING AREA
NO. 26
COMMERCIAL
KAHUKU SHOPPING
CENTER, LIMITED;
NICHOLAS RODRIGUES
PAO AND MABEL
GOMES PAO
BY: HIROSHI SAKAI
(PROPOSAL NO. 2)

A public hearing was held to consider a request to amend portions of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Laie-Kaaawa District, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, by changing the land use classification from Residential to Commercial on a vacant parcel of land situated north of Kawaipuna Street and southeast of Hauula Shopping Center, involving an area of 2.4 acres, and further identified as Tax Map Key 5-4-18: Parcel 59.

The notice of public hearing was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of August 3, 1969. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to interested parties, and to adjoining property owners. No written protests had been received to date.

It is proposed to establish food facilities for tourists and residents as well as other unnamed business activities.

Mr. George Moriguchi, Acting Director, oriented the Commission as to the location of the subject property and read the staff report of July 18, 1969, which recommended approval of the request.

There were no questions.

Testimony in favor of the proposal:

Mr. Hiroshi Sakai, attorney for the Kahuku Shopping Center, Limited, testified:

1. There is a definite need for a restaurant and other facilities in this area because:

   (a) Increase in population.

   (b) Tourism on the increase.

2. The food and additional facilities would be compatible with the present uses in the Shopping Center immediately adjacent to it.

3. Enough land for adequate parking facilities.

4. It is the intent to conform with the necessary requirements of the Building and Zoning Codes in the construction of the facilities.

Testimony in favor of the proposal:

Mr. James Kekama, resident of Hauula and President of the Hauula Community Association testified:

Aside from the Chop Suey House and a few Drive-Ins, there are only three restaurants (Crouching Lion, Pat's at Punaluu, and Laniloa Inn) and all are tourist-type restaurants and are too expensive for the residents. There is a definite need for a family-type restaurant.

There was no further testimony either for or against the proposal.

Upon the motion by Commissioner Rutledge, seconded by Commissioner Ingleson, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

<u>ACTION</u>: Upon the motion by Commissioner Chun, seconded by Commissioner Rutledge, the Commission deferred action for two weeks and requested that the following information be made available:

1. The Chairman expressed displeasure with the existing Hauula Shopping Center development and asked that the staff review the need for additional commercial designation in the area.

2. The Chairman also wished to know if there are any other areas presently zoned commercial that can be used for this purpose.

3. The Commission wishes to know if the property owners are going to develop the property themselves or solicit others to do the development.

4. The Commission wishes to know the specific details of the type of development proposed to be built since no plans or sketches have been presented and no architect has been engaged.

5. The Commission wishes to know the disposition of Proposal No. 1 before acting on Proposal No. 2.

6. The Commission wishes to know if the rezoning request has been made for speculation purposes or if they are prepared to move on it now.

7. The Acting Director wishes to have a clear idea of the existing commercial zoning in the immediate neighborhood and how it relates to the commercial DLUM designations.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
WAHIAWA
ALAWAINI WAY
PARK USE
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS
AND RECREATION
PLANNING AREA
NO. 35

A public hearing was held to consider, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Wahiawa by amending Alawaini Way (measuring approximately 5,250 square feet between Holua Way and Hoe Way) to Park use as part of the adjoining Alahula Park (6,783 square feet), further identified as Tax Map Key 7-5-12.

The public hearing notice was published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of August 3, 1969. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community and civic organizations in the area, to

interested individuals, and to adjoining property owners. No written protests had been received.

Mr. George Moriguchi, Acting Director, oriented the Commission as to the location of the subject parcel on the maps and read the staff report of July 11, 1969, in which approval of the request to designate Alawaini Way as part of Alahula Park on the Detailed Land Use Map was recommended.

Alawaini Way is considered a "paper" street and is not needed for purposes of providing access to the adjoining lots or for circulation in the immediate area. The street services no one -- it is actually grass.

Testimony in favor of the proposal:

Mr. Ted R. Green of the Department of Parks and Recreation testified:

In 1954, this parcel was turned over to the Department of Parks and Recreation by the Department of Public Works and it has been in use since that time as part of the park. It was not a gift. It was already City property by terms of the street. The responsibility of it passed from Public Works to Parks and Recreation. Mr. Green asked that the Commission look with favor upon this proposal.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Commissioner Rutledge, seconded by Commissioner Chun, the Commission accepted the proposal to amend Alawaini Way to Park use.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
WAHIAWA
PLANNING AREA
NO. 35
FAI TOM

PROPOSAL NO. 1
MEDIUM-DENSITY
APARTMENT

PROPOSAL NO. 2
PEDESTRIAN
PUBLIC EASEMENT

A public hearing was held to consider, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, a request to (1) amend the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Wahiawa by changing the land use designation of an area consisting of 2.265 acres, situated between Wilikina Drive and Wahiawa Reservoir at Kunia Road, Tax Map Key 7-3-09: Parcels 1-13, from Commercial to Medium-Density Apartment, and (2) initiate a recommendation to designate a 10-foot wide pedestrian public easement through parcels of Tax Map Key 7-3-09: Parcels 3-13, on the Wahiawa Detailed Land Use Map.

The notice of public hearing was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of August 3, 1969.

Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to interested parties, and to adjoining property owners. No written protests had been received to date.

The Acting Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the subject property via the maps, and read the staff report of July 23, 1969, which recommended approval of the request and initiated a recommendation for a 10-foot wide pedestrian public easement.

Questions of the Acting Director were answered thusly:

Proposal No. 1:

The present use is commercial. It is a vacant area with a large Masonic Temple (Private Club) building on one end of it.

The Masonic Temple is a nonconforming structure.

The apartment shoreline was pointed out on the map.

Testimony in favor of Proposal No. 1:

Senator John C. Lanham, attorney, had a Mrs. Palm present to answer questions but the Commissioners asked questions of him, to which he replied:

There is always a need for housing in Wahiawa.

You receive approximately 50 telephone calls each time you advertise a house or apartment for rent. When the 25th Division returns, there will be an even greater need. (Someone from the audience volunteered that a two-bedroom furnished home rents for around $175 per month).

The request merely rezones the land for what it was master planned.

There will be hearings before the next session regarding dedication of land (free) to the City and County for parks and schools before subdividing.

Testimony in favor of Proposal No. 2:

Mr. Delos Seeley of the Department of Parks and Recreation testified:

"The 10-foot wide pedestrian public easement would lead down to the reservoir. Although this reservoir is not part of the City and County Public Park System, there is a trend to make more recreational

use of our inland bodies of water and it is only a matter of time before this reservoir does take on public recreational overtones and use, and an easement of this nature providing access to it will become necessary. I would hope that the granting would be on a dedication basis."

Discussion:

Proposal No. 2 has no relationship to Proposal No. 1.

The land owner would like to have a 10-foot right-of-way down at the end rather than in the middle of the property.

It is the intent of the owner to deed the easement to the City and County of Honolulu with all rights and privileges except to sell. The owner will pay the taxes although it will be for public use.

There was no further testimony either for or against the proposals.

The Commission closed the public hearing and the matter was taken under advisement on the motion by Commissioner Chun, seconded by Commissioner Bright.

ACTION: Commissioner Chun made a motion that the Commission recommend approval of the applicant's request to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map from Commercial to Medium Density Apartment use, with the further recommendation that the Council be made aware of the fact that a 10-foot wide pedestrian public easement will be granted by the owner (Fai Tom) through Parcels 3 - 13. Commissioner Ingleson seconded the motion. Motion carried.

ZONING A-3
APARTMENT
DISTRICT
MAUNALUA
HAHAIONE VALLEY
KAISER HAWAII-KAI
DEVELOPMENT CO.
(FILE #69/Z-11)

Before proceeding with the meeting, Commissioner Sullam disqualified herself from any participation in the deliberations because of a conflict of interest, and left the room.

On July 31, 1969, a public hearing was held and closed and action deferred for a period of two weeks in order to:

1. Give the staff time to prepare reports of chronological order of events.

2. Read letters from the Department of Education and others.

3. Study the developments of Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company plan leading up to the adoption of the zoning for the area.

4. Read and study the new information received at the meeting of July 31, 1969.

The requested information, starting with April 1959, was received. However, the staff did not make contact with the Department of Education.

Mr. George Moriguchi, Acting Director, reported:

The planning staff actually made some traffic counts in the area during the peak morning hours and peak afternoon hours. They feel that there might be some difficulty in people getting out of Hahaione Valley on to Kalanianaole Highway in the event that the 1,200 units are built.

The State Highways Department has indicated that there is a program under the State Capital Improvement Program to improve the section from May Way to Hawaii Kai. This does affect the original recommendation of the Planning Department staff because they know the improvements will be under way now.

Mr. Wilfred "Buddy" Soares, Representative of the 17th District, Chairman of Hahaione Home Owners Citizens' Committee, and a resident of Hawaii Kai, was asked by Chairman Brennan if he were familiar with four letters in favor of the proposal received on March 8, 1966, one of which the Chairman read, from:

(1) Mr. H. B. Peterlit, President
Hawaii-Kai Community Association

"Gentlemen:

The Board of Directors of this organization has examined the amendments to the Detailed Land Use Map requested by the Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company. Our association is comprised of the residents of approximately 500 homes in the Marina-Hahaione Valley areas of Hawaii-Kai. It is our opinion that the amendments will not only benefit the residents of Hawaii-Kai but also the residents of the entire city. Therefore, we would like to go on record as endorsing the amendments requested by the Kaiser Hawai-Kai Development Company, as well as the action taken by the Planning Commission of the City and County of Honolulu, on

February 10, 1966. We earnestly recommend that your honorable body approve the amendments as requested by Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company."

(2) Maunalua Triangle Community Association.

(3) Koko Head Tourist Community Association.

(4) Koko Head Flower Growers Association.

Mr. Soares had not seen the letters but suggested that the Commission not place too much credence in these letters in favor of the proposal inasmuch as many of those people are not living in the area any longer and there are now three times as many residents than there were in 1966.

ACTION: The Commission recommended, upon the motion by Commissioner Rutledge, that the rezoning request to A-3 Apartment District be granted, and that the City Council insist on better communication between developers and potential buyers regarding future plans for development. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ingleson and carried.

Discussion:

Chairman Brennan suggested that since it is virtually impossible at the present time for the citizens to obtain a copy of the Detailed Land Use Map for review and study (except at the Planning Department), perhaps in the future they may be provided by the City at no cost to the citizens.

Commissioner Yamabe suggested that the Council be further requested to look into the matter of adequate or inadequate school facilities. Testimony led to the belief that it may be inadequate, and if it is, the Council should obtain a more specific answer from the Department of Education since the developer did indicate that if there were a shortage of facilities they would accommodate the need.

The Acting Director offered the information that the present status of the General Plan needs study. Five years have elapsed since the adoption of the Detailed Land Use Map and the General Plan. Director Way has specifically asked for, and received from the City Council in the new operating

budget, additional funds to enable them to upgrade and update the information and data upon which the General Plan can be based.

At this moment of the meeting, a communication was received from the Executive Office of the Land Use Commission. They have received requests for changes (in their present review of boundaries) which have not gone through the regular procedures. Therefore, an opinion was needed from this Planning Commission as to how they should view these requests at their meeting tonight when considering boundaries for Oahu.

The Acting Director suggested that since this request from the Land Use Commission is not for a specific change, there is insufficient time, and there is no backup material for review, the Planning Commission should recommend to the Land Use Commission that they process any applications that come before them now through the normal procedures, instead of under the general blanket five-year review change basis. The Commissioners agreed to send this message back to the Land Use Commission. (No motion necessary).

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) KAILUA PLANNING AREA NO. 24 SINGLE-FAMILY

The Planning Director initiated the request for a public hearing to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Kailua to include single-family residential use as well as military use on a portion of land located on the makai end of the Kawainui Drainage Canal.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Commissioner Chun, seconded by Commissioner Sullam, the Commission authorized a public hearing.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henrietta B. Lyman

Henrietta B. Lyman
Secretary-Reporter II

Special Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
August 21, 1969

The Planning Commission held a special meeting on Thursday, August 21, 1969, at 1:40 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Edward Brennan presiding:

PRESENT:

Edward Brennan, Chairman
Roy R. Bright
Philip T. Chun
Lewis Ingleson
Arthur A. Rutledge
Mrs. Fredda Sullam
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Daniel Moon, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

James K. Sakai, ex-officio

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING A-3
APARTMENT DISTRICT
MAKAHA
NORTHEAST OF MAKAHA
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
MAKAHA VALLEY, INC.

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a request for a change in zoning from R-6 Residential District to A-3 Apartment District for an area containing 13.746 acres of land situated 3,000 feet northeast of Makaha Elementary School in Makaha Valley in Waianae, and further identified as Tax Map Key 8-4-2: portion of Parcel 5.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of August 10, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, to interested civic and community organizations, Waianae Model Cities Agency, and to two property owners. No letters of protest have been received to date.

The Director reviewed the staff report. Displayed on the wall were the Detailed Land Use Map for Makaha, applicant's site plan, development plan, and the elevation plan.

The Director reported the following information:

1. The applicant proposes to construct interconnected, multi-story structures to consist of 587 units with 733 parking spaces.

2. The buildings are proposed to be constructed along the ridge adjoining the bluff area, with a maximum height of 16 stories. He believed that this development will enhance the esthetic appearance of Makaha Valley.

3. The access will be constructed to City and County standards and will be an incremental roadway development.

4. Regarding the topography of the area, there is a low point of approximately 330 feet to approximately 355 feet on the mauka side.

5. The Comprehensive Zoning Code provides that cluster developments must be designed in a manner which will permit subdivision in the future. In this case, since a single parcel is involved, it could be developed as separate structures or developed at one time. This is at the developer's option.

6. Since more information was needed relating to the parking lot, the plan originally submitted has been modified to show a slight change in the structure.

7. No indication of commercial uses are shown on the plan, although some commercial accessory uses are permitted in an A-3 Apartment District.

8. No discussion was held in dedicating any portion of the 13 acres.

Mr. Dean Ho represented the petitioner Capital Investment of Hawaii, Inc., and the development firm, Makaha Valley, Inc. He distributed a recent publication of their master plan which is intended as a sales brochure, primarily for developers and other interested parties.

Responding to questions from the Commission, he presented the following information:

1. With respect to roadways within this development, plans to construct four traffic lanes have been submitted to the Traffic Department for approval. Two lanes will serve the Condominium I Project presently under construction. The completion of the other two lanes will coincide with the completion of the second condominium project. These roads shall be constructed to City and County standards and

will be open to the public. It is intended to dedicate major arteries to the City and County; however, no decision has been made on whether or not to dedicate the road leading to the area known as Center Village, which is located in the middle of the golf course.

2. Presently, the extent of the commercial facilities provide for an administrative office area, and an office area to provide a rental agency service, and various areas for coin operated laundry services.

3. In the development consisting of 5,200 acres under deed, 1,500 acres will be developed and approximately 3,500 acres will be left in forest preserve which is necessary to provide for recreational and open space areas. This is intended to be under their control and ownership.

4. He is not authorized to commit any portion of land for dedication purposes to the City until guidelines have been established by the Planning Department.

5. Because of pressures from the purchasers of the condominiums to retain a low density, high rise structures are proposed to be constructed along the foothills and town houses to be constructed along the slope.

6. There will be two shopping centers to service the proposed project. One is located in the center village area, in the middle of the golf course, which is about a one-mile distance and the other is approximately one-mile to three-fourths mile of the proposed shopping center at the intersection near Makaha Surfing Beach. At present, the nearest shopping center is the Cornet Shopping Center located at the corner of Makaha Valley Road and Farrington Highway.

7. For information, the buildings shown on the brochure are inflated in size by about 15%.

8. They will be prepared to proceed with construction within a six-to eight-month period, depending on when labor will be available.

9. It is anticipated that the total projected population of Makaha Valley, upon completion, will be in excess of 20,000 people.

10. With respect to the school and playground sites as set forth in the General Plan, he stated that the Planning Director had requested that the Department of Education select the sites before the Detailed Land Use Map is approved. Of the 57 acres designated for parks, schools, playgrounds and utilities, he does not know the land area to be designated for park use. He pointed out that there is not included in the 57 acres a substantial amount of forest preserve located in the back of the valley.

11. The area to be retained in forest preserve is part of the Makaha Historical Society concept which is a non-profit organization whose objections are to develop and own historical sites and areas in Makaha Valley. This organization is funded by Capital Investment Foundation, Trans-America Corporation, and the Weyerhauser Family Associates. Over $200,000 have been expended for archeological research performed by Bishop Museum. For this reason, the plan is flexible and it is hoped that the historical findings in Makaha will be integrated with the overall plan. By doing so, it is felt that an integrated atmosphere can be created whereby there will be recreational facilities with some historical and cultural values. The acquisition phase has not started as they would like to have as much time to thoroughly research the artifacts and remains of Hawaiian civilization in the area. Fortunately, the upper area in the valley was not used for agricultural purposes by the sugar plantation and many heiaus have been found.

Regarding the areas set aside for park and school use, the Director indicated that assuming that 57 acres will be designated for this use, that the actual area for parks would possibly be not more than 20 acres which would be the neighborhood type park.

Upon a call by the Chairman, no one spoke in opposition to this proposal.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

In later discussion, Mr. Rutledge moved that this matter be tabled until such time thata public hearing is held on the park dedication ordinance wherein the City and County may be able to obtain some land from the applicant. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Sullam.

It was Mr. Bright's opinion that since the applicant will be applying for additional projects, he saw no reason for any delay because the amount of land involved is small as compared to the overall project.

Mr. Ingleson believed that tabling of this matter until the passage of the park dedication ordinance in order to obtain some land for the City and County is unfair to the applicant. He suggested that the matter be deferred for a visit of the site.

ACTION: Mr. Rutledge withdrew his motion and Mrs. Sullam her second thereto. He made a new motion to defer action for a visit of the site which was seconded by Mrs. Sullam and carried.

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
WAIMANALO-NORTH OF KULAIWI STREET
PACIFIC ROCK AND CONCRETE COMPANY, LTD.
(EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRY)

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a request for a Conditional Use Permit to continue the operation of a quarry, rock crushing, sand, and batching plant on an area of land containing 33.34 acres situated north of Kulaiwi Street approximately 1,000 feet southwest of Kalanianaole Highway in Waimanalo and identified by Tax Map Key 4-1-08: Parcel 3.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of August 10, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, several property owners, and to two community organizations.

The Director read a letter of protest from Mr. Herbert Shimabukuro, attorney representing Mr. Ronald Wong, operator of the Golden Melon Farm located immediately adjacent and mauka of the quarry site. The protest is not against the operation of the quarry, but against the specific location of the batching plant.

The Director oriented the Commission as to the location of the subject property. He reviewed the staff report and the 16 conditions to be imposed on the Conditional Use Permit, and recommended that the following conditions be deleted:
Condition No. 4: A gate, at least 6 feet in height shall be installed at the entrance road to the site at Kalanianaole Highway. Said gate shall blend in with the residential character of the area and shall be locked except during quarry operation.

The applicant has indicated that there are other property owners in that area who are serviced by

the roadway and it would not be practical to have a locked gate, since other property owners would need access over this roadway.

Condition No. 9: A buffer strip at least 100 feet wide shall be provided makai of the subject site for the buffering of noise and other disturbances of the site from the residential area. The buffer strip shall be planted with ground cover, trees and shrubbery acceptable to the Planning Department within one year upon approval of the conditional use permit.

It was originally proposed to have a buffer strip 100 feet in width, but since fencing will be installed and additional trees and shrubbery will be planted acceptable to the Planning Department, this condition should be deleted.

Condition No. 12: The facilities for quarry operations shall be constructed in accordance with the map entitled, "Proposed Layout of Crushing Plant, Waimanalo Quarry," marked "Exhibit A", and shall be made a part of the conditional use permit and changes shall be made only upon approval by the Planning Department.

The applicant has indicated that their operation is such that it does require the occasional moving of the plant facilities; therefore, this should not be made a condition.

Condition No. 13: The finished grade of the subject site upon termination of excavation shall be in accordance with the map marked "Exhibit B" and entitled "Grading Plan and Section." Sufficient soil shall be provided and compacted to allow the reuse of the subject site for residential purposes.

In discussions with the landowners and the developers, they have indicated that it is not necessary to compact the soil since the property will be used for residential purposes and it is assumed that the Hawaiian Homes Land would develop the site for those purposes and bring in the necessary soil required. Also since there is a plus or minus two-foot requirement in the grading plan for the operation, this condition could be deleted.

Replying to questions from the Commission, the Director stated that the principal development for residential uses is along Kalanianaole Highway and the areas shown in yellow on the map are the house sites. The land is relatively

undeveloped on the makai and mauka sides of the property. The Hawaiian Homes Land have indicated that they do not have any plans for development for residential uses until the quarry operation is completed. There is a tentative subdivision plan in the general vicinity.

(Mr. Sharpless attended the meeting at about this point).

Mr. Robert B. Robinson, President of Pacific Rock and Concrete Co., spoke in favor of the application and presented the following information:

1. The Waimanalo quarry site was acquired three years ago and no complaints have been received until now. The quarry site was opened up in order to harvest a rich coral deposit, planned for road rock. However, after doing some research and development which resulted in a considerable sum of money, they found that they could process a suitable coral sand. The only sand from the neighbor islands is imported from Molokai.

2. The land was originally in ekoa and used as a grazing parcel and there were no benefit economically to the State. It was his understanding that under the grazing permit, the State received $100 to $125 for the parcel per year. The land was unfit for residential or agricultural uses because the land was too steep and only a mound in the center of the valley.

3. They have started processing material three years ago averaging approximately 150,00 tons of material per year. The current operation is being doubled and they will have about 300,000 tons of material this year. Economically, this means that with 150,000 tons of material, the Hawaiian Homes Land will receive in excess of $50,000 per year with the current operation. This will mean $100,000 per year and over $2 million to the Hawaiian Homes Land for use in developing homes for the Hawaiian people. This is based on 32-1/2¢ per ton with a minimum of 150,000 tons per year. At the current production rate, it is estimated that it will take 20 years to level the whole hill.

4. Currently, 19 persons are employed. They are currently operating on 20 hours per day, 7 days a week, on a portion of the sand plant. He hoped to be on a one-shift basis by the end of January.

5. It is his understanding that the parcel of land that is apparently downwind is located in the "shoe" of the area and the operators are on a month-to-month permit basis with the State. The Hawaiian Homes Commission have indicated a possible land exchange with the State of that land because of a 50-foot high embankment which should be leveled ultimately. This is in the overall plan of the Hawaiian Homes Commission and the use of that area would also be used for residential purposes.

6. Samples of two grades of sand were shown to the Commission: a) the coarser grade which is ideal for concrete; and b) the finer grade used for masonry operations. This is possible due to the close control of the gradation. Originally, it was thought that a round particle was needed to obtain workability in concrete; however, they found that the gradation itself offset that need. Presently, they have over $800,000 in this project in capital improvements.

7. The mound which serves as the buffer should not be disturbed for another 8 to 10 years since there is sufficient material beyond that which could be leveled at a later date and blended right in the lower elevation; otherwise, there will be a cliff of approximately 50 feet. The area will eventually be developed into house lots, not by excavating down into a pit, but leveling the mound down to a grade.

8. The batching plant cannot be relocated because it is presently situated on the only flat area available. The other areas are on grade. He did not believe that the dust problem is caused by the batching plant, but rather the screening plant which is 80 feet high.

9. The conditions as imposed by the Planning Director are satisfactory. They operated under a similar situation in Kailua where they were within 500 feet from the Liberty House Department Store in Kailua for approximately 8 years. The area is now developed for residential uses.

10. Eighty acres of the land is unsuitable for residences at this time because of its steepness. The area immediately below the

quarry site will be condemned for a road, although this has not been confirmed as a firm route. The area above Pope School will be developed within one or two years without any adverse effect from the quarry operation because of the direction of the wind.

11. He has no objections to discussing the matter with the protestor in an attempt to work out a solution to the problems.

Mr. James Clark, Chief Engineer for Hawaiian Homes Land, reported that the property of Hawaiian Homes land in the immediate area involves 150 acres in addition to the 80 acres in the quarry site. The balance of the land within the 150 acres will be developed within four years. When the quarry operation is half way completed, they will begin construction of house lot subdivisions.

Regarding the possible land exchange, he indicated that this involves 28 acres either through a land exchange or they will agree to come in with their quarry operation to level off the area.

Attorney Herbert Shimabukuro, representing Ronald Wong, operator of the Golden Melon Farm, stated that his client's objections are filed mainly on the basis of meeting the requirements of the Planning Commission and also the requirements of the Charter. He further gave the following reasons for objecting to the application:

1. Although there is economic value to the State and all parties concerned, there is the problem of an economic competing interest between the small farmer and this large concrete industry.

2. His client has been located at this area for several years, fist obtaining a five-year lease from the Waimanalo Home Plantation and then for the subsequent 16 years on a month-to-month lease with the State. However, because of this continuous renegotiation, it may revert back to a five-year lease. He pays his taxes on the land and the rental.

3. His client's home is located approximately 500 feet from the batching plant and 90 feet from the edge of the quarry. There is only a dirt road, approximately 12 feet wide, which divides his home from the quarry site. The home is covered daily with the gray coral dust because it is located in the direct path of the prevailing tradewinds. Since the

operation of the sand crushing plant in April, the dust problem has increased tremendously.

4. For the record, there have been complaints filed against this operation since its inception three years ago. Mr. Ed Among and the superintendent at the job site were informed of this dust problem and they have attempted to minimize the dust situation by putting a shaker screen on the conveyer belt and by covering it. They also attempted to put sprinklers on the head of the driller area, but that proved unworkable.

5. Photographs were displayed showing the dust covering the mauka or back portion of his client's home, the interior of the home, the automobile, and various trees. An inspection of the premises revealed dust all over the house although the doors and windows are always closed.

6. His client has not received any notification from the Hawaiian Homes Land or the State to evict the premises. It is his understanding that the State has no plans for the use of the property, except for the proposal by Hawaiian Homes Land.

7. Six to eight acres of prime farm land were taken out of production and more land will be taken out of production if the sand crushing plant is allowed to continue its operation.

8. Of the two letters submitted to the Commission, one letter was written by his client offering several suggestions as possible alternatives to solve the problem. The letter written by his client was not shown to Mr. Robinson because it was received just prior to the meeting.

9. As a possible solution, his client has suggested a) that his dwelling be moved to a location on the Makapuu side of its present location out of line of the quarry operation and that Pacific Concrete and Rock Co., incur the costs and provide lumber if required; or b) since the home is old and may not be able to be relocated, he would be satisfied with a new simple home to be located on the Makapuu side of its present location. The only problems to be resolved are the installation of the water system., sewer system, etc.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

In later discussion, it was the consensus of the Commission that a field trip be taken to the area to check whether an obnoxious condition exists and what economic impact there might be on the overall area.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Bright, the Commission deferred action for a visit of the site and requested that the applicable governmental agencies investigate whether an obnoxious condition exists, and further to request an opinion from the State Department of Planning and Economic Development as to what economic impact there might be on the overall area.

PUBLIC HEARING
CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT
MANOA
2642 PAMOA ROAD AND
2730 HIPAWAI PLACE
SCOPE CORPORATION
BY: LEON CHUN,
ATTORNEY
(DORMITORY USE)

A public hearing, continued from June 12 and July 24, 1969, was held to consider a request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct and operate three-and four-story dormitory buildings for 850 students; a two-story commons building; and one-half story parking buildings for 252 cars on an area of land containing 6.045 acres situated at 2642 Pamoa Road and 2730 Hipawai Place in Manoa and identified by Tax Map Keys 2-9-13: Parcels 12 and 51, and 2-9-23: Parcels 2, 3, 8, 13 and 14, within an R-4 Residential District.

The public hearing was kept open pending submittal of a revised plan by the applicant.

The Director reported that a letter was received prior to the meeting from Mr. Leon Chun, attorney for the SCOPE Corporation. A number of proposals were made, particularly in revising the automobile and pedestrian traffic pattern. He recommended that the public hearing be closed and referred back to the Director for study and report back to the Commission.

It was recalled that at the time of the public hearing, the developer indicated that plans would be submitted within two weeks or so. Since seven weeks have passed since the public hearing, the Director believed it was appropriate to take this request off the calendar.

ACTION: Mr. Chun moved that the public hearing be closed and further moved to include

the recommendation of the Director. He suggested that the Director contact the applicant to find out whether they plan to proceed or to withdraw the application, and that perhaps two weeks would be a reasonable time. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) EWA BEACH-VARIOUS CHANGES

The Commission again considered an amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Ewa Beach by changing the land use designation as follows:

1. Designating 12.1 acres of land along the mauka side of Fort Weaver Road between Kimopelekane Road and a proposed 56-foot roadway from Medium Density Apartment use to Residential Use;

2. Designating the 5.0 acre parcel along the proposed 56-foot roadway from Low Density Apartment use to Residential use; and

3. Designating 4.5 acres of Low Density Apartment use along the mauka side of Fort Weaver Road between the proposed 56-foot roadway and U.S. Coast and Geodetic Observatory to Residential use.

A public hearing was held and closed on July 10, 1969, and the Commission deferred action for further information.

Mr. Jack Gilliam, staff planner, reported that there are two basic apartment areas in Ewa Beach although neither has any existing apartments on them. These are the Ewa Acres and the 19-acre Low Density apartment areas. Four alternatives for these areas are as follows:

1. Both areas remain as designated on the existing DLUM. This alternate would probably result in apartments being built in Ewa Acres in accordance with demand with little or no apartments developed in the 19-acre area and tend to encourage non-repair of existing dwellings within the 19-acre area.

2. Both areas be redesignated as Residential. This alternate would tend to maintain the status quo within the 19-acre area and create doubt as to any future changes.

3. Retain apartment designation for Ewa Acres and redesignate the 19-acre area to Residential.

This alternate would probably provide for more physical stability to the 19-acre area, but may have adverse social implications on the community.

4. Retain apartment designation for the 19-acre area and redesignate Ewa Acres to residential. This alternate may tend to renew the 19-acre area over a period of time depending on the actual demand for multiple family units.

The Planning Department's recommendation is to redesignate the low and medium density apartment area to residential use.

In reply to an inquiry, Mr. Gilliam reported that only one ownership change has occurred in the Ewa Acres property since the apartment zoning has been granted. A subdivision plan has been filed and granted tentative approval.

Mr. Rutledge requested a legal opinion of the possibility that the City may be liable to lawsuits in the event the parcels are downzoned to residential use.

Mr. Gilliam indicated that a legal opinion was prepared for the Punchbowl area between Nehoa Street, Pensacola Street, and above Lunalilo Street, which was downgraded from the 200% Apartment District to the 100% Apartment district.

Legal Counsel Moon reported that any action taken on zoning, whether it is to upzone or downzone the property, must be based on facts and findings taking into account all changes of circumstances. In this way, the decision for the zoning change will then be warranted.

The Commission requested information on the possibility of whether there might be other areas with similar situations and what effect there might be on the total planning process. Mr. Gilliam indicated that this is done through a complete review of the General Plan and the factual data to support what the General Plan should contain. In this particular case, the figures which were shown are those based on the adopted Detailed Land Use Map.

Mr. Yamabe believed that the decision in this particular proposal could not be taken lightly because if it was indicated that there are situations existing in other areas and if such a situation was brought before the Planning Commission, whether the Commission is expected

to make a decision based on information presented such as in this proposal. Although the staff had indicated that it had sufficient information, he was in doubt because he did not believe that the conditions have changed enough as compared to the conditions which existed at the time the Detailed Land Use Map was adopted.

Inasmuch as the influx of structures are single family residences amounting to about 1-1/2% of the total in the current year, it seemed to Mr. Brennan that the plans by Lewers and Cooke to construct 500 units at this time would seem to be a suicidal venture based on construction in the past years. With the completion of the H-1 Freeway, he inquired whether there is the possibility that there would be just as much demand for apartments as there are for single-family residences.

Mr. Gilliam pointed out that from an employment standpoint, there is no indication of employment in that area. He believed that the apartments would be of a rental-type unit rather than a single family-type unit which would be located closer to employment, such as in the Waipahu area. He noted that a total of 44 single-family dwelling unit permits have been issued during the period from January 1, 1965 to June 1, 1969, representing 1.4% increase in single-family units. Out of these 44 units, 16 units are on a daily rental basis located behind the commercial area. The other units located in the commercial area are 14 units and 12 units which have a low vacancy rate. Because of this low percentage, it is possible that this has caused a need for whatever units there have been and with the opening up of the military lands to provide for additional residential needs.

Private renewal in multi-family areas can occur if the areas are not overzoned by balancing the land use pattern. As an example, he cited private renewal occurring in the Kapahulu and Waikiki areas as it is not overzoned in this development area; whereas, in the Makiki-Moiliili areas, there are not sufficient types of zoning in that there are enough areas zoned for high density apartment uses to accommodate approximately one million persons.

In reply to an inquiry of whether the 19 acres zoned for low density apartment use lends itself to residential uses, Mr. Gilliam replied that a very crowded type of single family use presently exists. If one were to drive through this area, there is quite a variety of conditions of housing within this area with substandard streets in

relation to the potential apartment development. No zoning is recommended until other conditions are met such as installation of sewer systems and improving the drainage system.

Regarding the Ewa Acres property, there is a possibility that it could be developed with single family residences; however, this matter must be given further consideration. He pointed out the areas which were sold at 19¢ and was purchased at 39¢ by the City. He did not have the figures for the properties above the Lewers & Cooke area.

Mr. Rutledge believed that further study must be done for the entire areas and it may be concluded that the only practical solution would be for the City to purchase the properties, because he did not feel it practical to even consider downzoning the area without giving any consideration to the purchasers of the properties.

Regarding school facilities, Mr. Gilliam reported that the Department of Education has purchased more land to expand their school facilities. There are a few other elementary schools sites in the area. In essence, this means approximately 3,000 units with 10,000 persons and three elementary schools.

Assuming that the Commission does not approve the amendment to the Detailed Land Use Map, Mr. Chun inquired whether the Planning Department will then initiate a change in the Detailed Land Use Map to redesignate the 19 acres from Low Density Apartment use to Residential use, to which the Director indicated that he would have to take this matter under advisement.

Mr. Yamabe believed that the entire Detailed Land Use Map should be considered and not only the area under consideration in view of the fact that the Detailed Land Use Map is based on a 20-year period.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Bright, deferred action until the next meeting.

ZONING B-3
BUSINESS-
RESIDENTIAL
DISTRICT
CENTRAL HONOLULU
DISTRICT
1020 -1022 SOUTH
KING STREET
DR. KIYOSHI INOUYE

The Commission again considered a proposal to change the zoning from B-1 Neighborhood Business District to B-3 Business-Residential District for a 21,553 square foot parcel of land situated at 1020-1022 South King Street in the Central Honolulu District. The development proposal is the construction of a multi-story building with commercial units on the ground floor and dwelling units above.

A public hearing was held and closed on August 6, 1969, and the Commission deferred action for furthe information in reference to the surrounding areas, and the concept of the B-3 Business-Residential District.

Photographs were shown of the subject parcel and the surrounding parcels. The Director reported that the structure located immediately ewa of the subject parcel is the Medical Arts Building, an 8-story structure, and the structure located on the Waikiki side is the Professional Building, a 4-story structure. The relationship of these structures are primarily of a commercial nature. The area across the street, Waikiki of McKinley High School, is zoned for medium density apartment use. The area along Lunalilo Freeway is zoned for a higher density apartment use.

The concept of the B-3 District is that of mixed or transitional commercial and apartment uses. In reviewing this application, the Director felt that the B-3 zoning was more appropriate than the present zoning of the B-1 District.

Responding to questions from the Commission, the Director believed that the designation of the boundary line for the B-3 District would relate to the mass transit facility and the station stops, and also to the mixed commercial and apartment facilities. The B-3 District could be applied from Piikoi Street over to Victoria Street between Beretania and King Streets; however, he indicated that further studies should be made on the overall area.

It was Mr. Yamabe's understanding that the B-3 District was created to apply to areas where it lacked residential population to bring people back into the area. He believed that a study should be made of the overall area to determine where the B-3 District is to be designated and not just arbritrarily establishing the boundary line of the B-3 District.

In reply to an inquiry of whether there are enough commercial areas to service the apartments that will be constructed in this vicinity, the Director gave an affirmative reply. On the other hand, there are a considerable number of apartment zoning in this area and this was discussed at some length by the City Council before the final adoption of a portion of the Detailed Land Use Map which reduced the density proposed by the Planning Department. He pointed out that the B-3 District was conceived by the City Council.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, deferred action to discuss and obtain an interpretation of the legislative intent of the B-3 zoning district.

The Planning Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Chun, authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director:

PARK DEDICATION ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 22

(1) An Ordinance to amend Chapter 22, R. O. 1961, by adding thereto a new article to be numbered Article 6, relating to Dedication of Land for Parks and Playgrounds or the Payment of Money in lieu thereof, as a condition precedent to final approval of a subdivision.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (VARIOUS AMENDMENTS) WAIPIO MILILANI TOWN, INCORPORATED

(2) Prior to authorizing the calling of a public hearing, Mr. Ingleson declared a conflict of interest, signed a statement for submission to the Mayor, and left the room.

Various amendments to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Mililani Town in Waipio, comprising an area of 149± acres, and identified by Tax Map Keys 9-5-01: portion of Parcel 7; 9-5-01: portion of Parcel 22; and 9-5-01: portion of Parcel 37.

STREET NAMES KAILUA POOAKEA SUBDIVISION

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Bright, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, recommended approval of the following street names for roadways within the Pooakea Subdivision in Kailua, Oahu:

AKAMAI STREET - Extension of an existing roadway.

AKUPA STREET - Roadway off Akamai Street proceeding in a northwesterly direction.

Meaning: Same as 'ōkuhe, an 'o' opu fish.

AKUPA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Akupa Street.

Meaning: Same as 'ōkuhe, an 'o'opu fish.

MISCELLANEOUS SUMMARY OF PROPOSED SIGN REGULATIONS

The Chairman requested that the Commission review the summary of the Proposed Sign Regulations which were distributed and to discuss this at the next meeting.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT REVOLVING FUND BERETANIA-SMITH OFF-STREET PARKING LOT

By Resolution No. 311, the City Council had referred to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation, a proposal to transfer $17,940.27 from the Improvement Revolving Fund to the Department of Traffic to settle two civil cases involving the acquisition of two parcels of land as additions to the Beretania-Smith Off-Street Parking Lot. The total cost of the two parcels, comprising 12,162 square feet of land, and the improvements would be $200,314.27.

The Director reviewed the staff report and recommended approval of Resolution No. 311.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, the Commission approved the transfer of $17,940.27 from the Improvement Revolving Fund to the Department of Traffic for the purpose indicated with the recommendation that the Improvement Revolving Fund be reimbursed when funds become available in the Capital Improvement Budget Ordinance.

PERSONNEL ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The Commission held an election to select its Chairman and Vice Chairman for the next ensuing fiscal year.

Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, Mr. Chun was elected as the Chairman Of the Planning Commission.

Upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, Mr. Rutledge was elected as the Vice Chairman.

PERSONNEL CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

Mr. Brennan expressed his appreciation for the opportunity of serving as Chairman of the Planning Commission.

PERSONNEL MR. BRENNAN

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Chun, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, expressed its appreciation to Mr. Brennan for his efforts during his term as Chairman.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie M. Abbott
Hearings Reporter

Special Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
August 28, 1969

The Planning Commission held a special meeting on Thursday, August 28, 1969, at 8:45 a.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT:

Philip T. Chun, Chairman
Roy R. Bright
Lewis Ingleson
Mrs. Fredda Sullam
Thomas N. Yamabe II

James Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Edward Brennan
Arthur A. Rutledge

PUBLIC HEARING GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) KAILUA MAKAI END OF THE KAWAINUI DRAINAGE CANAL PLANNING AREA NO. 24

A public hearing was held to consider, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Kailua, Lanikai, Maunawili, and Waimanalo to include single-family residential use as well as military use on a portion of land situated on the makai end of the Kawainui Drainage Canal. This request was initiated by the Planning Department.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of August 17, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, Kaneohe Ranch Co., and to interested community associations. No letters of protest had been received.

The Director presented the following information:

1. The Detailed Land Use Map for Kailua, Lanikai, Maunawili, and Waimanalo was adopted on June 29, 1964, Ordinance No. 2473.

2. In March, 1969, Councilman Mary George informed the Commission that a portion of the Detailed Land Use Map for Kailua was not included. Since then, the Planning Department has updated the maps to include that portion.

3. The portion of land not included in the Detailed Land Use Map is located at the makai end of the Kawainui Drainage Canal and adjoins the Kaneohe Marine Air Corps Station.

4. The area is developed primarily with single-family dwellings and should be designated for that use.

5. The portion designated for military use is required to serve as a buffer for the landing field and other related military activities.

6. The Planning Department recommends that the Detailed Land Use Map be amended to include the single-family residential use as well as the military use.

Councilman Mary George raised the question as to whether the present zoning and the Detailed Land Use Map is consistent with an area presently used as a grazing area, and not urbanized. It didn't seem appropriate in a residential district. Director Way thought uses under conditional use permits e.g. a recreational type facility in a residential district would be appropriate. The area has been laid out in a subdivision pattern for single-family residential use.

The General Plan shows a green buffer strip on Mokapu Peninsula, where the Kaneohe Marine Air Corps Station is located, stretching from Kaneohe Bay to Kailua Bay. Councilman Mary George questioned why the Detailed Land Use Map does not reflect the green strip as shown on the General Plan. Director Way stated that there apparently had been an amendment to the General Plan to change the designation from Conservation to Military use.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Commissioner Sullam, seconded by Commissioner Yamabe, closed the public hearing and recommended approval to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Kailua, Lanikai, Maunawili and Waimanalo to include single-family residnetial use as well as military use on a portion of land situated on the makai end of the Kawainui Drainage Canal.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (VARIOUS
AMENDMENTS)
KAILUA
KAPAA VALLEY AND
KAWAINUI SWAMP
(HC&D AND HAWAIIAN
TRUST) PA#25

This public hearing (previously held on August 6, 1969, and kept open pending receipt of further information) was held today to consider amendments to portions of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Kailua by changing the land use designations (Tax Map Keys 4-2-13 through 4-2-16) as follows:

1. From Agricultural and Public Facility to Industrial for an area comprising 2.47 acres. (The applicants, H.C.&D. and Hawaiian Trust, propose to develop a concrete product manufacturing facility in an area of approximately 27 acres of which 2.1 acres are designated as "Agricultural" and 0.37 acres is designated as "Public Facility.")

2. From Industrial and Open Space to Public Facility for an area comprising 72+ acres. (Initiated by the Planning Department.)

3. From Agricultural and Open Space to Park for an area comprising 1,018+ acres. (Initiated by the Planning Department.)

4. Designate the location of the existing Quarry Road (Initiated by the Planning Department.)

The Director reviewed the proposed amendments:

A. 750 acres of Kawainui Swamp acquired by the City is within the flood plain area. Approximately 640 acres is actual "flooding area" and the City has agreed with the Corps of Engineers to develop this area accordingly. The remaining 110 acres are located on the Kailua side of the existing dike.

B. Land owned by Kaneohe Ranch Co., located at the corner of Kalanianaole Highway by the Kailua Drive-In Theater, is not directly in danger of the flood area. However, it is desirable to consider preventive measures. The park plan shows this area as a possible silting basin at the juncture of two streams.

C. The multi-use concept of the 750-acre flood plain area was conceived in the planning of the Flood Control Project known as the Kawainui Regional Park Plans. Consideration was also given to the subdivision development proposed by Mr. Wong, Kaneohe Ranch Co., which is on a 20%--40% slope frame and is considered economically unfeasible

for residential development. The Department of Parks and Recreation believes that this area is essential for the planned regional park development to insure park use in the adjoining portions of the area and also to serve as a buffer for the park facilities. The completion date of the feasibility study is scheduled for September 20, 1969.

D. Present zoning and land use, as well as future development of lands in the area, is proposed for private development. At the request of the Planning Commission, the staff investigated development proposals with various owners.

1. A golf course (3,705 yards in length) on approximately 60 acres of land at the corner of Quarry Road and Kalanianaole Highway is planned by Kaneohe Ranch.

2. On January 21, 1969, plans were submitted for a Planned Unit Development (21 acres on the slope land adjoining the Kukanono Subdivision, which is the area indicated as appropriate for the buffer area to protect the park and flood plain area). This would require a zoning change from R-6 Residential to A-3 Apartment District. No request for a change in zoning has been submitted to date.

3. On October 24, 1969, Centex-Trousdale Co. submitted a preliminary subdivision plan for 218 lots in the area from the Kailua Drive-In Theater to the Quarry. Tentative approval was granted by the Planning Director on February 2, 1967, but expired due to inaction on the part of the developer.

E. Representatives of Kaneohe Ranch Co. (owner of the land located at the corner of Quarry Road, proposed H-3 Highway, and Mokapu Saddle Road, within the State Urban District and zoned R-6 Residential) have indicated that this area is not being leased to H.C.&D. Mr. Robert Muller, President of H.C.&D., opposed the designation of this area to Park use since it is planned to be used for disposing of quarry wastes. The Division of Land Survey and Acquisition, Department of Public Works, has indicated that the City is negotiating to acquire the right-of-way on the improved quarry road to provide access to the City's incinerator plant site from Mokapu Boulevard. It was the intention of Kaneohe Ranch Co. to dedicate the road, and the City was willing to accept and

improve the road provided no subdivision would be developed along the road. Presently, the City is not certain whether the Kaneohe Ranch Co. will agree to this condition. With this information, the department withdraws Amendment No. 4 which designates the location of the quarry road, based on the outcome of the negotiation between the City and the Kaneohe Ranch Co.

Testimony from the Audience:

1. Mr. Robert L. Muller, President of H.C.&D. Company, did not testify, but in answer to an inquiry indicated that the proposed park site is presently being used by the City and County for fill purposed. A request has been made to the Kaneohe Ranch Co. for use of this area after the City and County has completed its work. The need for use of this area arose because the H-3 Highway is proposed to be located through the middle of Kapaa Valley.

2. Mr. DeLos Seeley, Department of Parks and Recreation, in response to a question by Commissioner Yamabe regarding the proposed park site and whether or not a park is proposed to be developed immediately, replied:

   a. There is no reason why development of a park should not occur immediately.

   b. Assuming there are no other conditions which would cause such development to occur, a time schedule could be worked out to accommodate the property owner and the uses proposed for this area.

   c. The Department of Parks and Recreation is anticipating their long-range goal of a 1,000-acre regional park in this area.

   d. It is difficult to proceed in their long-range planning if there will be interim uses other than park.

   e. The request of H.C.&D. to use the area for fill purposes in the interim would be beneficial.

   f. If plans for the silting basin could be incorporated in the golf course design, with

provisions for the Department of Parks and Recreation to accomplish its goal, it is possible that a golf course could be compatible to the park and to the silting basin. A more reasonable solution would be to have the City acquire the land and lease it to a private owner for the development of a golf course, whereby the City would be able to control the use of the golf course which is compatible with the adjacent park.

h. One of the basic advantages of the silting basin is that it provides some holding capacity for water for flood purposes. Any overflow of water would go out into the swamp and this would allow the silting basin to be cleaned regularly.

i. Plans must be prepared on a comprehensive basis. Assuming that all reasonable solutions are met, a period of two or three years would be required for construction of the silting basin. Coordination among the Federal, State, and City and County governments on sanitary fill investigation of certain sections of the pond have been started.

j. The objection to leaving the area in Agricultural (which allows the development of a golf course) is that there is always the possibility that the golf course may not materialize. Therefore, a request for other uses may be made. On the other hand, the plans for development of the golf course might not include a silting basin.

k. If, in the detailing of the golf course proposal, it were found that a silting basin of adequate size is not feasible, definite provisions should be made to locate the silting basin across the Pali Highway, as discussed previously.

l. While it is possible to develop a golf course without it, this silting basin is more of a concern to the Department of Parks and Recreation than to the Corps of Engineers.

3. The Corporation Counsel's office, in their discussion with Mr. Wong of Kaneohe Ranch, did not reveal any negative reaction to a private golf course development on areas designated for park use on the Detailed Land Use Map.

4. Mr. Robert Young, Refuse Division, Department of Public Works, pointed to an area on the map which has been refuse-filled, and asked if the Department of Parks and Recreation would be interested in using it for recreational purposes. Mr. Seeley wouldn't give a definite answer until checking into the matter further.

There was no testimony against the proposal.

The public hearing was closed and the matter taken under advisement, upon the motion by Commissioner Yamabe, seconded by Commissioner Ingleson.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Commissioner Yamabe, seconded by Commissioner Ingleson, the Commission approved Amendments to portions of the General Plan of the City and County of Honolulu and to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the City and County of Honolulu by changing the land use for a certain area of land situated in Kapaa Valley and Kawainui Swamp, Kailua, Oahu, Tax Map Keys 4-2-13 through 16 by changing the land use designations as follows:

1. From Agricultural and Public Facilities use to Industrial use (2.7 acres);

2. From Industrial use and Open Space to Public Facilities use (72.4 acres);

3. From Agricultural use and Open Space to Park (982.1 acres) and Open Space (10.3 acres).

Item 4 was withdrawn by the Planning Staff and will comply with the outcome of the negotiation between the owner and the City.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) LAIE, KAIPAPAU, HAUULA, MAKAO, KAPAKA, KALUANUI, PUNALUU, KAHANA AND KAAAWA COMMERCIAL USE (KAHUKU SHOPPING CENTER, LTD.; NICHOLAS PAO AND MABEL G. PAO BY HIROSHI SAKAI) PA#26

A public hearing had been held and closed on August 14, 1969, at which time the Commission deferred action pending further information.

Today, the Commission again considered the proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Laie, Kaipapau, Hauula, Makao, Kapaka, Kaluanui, Punaluu, Kahana, and Kaaawa (2.4 acres--Tax Map Key 5-4-18: Parcel 59) by changing the land use designation from Residential to Commercial use.

The Director introduced Mr. Ian McDougall of the Planning Department staff who reviewed the background of the original and current proposals and parcels. He also presented the additional information which had been requested at the previous meeting:

1. A letter received from Mr. Donald K. Iwai, Attorney for Jonathan Manor, Inc., confirming the oral request made on August 13, 1969, for the withdrawal of:

   Request for Amendment to General Plan
   Laie--Kaaawa Districts
   Tax Map Keys: 5-4-04: 22 and 5-4-19: 53
   Applicant: Jonathan Manor, Inc.

2. A letter received from Mr. Hiroshi Sakai, Attorney for Kahuku Shopping Center, et al, containing the information relative to development of the property by the property owners; services of an architect; a preliminary sketch; other commercially-zoned areas which could be used for this purpose; existing commercial zoning in the immediate neighborhood and how it relates to the Commercial Detailed Land Use Map designations; and the need for additional commercial designation in the area.

At this time, the staff recommends, as previously recommended, that the Detailed Land Use Map designation for Tax Map Key 5-4-18: Parcel 59 be changed from Residential to Commercial and, additionally, the staff recommends that the Detailed Land Use Map be amended to change the existing portion designated as Commercial for property identified as Tax Map Key 5-4-04: 22 from Commercial to Residential.

It was the opinion of Corporation Counsel that since Proposal #1 had been withdrawn verbally and by written communication, the matter is no longer before the Planning Commission for consideration and no further testimony is necessary.

The Planning Director recommends the change for the second parcel (the one on the highway) only if the parcel behind is rezoned.

This is a land use designation and not a zone change. Therefore, at another time, the staff will take action initiated by the Planning Department to rezone the parcel from commercial to residential. It was felt that the decision on Proposal #2 is contingent on Proposal #1.

<u>ACTION</u>: In view of the opinion rendered by Counsel, Commissioner Yamabe moved that the matter be deferred for two weeks while the planning staff works out the details. Commissioner Ingleson seconded the motion and it was carried.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT--MAKIKI MAKIKI AND NEHOA STREETS (THE CHINESE CENTER) 69/CUP-9

Prior to consideration of this application, Commissioner Ingleson declared a conflict of interest and left the room.

A public hearing was held on August 14, 1969, at which time the Commission closed the hearing and deferred action pending information on traffic.

The Commission again considered this application for a Conditional Use Permit to construct and operate a convalescent home on two parcels of land containing a total area of 44,875 square feet, located at the mauka-Diamond Head corner of Makiki and Nehoa Streets in Makiki within an R-6 Residential District. The applicant has proposed a three-story structure containing 64 rooms (a total of 120 beds) and the necessary service facilities. Off-street parking will be provided at the rear of the property and on an adjoining parcel.

The Director reported that the Traffic Department requested that this application be deferred pending a traffic count during school peak periods.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Commissioner Chun, seconded by Commissioner Bright, the Commission deferred action pending a traffic count by the Traffic Department.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) EWA BEACH-- IROQUOIS POINT (VARIOUS CHANGES)

A public hearing was held and closed on July 10, 1969, and action deferred for two weeks. On August 21, 1969, the Commission again deferred action for another week.

Today, the Commission again considered the amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Ewa Beach by changing the land use designation as follows:

1. Designating 12.1 acres of land along the mauka side of Fort Weaver Road between Kimopelekane Road and a proposed 56-foot roadway from Medium Density Apartment use to Residential use.

2. Designating the 5.0-acre parcel along the proposed 56-foot roadway from Low Density Apartment use to Residential use.

3. Designating 4.5 acres of Low Density Apartment use along the mauka side of Fort Weaver Road between the proposed 56-foot roadway and U.S. Coast and Geodetic Observatory to Residential use.

Commissioner Sullam reminded the members that at the last meeting Commissioner Rutledge suggested buying the land, and inasmuch as they discuss imaginative and innovative planning, and golden opportunities, they should visit the site.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Commissioner Ingleson, seconded by Commissioner Sullam, the Commission deferred action pending a visit to the site scheduled for September 3, 1969.

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION WAIPIO URBAN DISTRICT (MILILANI TOWN, INCORPORATED)

Prior to consideration of this petition, Commissioner Ingleson declared a conflict of interest and left the room.

The Commission reviewed a petition, submitted by Mililani Town, Incorporated, for an amendment to the Land Use Commission District Boundary to change the district classification of 2,500 acres of land situated in Mililani Town in Waipio from Agricultural to Urban use.

The Director oriented the Commission to the location of the area under consideration and other areas which have been granted urban designations. In reviewing the Staff Report, he reported that 2,000 acres have already been designated for urban use on the General Plan for Central Oahu. The development time schedule of the requested 2,500 acre ranges from 1971 to 1980. However, the Planning Department is recommending approval for the portion shown as 1971, consisting of 227 acres and based on incremental development.

Testimony in favor of the petition:

Mr. Jack Palk, Vice President of Oceanic Properties, testified on behalf of Mililani Town:

1. The development of the 650 acres is scheduled for town house and single-family dwellings.

2. Experience has shown that a period of at least two years is required for planning concept processing with all the governmental agencies involved. In order to provide a continuity of process, an increment-type development must be worked out.

3. When the new rules and regulations were adopted by the Land Use Commission in June for incremental development, the applicant felt it was appropriate to show the entire plan, but with the understanding that approval may not be granted for the

entire 2,500 acres. Therefore, the applicant is requesting approval on an incremental basis for the areas shown as '71, '72, and '73 on the map and located on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway.

4. Many homes have been sold on a fee-simple basis since June 1968. However, they have not been able to achieve their goal by selling the homes for $15,000. The cost of construction index, a basic factor, has risen approximately 35% to 40% since 1964. Only by increasing the density will the applicant be able to reduce the cost of the homes. Perhaps within the increments, an increase to 5 units per acre for single-family detached homes and to 8 units per acre for the town houses.

5. In 1962, a petition was submitted to change the land use district boundary of 2,500 acres. However, the rules and regulations adopted by the Land Use Commission provides for development on an incremental basis rather than in its entirety. (The City and County of Honolulu does not have such a policy.)

6. Mililani Town is prepared to live with the incremental process if necessary and willing to abide by those conditions. Therefore, if this Commission feels that they could give an increment or recommended increment, it is thehope of the applicant that they would take the four increments shown on the makai side of approximately 650 acres.

Mr. Ramon Duran, Executive Officer of the Land Use Commission, was asked to explain the concept of incremental approval:

> It is the intent of the Land Use Commission to allow an applicant to develop the first increment within a five-year period. If the development is in accordance with the conditions of the Land Use Commission, the applicant may continue development of the second and remaining increments in that manner.
>
> As the Land Use Commission approves each incremental development, they are committing themselves to the next increment--in essence, to the total plan.

Only the district boundaries would reflect the areas that were rezoned. The records would reflect the attitude of the Land Use Commission with regard to the total development plan insofar as adopting the concept. No maps are amended regarding approval of the concept of the total development. This is similar to the City and County's General Plan which reflects the 20-year program and land use map and subsequent zoning changes generally geared to a lesser period of time of ten years.

The Land Use Commission acts on the application by taking two separate votes at its meeting.

Commissioner Sharpless commented on the time limitation in which the Planning Commission must make its recommendation to the Land Use Commission:

"If a public hearing is held on this matter on September 12, 1969, the Land Use Commission should have the Planning Commission recommendation about a week before but on the other hand, legally speaking, there are two provisions in the law:

1. The Planning Commission should make its recommendation within 45 days of receipt of the request from the Land Use Commission or, with an extension, 60 days.

2. The Commission should hear testimony as long as 15 days after the public hearing. However, the Planning Commission has accepted testimony up to the action date which would be a minimum of 45 days beyond the public hearing and it could even be as long as 90 days."

The Director explained that emphasis was placed in the Staff Report with reference to the rate of development. For example, approximately 10,000 building permits were issued in 1968 of which 3,683 were single-family dwelling units and 6,743 multiple-family structures. The developer projects the potential of housing units (including single-family and multiple-family) at 800 annually from 1971 to 1975.

There being no further testimony, the matter was taken under advisement upon the motion by Commissioner Yamabe, seconded by Commissioner Sullam.

ACTION: On the motion by Commissioner Yamabe, seconded by Commissioner Sullam, the Commission deferred action until testimony is heard on the Detailed Land Use Map.

FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAM URBAN RENEWAL COORDINATOR CITY & COUNTY OF HONOLULU ADDITION TO KUALOA BEACH PARK

In compliance with Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, the Urban Renewal Coordinator of the City & County of Honolulu referred to the Planning Commission, for review and project certification, an application for Federal Grant to acquire land for open-space purposes under Title VII, Housing Act of 1961, as amended. The Grant will be used to acquire a 42.427-acre addition to Kualoa Beach Park.

This planned addition will expand the present Kualoa Beach Park from approximately 113 acres to 155 acres. An earlier application requesting funds for the initial 113 acres has been approved by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The current six-year Capital Improvement Program for the City and County of Honolulu, in addition to land acquisition costs, includes $1,213,000 for the development of this beach park. This beach park will provide an open space for beach recreation and picnicking in an area that is rapidly urbanizing.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Commissioner Yamabe, seconded by Commissioner Ingleson, certified this application for Federal funds as being consistent and in consonance with existing planning programs and studies to achieve the comprehensive and coordinated physical development of the City & County of Honolulu and to promote the general welfare and prosperity of its people.

STREET NAMES KUKUI AND KAULUWELA HONOLULU REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY PROJECT AREAS

Aala Street------Roadway (former Aala Lane, now deleted) running in a mauka direction beginning at approximately 300 North Beretania Street to terminate at North School Street.

Meaning: Fragrant.

Aala Place------ Dead End roadway off Aala Street between Beretania Street and Vineyard Boulevard.

Maunakea Street- Extension of existing roadway running from Beretania Street to terminate at Vineyard Boulevard.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Commissioner Bright, seconded by Commissioner Sullam, the Commission recommended approval of the above-mentioned street names in the Kukui and Kauluwela Honolulu Redevelopment Agency Project areas.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP PORTIONS OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN (AMENDMENT) WAIKIKI JEFFERSON SCHOOL VICINITY (STATE DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND GENERAL SERVICES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION)

Amendment to a portion of the Development Plan and Detailed Land Use Map to change the circulation system and to provide for the expansion of Jefferson Elementary School in Waikiki.

ACTION: The Planning Commission, upon the motion by Commissioner Yamabe, seconded by Commissioner Ingleson, authorized the calling of a public hearing initiated by the Planning Director.

DISCUSSION SUMMARY OF PROPOSED SIGN REGULATIONS

Director Way informed the Commission that the Public Works Committee is still soliciting proposed changes to the sign regulations, asking the community to respond to the draft material, after which they will make recommendations to the City Council. He suggested, since the Public Works Committee of the City Council is meeting tomorrow, that this Commission defer further discussion pending the outcome of that meeting. At that time, there would be more information available as to the specific regulations which may be imposed.

Commissioner Ingleson was of the opinion that this Commission, as an interested body, should submit their recommendations for amendments to the sign ordinance to the City Council prior to their drafting of an ordinance and, therefore, should discuss it now for presentation at the Public Works Committee meeting tomorrow.

Commissioner Yamabe felt that additional information was needed and, if there were any comment to be made, it should be made after the public hearing.

While this Commission has had information submitted to them by the Planning Department from which they could make their own personal decisions, Commissioner Chun questioned whether or not this Commission has a duty to solicit other testimony.

ACTION: Commissioner Ingleson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Yamabe, that the Commission formally request the City Council to afford the Planning Commission the opportunity to present their views on the proposed changes to the sign ordinance prior to its adoption. Motion carried.

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION WAIPAHU KUNIA ROAD & WAIKELE GULCH (HSM VENTURES AND ROBINSON TRUST)

The Planning Commission considered a request by the Land Use Commission for Re-evaluation of the Planning Commission's Position on the Amendment of the Land Use District Boundary for a change in land use from Agricultural to Urban in Waipahu between Kunia Road and Waikele Gulch, mauka of the H-1 Freeway.

The Director reviewed with the Commission the 7-page Staff Report of August 25, 1969, which recommended denial of the request based on the fact the circumstances surrounding the petition for Amendment of the Land Use District Boundary have not changed materially in the past year to warrant altering the Director's prior recommendation.

Commissioner Sharpless asked the Director if the Land Use Commission's request for re-evaluation states the basis on which it makes the request. Whereupon the Director read a letter addressed to the planning Director from Mr. Ramon Duran, Executive Officer of the Land Use Commission, Department of Planning and Economic Development, dated June 23, 1969:

> "Subject -- A68-197 - Robinson Trusts et al and HSM Ventures Rezoning Request, Waipahu, Oahu
>
> The above-caption matter was filed with the Land Use Commission on July 16, 1968. The Land Use Commission conducted a public hearing on November 1, 1968. Since that time, the applicants have requested three (3) extensions totaling 167 days. In a telephone conversation, Mr. Stanley Mukai, attorney for the petitioners, stated the petitioners were again seeking a 90-day extension in order to complete the preparation of additional evidence.
>
> In view of the time lapse and the rapid changes occurring on Oahu, would the Planning Department and Planning Commission reconsider and re-evaluate their positions on this matter at the earliest opportunity.
>
> Attached are recent Land Use Commission staff reports. Also a substantial file has been developed in this office and will be available to you and your staff upon request."

Since Mr. Duran was present, he was questioned by the Commission:

1. Is this a submission which has been deferred by the Land Use Commission or is it a new application?

"This is a new application. It is an action that hasn't been taken by the Commission. There were two petitions. The first one was disposed of, which your Director indicated--it was denied. This is a second application which has been pending now for almost a year. You have already submitted a recommendation on this request over a year ago. It has not been acted upon so, in a sense, it is a new application. A lot has happened since that time that has changed the picture in this total area. For example, in our Land Use Boundary review, so many proposals have come to light that were not known at the time this Commission took its original action, such as:

a. A pending request by Bishop Estate to rezone 4,500 acres of prime agricultural and pineapple lands in Waiawa area.

b. The request of Mililani to increase their area to 3,500 acres.

c. The pending request by Campbell Estate to convert their properties around Honouliuli and up above the freeway and on either side of Makakilo.

d. A request by Ewa Resorts to rezone the Kamakilo Campbell property--about 300 acres--to urban development, most of which is in cane.

e. The fact that the Land Use Commission rezoned roughly 1,000 acres of Bishop Estate and Austin Estates property at Waiawa.

f. The fact that there is a new Planning Director.

g. There is a relatively new Planning Commission.

These are all new factors that have influenced the total development, or potential development, of the Waipahu area and could now bear, perhaps, on recent recommendations to the Land Use Commission. We are planning to schedule our action on this petition September 12."

2. Under the Land Use Law, is there a provision for requesting reconsideration of the action of the Planning Commission?

"It doesn't specifically spell out in the law that the Commission may or may not request a re-evaluation of a previous recommendation. However, I think the Commission has always attempted to work with the counties where major decisions could influence the development of these counties."

3. Has the Land Use Commission asked this Planning Commission for a re-evaluation?

"The Chairman of the Land Use Commission has asked for a re-evaluation and the Staff has also requested a re-evaluation, but it hasn't come as a formal request from the Land Use Commission, per se."

4. According to the Director's Report, the Land Use Commission's action was deferred to September 12. What was the purpose of the request for deferment?

"It has always been on the basis of securing new evidence, which are the requests that have come about through our Boundary Review study."

5. If nothing is done by this Commission, then the original recommendation is still part of the record of the Land Use Commission?

"This is correct. But, there seems to be a conflict in the record wherein your Commission has recommended that this area be rezoned, and that is contrary to your General Plan Detailed Land Use Map. Secondly, since that decision, your Commission took the position that nothing should be changed in the Waipahu area because it is ill-planned and there should be a thorough study of the area. This seems to be in conflict with your decision. Now, has your Commission changed its position since that original recommendation? In other words, the Land Use Commission staff will have to make a report to the Commission prior to this September 12 action which will summarize, or at least present to the Commission everything that has transpired since the public hearing and it will all be a part of the record. Now, my question to this Commission for clarification (in view of all of these proposed developments that will soon come before your Commission for a recommendation) is, 'Does

this Commission endorse the concept of urbanizing all of this land between Waipahu and Wahiawa?' On the basis of your original recommendation, if moving across the highway is a logical extension of an existing urban area, then at what point is it no longer a logical extension? Because there doesn't seem to be any physical boundary above the area, then at what point is it no longer a logical extension? Because there doesn't seem to be any physical boundary above the area presently being considered, except the golf course that is 2,000 acres mauka of what is being considered at this point. Also, there is a conversion clause in the sugar leases of Robinson's that they may withdraw 50 acres per year from this area--from the cane leases. So, if Mililani's schedule of development is typical of all development schedules, wherein it takes perhaps 4 to 5 years to develop 350 acres, then another 250 acres could be available for additional urban development and you will be faced again with the decision of moving into this cane land another 250 acres."

Commissioner Yamabe addressed the Chair: "The question seems to be--whether the Planning Commission wishes to satisfy the Land Use Commission by stating, (1) our earlier position, (2) whatever position we take at this time, or (3) no comment other than through legal channels."

Commissioner Ingleson stated that while there may be some procedural problems (previous actions, new information, planning, processing, change of Commission members, change of Director, and many other valid points which Mr. Duran has brought out) it would not be consistent with good planning to not consider and re-evaluate the previous position because this is a continuing thing. He felt very strongly that the Commission just couldn't sit on what has gone before without reconsideration.

Commissioner Sullam felt that there is new evidence and the fact that there are petitions being submitted indicates that the problem is changing.

ACTION: The Commission deferred the matter one week for further study, on the motion by Commissioner Ingleson, seconded by Commissioner Sullam.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Henrietta B. Lyman

Henrietta B. Lyman
Secretary-Reporter II

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
September 4, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, September 4, 1969, at 1:45 P.M. in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT:

Philip T. Chun, Chairman
Edward Brennan
Roy R. Bright
Lewis Ingleson
Arthur A. Rutledge
Mrs. Fredda Sullam
Thomas N. Yamabe II

James K. Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel

Prior to consideration of this public hearing, Mr. Ingleson declared a "conflict of interest" and left the room because his firm is performing architectural services for Mililani Town.

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENTS)
WAIPIO
MILILANI TOWN
(MILILANI TOWN,
INCORPORATED)

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider various amendments to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Mililani Town, located in Waipio, for parcels of land (149± acres) identified by Tax Map Keys 9-5-01: Portions of Parcels 7, 8, 22; and for 9-4-05: Portion of Parcel 03.

The public hearing notice was published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of August 24, 1969. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, and to interested organizations.

No written protests were received.

The Director reported that the Waipio Detailed Land Use Map was adopted in July 1964. Due to the change to the plan for Mililani Town, the Waipio Detailed Land Use Map was amended in 1966 and again in early 1968. A third change is now requested.

The major reason for this request is to adjust boundary lines due to finalization of the

Mililani Town plan. The entire request lies within the existing 760-acre Urban District of Mililani Town.

Displayed on the wall were (1) a map indicating the existing Detailed Land Use Map for the area; (2) proposals advanced by the developers; and (3) staff recommendations concerning adjustments.

The changes recommended by the staff were discussed with the developers over a period of several weeks. There have also been several meetings over the past few months with respect to open space (the primary disagreements) which have not been resolved.

Changes in the Detailed Land Use Map:

+	18.9%	Single-family areas
+	2.5	Low-density apartments
-	13.8	Medium-density apartments
+	5.2	Public facilities
-	3.9	Parks and recreation
-	8.9	Commercial facilities
0	----	Open space

The Director reviewed and commented on each amendment:

Approve #1 -- Medium-Density Apartment to Low Density Apartment

Town houses are proposed to be located adjacent to the golf course.

Approve #2 -- Medium-Density Apartment to Single-Family Residential

This change in land use designation would contribute to lowering the overall density. An area of 22 acres is involved.

Approve #3 -- Park to Medium-Density Apartment

This change is necessary to adjust boundaries resulting from metes and bounds description. The 1.5-acre area would be added to the 3.2 acres already designated Medium-Density Apartment and the total 4.7-acre area would be developed to accommodate a total of 141 units. Density of the total area is 30 units per net acre while the standard is 50 units.

Approve #4 -- Medium-Density Apartment and Single-Family Residential to Public
& Facility and Park

Approve #5

This change is for a new elementary school and park complex on the west side of Kamehameha Highway. The State Department of Education and the City Department of Parks and Recreation endorse the location and size of the school-park complex (letters of July 23, 1969, on file).

Approve #6 -- Park to Single-Family Residential Use

There would be no adverse effects since there was an exchange of single-family residential use to park use in amendments #4 and 5.

Approve #7 -- Single-Family to Low-Density Apartment Use

This 5.7-acre site is located immediately south of the elementary school and could accommodate 60 units on the acreage.

Approve #8 -- Park and Single-Family Residential Use to Low-Density Apartment Use

There would be no adverse effects from mixing a large single-family housing area with a smaller concentration of low-density apartments.

Approve #9 -- Commercial to Medium-Density Apartment

It would be desirable to develop an apartment area with such a generous provision of open space.

(Low Density Apartment) (Modified) #10 -- Commercial to Medium Density Apartment

Requested change was denied and a recommendation for low-density apartment was made.

Possible objections by residents of the Waikakalau Gulch area should be considered by lowering the density in this area. The area overlooks the gulch and there are dwellings below. This may create an adverse appearance and effect.

Approve #11 -- Commercial to Public Facility Use

It is necessary to provide an adequate size fire station in an accessible location.

The Fire Department agreed with the location and size (letter of November 20, 1968, on file).

The Fire Station site and the Hawaiian Telephone Company's switching equipment facility site have adequate access. The telephone facility already exists at the involved location.

(Medium-Density Apartment) (Modified) #12 -- Medium-Density Apartment and Park to Low-Density Apartment

Staff recommendation for medium density is based on changes in density and open space in other areas.

Approve #13 -- Single-Family to Low-Density Apartment

There would be no adverse effects from mixing a large single-family housing area with a smaller concentration of low-density apartments. This would conceptually, and from a design standpoint, be in keeping with the approach of having a small conclave of low-density apartment areas within a single-family residential neighborhood.

(Single-Family Residential) (Denied) #14 -- Open Space to Single-Family Residential Use

There is no justification to change the originally designated open space area to single-family residential use (Church). It would be desirable to retain open space surrounding the community center (civic & commercial center).

(Single-Family) (Modified) #15 -- Low-Density Apartment and Open Space to Single-Family

This request is acceptable; however, the open space area already designated should be retained.

Approve #16 -- Low-Density Apartment and Public Facility (Elementary School) to Single-Family Land Use

The request is acceptable on the basis that an adequate area is reserved for an elementary school in the future plan of the remaining area of Mililani Town.

(Medium-Density Apartment) (Modified) #17 -- Open Space to Medium-Density Apartment

The conversion of some of the areas is due to the change of planning policy by the developer. The new proposal is to include the entire area from the Waiahole Ditch to the roadway frommedium-density apartment uses. However, it was felt by the staff that the open space of 15.9 acres, already designated, should be retained.

MR. MORIO OMORI represented Waipio Land Company and Dr. & Mrs. Stearns, abutting property owners, whose properties would be involved in the requested amendments. He did not wish to testify against the Detailed Land Use Map Amendments but merely to clarify the Kipapa Street access. He presented the following points:

1. The proposal shows a "proposed" roadway, which is actually an existing roadway and should be shown as such on the Detailed Land Use Map.

2. The existing "Kipapa Street" has not been dedicated and is not part of the City street system.

3. There is a right-of-way owned by the State which serves the traffic out to Kamehameha Hwy.

4. There is no provision for keeping or maintaining this access which has existed and used as a public road for many years.

5. An application for zoning was submitted in 1968 to the Planning Commission and the Planning Director by Dr. Stearns and the Waipio Community Association on this matter.

6. The State was contacted since it owns the right-of-way known as "Easement R", a 15-foot roadway which is part of the public domain, in existence since 1932. The developer owns the balance of 35 feet.

7. The Detailed Land Us Map does not show Easement R and, by some inadvertency, the whole area on the map was colored red.

8. Two letters had been received from the State agencies with jurisdiction in this matter: (1) Dr. Fujio Matsuda, Director of the Department of Transportation, State of Hawaii, dated June 18, 1968, and (2) Mr. Sunao Kido, Department of Land and Natural Resources, State of Hawaii, dated July 22, 1968. (The letters were read and submitted to the Commission for the record.)

9. Although this is a proposal from private developers, in view of the position of the State and the Community, and the adverse effect the closing or re-routing of traffic would have on the business located on Kipapa Street, the Commission should General Plan a roadway and designate it as such on the Detailed Land Use Map for future use.

10. The easement owned by the State should not be zoned for commercial purposes as it is presently being used as a roadway. Also, it may possibly increase damages in the event of condemnation proceedings.

11. The Commission has followed this policy in other cases where there is a proposed widening or taking of roadways to zone only that portion which would not be involved in any right-of-way in order to avoid higher acquisition costs.

12. When his clients' were granted zoning changes to permit commercial uses adjoining Kipapa Street, one of the conditions for construction was a 10-foot setback on the Wahiawa side of Kipapa Street (where the Texaco Station is presently located with a 10-foot setback).

13. The Commission was urged to consider designating an extension of the present Kipapa Street.

14. His clients' three lots fronting on Kamehameha Highway were shown on the map.

15. Easement R provides access to the school.

16. Dr. and Mrs. Stearns also own the property in the back and, since it abuts the highway, access is provided through Kipapa Street.

Mr. Chun reported that information received indicates the Detailed Land Use Map does show the roadway in the actual plan and there is no intention of eliminating it.

In answer to questions by the Commission, Mr. George Yim, Vice President of Mililani Town, explained the following:

1. The easement was appurtenant to the school when first sold.

2. This easement, which leads up to the school, is merely a 15-foot wide dirt road over private property.

3. There has never been a demand on this easement from any governmental agencies.

4. Letters on file specifically forbid the use of that road.

5. They are not permitted to put a road in there, and neither is it an opportunity for gain from future condemnation.

6. This is not a request for amendment, but the applicant should consult with the State Department of Transportation and the City Department of Traffic before any action is taken on the easement.

7. The road is very dangerous to come out of and on to the intersection.

8. It is depriving the Doctor of customers to his commercial area by not putting a road in there.

9. They should be concerned with the development concept and the proper development of Mililani Town.

10. Easement R will be improved to City Standards and will be 60-foot wide and dedicated as a public street.

11. They are not allowed to divert any traffic generated by Mililani Town through the easement since it is only 15 feet wide. The fee is owned by Mililani Town.

12. This is an easement in favor of the State--a land court property, so no one acquired the right to use it over the years, and there is no provision under land court for descriptive rights-of-way, so the holder of the right is the City or the State. In this case it is the State.

The Director replied to questions by the Commissioners:

1. In the original layout, the City did not intend to expand this road or acquire additional properties in motion from a substandard roadway--only for that portion from the school.

2. It is preferred not to go out to the service station to the intersection. It exists as an access roadway and will continue, by the fact that it exists and provides access along a portion of the property.

3. We wouldn't want to see any expansion because it is felt that the circulation will be much more improved with another alignment.

4. The developer's pattern is a proper one.

5. It would not be in the best interest to continue the roadway all the way out.

6. From a traffic circulation standpoint, this is not a desirable roadway for a major accessway even it it were widened. But, as an interim measure to provide access to the school, it is satisfactory.

7. With the commercial and apartment developments that will occur, it is a less satisfactory connection to Kamehameha Highway as it is on a curve.

8. If the State does not make use of the roadway, then it would be desirable to have it referred to the owners of the fee over a longer period of time and provided that the requirements of the adjoining property owners are met, as presented by Mr. Omori.

9. If this had been deeded to the City instead of to the State, the City would not have accepted it as a roadway because it does not meet City standards.

10. It might be recommended to the State that the easement be eliminated since it is an access easement across private property and not in the best interest of the public welfare.

11. The Staff feels that there should not be a road coming through, and we should not General Plan it.

Mr. Mark Hastert, Planning Coordinator for Mililani Town, Inc., spoke generally about the areas which are in conflict with their proposals and the Planning Department's proposals:

In agreement -- Proposals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16.
In conflict --- Proposals 10, 12, 14, 15, 17.

Items #10 and #12

Height:

Planning Department recommended switching #10 to low-density and #12 to medium-density.

Mililani recommended medium-density, low-density and residential.

These were all zoned commercial and now the CZC requires separation between commercial and apartment.

Mililani requested two parcels to be medium-density apartments (these were shown as town house and low-density apartments). They would like to continue to hold that particular approach since they have gone ahead with master planning and actually put in utilities on the street systems and shown the area currently under improvement now. Utilities are to service the low-density apartments and medium-density apartments and it would be an added burden on the applicant to try to revert back to the particular land use.

Mililani does not feel that a density higher than what would be permitted in an A-2 zoning will be proposed; it will be kept at 30-35 units per acre and will be no higher than 3 stories so that it will not be an imposing site on Waipio Acres, or will cause any invasion of privacy.

Items #14 and #17

There is a major conflict in thinking:

Mililani felt they shouldn't be held to the line which initially was intended to be a very weak definition of boundary. Since the initial Detailed Land Use Map, they have moved the golf course and put in several small parks. This is the third amendment, and that particular area is under development right now so it will not be changed again.

Mr. Yamabe felt that the question of boundaries should be left up to the administration.

Mr. Hastert explained that there are buffers, not parks, between the commercial center and the residential area and proposed that instead of an extremely wide buffer, that a buffer be retained on both sides of Waiahole Ditch. He did not want to burden the Mililani Town Homeowner's Association with such a large open space area as 300 feet to 600 feet to maintain, when an area of 200 feet to 300 feet would serve the same purpose. (Later, in discussion, it was agreed among Messrs. Way, Brennan, and Hastert that the buffer area could be 100 feet to 300 feet.)

The City has expressed interest in taking only 5 acres of park next to the school and a regional park. On the other large portion (left-hand corner of schematic plan) which is undeveloped and separated by the Waiahole Ditch, there would be a church and they would not go into single-family because of access problems off of this street.

Mililani is proposing that the green belt system be extended through the townhouse complex and into the commercial center or around the high school or around to the apartment areas. There will be a pedestrian overpass over Kamehameha Highway to connect the areas on the other side.

Mililani feels that breaking the open space down is far better from a standpoint of usability, economy, maintenance, and general benefits of the community, and recommends that the portion (open space #17) be all in medium-density apartment.

Mr. Hastert recalled that in the meeting last week, the Planning Commission recommended increasing the urban zoning to include a portion over in the area left of #15 involving approximately 225 acres. He stated, "That particular portion is shown on the Detailed Land Use Map as mostly open space now and if the staff's intent on recommending giving up this particular piece of property was that we continue to develop a segment of the town, primarily residential and townhouses, this would be in conflict with the open space shown on the map and we would have the same problems." He stressed that problems would be incurred if the development is not done according to the applicant's General Plan.

Item #15

Mililani also objected to #15 as low-density apartment area and recommended that it be designated for single-family residential uses as originally proposed.

If open space is chosen, there is a question as to whether or not this area would be sufficient to economically develop as single-family residential uses. Instead of open space along Waiahole Ditch going through #14 and #15, the walkway would exist on the buffer.

During discussion of items in which there were disagreement, several other points were brought out:

1. How is it intended to get the metes and bounds on the buffer zone?

   Mr. Way thought it would be based on the topography and its relationship to the site plan development of the area and that it would have to come after detailed studies of the layout.

2. Commercial area.

   Mr. Way pointed out that there is no indication that there was going to be an adjustment on the other side for the commercial area.

3. Items #14 and #15

   Mr. Way stated that the Detailed Land Use Map, where the original concept was to provide for an open space corridor where it would be useful, particularly in relation to the low-density apartment area should be studied. He felt that the original plan was still valid.

4. Mr. Hastert explained the basis for the open space by taking the amount of acreage in developed parks, open space (including gulches).

   The original Detailed Land Use Map shows approximately 365 acres and a calculation was made on the 365 acres which is almost identical--they are just redistributing the open space.

Mr. Journ Yee of Maunahali Development Corporation,owner of one of the parcels located near Mililani Town, made two comments:

1. The traffic circulation would be improved by not maintaining the easement. Although not shown on the map, the road dips down and is quite dangerous for ingress and egress purposes.

2. They were not notified of the recommended Detailed Land Use Map amendment to change the zoning of this parcel from medium-density to low-density, and are not in agreement with this proposal. They own the parcel that is not colored and which is zoned for medium-density. The area was already zoned medium-density apartment for at least eight or nine years during development of homes in Waipio Acres. He felt that the medium-density apartment zoning is quite appropriate because there is quite a bit of variable separation between the parcel and houses below, and it would not be objectionable. There is the view of the Waianae mountain range area. More important is the kind of design that will go into that type of development. Mr. Yee was requested to discuss this matter with the Planning Department staff.

No one spoke against the proposal.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement on the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

ACTION: Mr. Yamabe moved that this matter be deferred for further discussion between the applicant and the Planning Department staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried.

PUBLIC HEARING
SUBDIVISION RULES
AND REGULATIONS
(AMENDMENTS)
DEDICATION OF PARKS
AND PLAYGROUNDS OR
THE PAYMENT OF MONEY
IN LIEU THEREOF

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal for an amendment to Chapter 22, R.O. 1961, Subdivision Rules and Regulations by adding thereto a new article to be numbered Article 6, relating to dedication of land for Parks and Playgrounds or the payment of money in lieu thereof, as a condition precedent to final approval of a subdivision.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of August 24, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, American Institute of Planners, American Society of Civil Engineers, Home Builders Association, and to the Outdoor Circle.

The following letters received prior to the meeting, were reviewed by the Commission:

IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL:

Trustees of the Estate of James Campbell, Deceased (Signed by Messrs. Davis, Randolph, and Collins) September 4, 1969.

AGAINST THE PROPOSAL:

1. Journ T. Yee, Vice President, Finance Realty Co., Ltd., September 4, 1969.

2. Charles Hamane, Chairman, Builder/Developer Committee Home Builders Association of Hawaii, September 4, 1969.

(See Files: Park Dedication Folder #2)

Mr. Paul Devens, Corporation Counsel, was present to answer questions relating to the legal aspect.

Mr. Jack Gilliam, staff planner, reviewed some of the significant provisions of the proposed ordinance:

1. This is an ordinance which would require dedication of land for parks and playgrounds as a condition precedent to final approval of any subdivision in which the zoning or the land use plan is in a residential or apartment designation. If, in some conditions, taking of land is not feasible, it provides for payment of money in lieu, thereof, of the dedication.

2. This proposed ordinance is essentially the same ordinance which was before the City Council approximately a year ago; and the ordinance has been revised to reflect the changes in land use and zoning designations which have occurred by the adoption of the Comprehensive Zoning Code.

3. The amount of dedication required would be dependent upon the zoning classification. For example: In an R-1 Residential District, with a minimum lot size of one acre, 0.72 percent of the gross area subdivided would be required to be dedicated. In residential districts, in the event the land to be dedicated is less than three acres, then the "in-lieu of dedication" would be required instead of the actual dedication.

4. In cases where the topography of the land involved is not suitable for parks, then the "in-lieu of dedication" would be applied.

5. This "in-lieu of dedication" would be at fair market value of the land area that would be required for the park dedication.

6. The standards used for residential districts (based on the derivative percentage) are as follows:

	Park Area To Be Dedicated	Per Population Of	Population Based On
Residential	2 acres	1,000	4 persons per Dwelling Unit
A-1 Low-Density Apt. District	2 acres	1,000	2.3 persons per Dwelling Unit
Medium and High-Density Apt. Districts	1-1/2 acres	1,000	1.7 persons per Dwelling Unit

This is roughly the standard for a neighborhood park. It was found that there is a different relationship of people per unit in the apartment district and in the residential district; therefore, the percentages are based on the various districts according to these standards.

7. In any subdivided land which may be zoned residential, but designated on the General Plan as apartment, the land area for dedication would be based on the apartment category and not the residential zoning.

8. The term "Apartment District", for purposes of this section, shall include areas zoned for apartments and, in addition, areas designated for apartments on the adopted General Plan or Detailed Land Use Map.

9. There are terms set up for the evaluation and appraisal of land when the "in-lieu of dedication" method is used.

10. There are provisions for providing credit to private parks within a subdivision, perhaps in a cluster development, and also in planned developments where there are subdivisions.as meeting the requirements of the dedication. For instance, the land would be designated as private parks, and restrictive covenants would be required making the City a consent party to assure that the private parks could not be eliminated without the consent of the City Council.

Mr. Devens presented information on: (1) a brief history of the enabling legislation, (2) the legality of the proposed ordinance, (3) his comments as to the ordinance itself, and (4) some of the many complexities.

History: "The proposed ordinance is an outgrowth of the old and long-accepted dedication of streets by subdividers or builders. The ability of the builder to use the land and to profit thereby has caused the Court to support laws that would require him to dedicate streets and roadways. This is an extension of that concept. It goes beyond the streets and roadways, into parks and recreation areas."

Legality: Legislation of this type has been tested in various areas. In a couple of jurisdictions, it has been attacked constitutionally instead of tried. It has prevailed in most jurisdictions where it has been tested.

The typical constitutional grounds raised are based on a 'taking of the land' without just compensation which is called for under the United States Constitution and in most State Constitutions.

Most of the Courts have held legislation on the theory that it is constitutional because there is no taking of the land and it is controlling the use of the land under the police powers of the State.

The most recent case arose in California, filed by The Associated Homebuilders of the Greater East Bay Area in conjunction with the Homebuilders Council of California. We have been in contact with the City Attorney and it is now before the Court of Appeals in California but no decision has yet been handed down. Counsel feels confident, however, that it will be upheld. In the lower court's decision, it was indicated that (a) California Cities and Counties state that the population explosion will bring about an ever-increasing demand for more local parks and recreation facilities, (b) neighborhoods lack local park and recreational facilities altogether or have woefully inadequate park and recreation space, (c) in cities and counties throughout the State, there are not enough tot lots, playgrounds, play fields and other local recreational facilities, and (d) in the fast growing communities and counties, the Recreation and Park Commissioners, recreation executives, and officials of school districts in which the facilities are being used for recreation purposes live in an atmosphere of continuing crisis.

The attorney handling the litigation in California wrote an article in which he states:

'In two and one-half years, the City of Walnut Creek, California (over 33,850 residents) collected $52,770 in money in lieu of land, and 5,200 acres of land with an estimated value of $78,750.'

Comments:

California chose 'dedication' and not 'perpetuity'.

There are large estates here in the islands which have acquired land under various conditions. Now the people need the land back. We need the land rather than the money.

The law is quite clear. It provides that 'Each county shall adopt ordinances (and that much is clear--we've got to adopt it) to require a subdivider, as a condition preceding the final approval of a subdivision, to (1) provide land in perpetuity for park and playground facilities for the use of the purchasers or occupants of lots in subdivisions, or (2) to dedicate land for park and playground facilities for the use of the purchasers or occupants of lots.' If we have such an ordinance, then it would be an open violation of the law to grant a subdivision approval when the conditional precedent has not been met. But we can not do it until we have such an ordinance.

Apparently, there was some distinction in the minds of the legislators between (1) providing land in perpetuity, or (2) dedicating land. However, the statute does not make clear as to whether the developer is given the option.

The ordinance under consideration gives the County the option as to which it will require of the subdivider. The option was not meant to be given to the developer.

Regarding 'land in perpetuity', the Corporation Counsel's Office has tried to determine the intent. There are some hints. In the first draft that came out of the Senate, it was stated:

> 'He who provides the land in perpetuity must maintain that land after he has provided it for park purposes.' The theory seems to be that fee title would remain in he who provides the land in perpetuity for park and playground purposes.

In the second draft, the above sentence was withdrawn and they adopted a provision that is tacked on to the end of the bill which says, 'Whether the land is provided for in perpetuity or is dedicated -- in either case -- the County will maintain it!.

It should be decided as to the type of park which meets the demand of subdivision-type communities. A 2-acre to 3-acre park site is considered more of a neighborhood-type park.

A request for a legal definition of a 'park' brought on the following definition of terms used in the ordinance:

Park --------- Place of recreation available and open to the public to rest.

Decorative Park ---- For the elderly.

Active Park -- Tot lots, ball fields, gymnasiums, tennis courts, etc.

Passive Park-- Visual, not active.

Perpetuity --- Forevermore. If no longer used, may be given back to the giver.

Dedication --- Equivalent of a conveyance, or grant. A setting aside for a particular purpose. A transfer of property, a gift.

Deed --------- A sealed instrument in writing, duly executed and delivered, containing some transfer, bargain or contract.

Deeding ------ To convey or transfer by deed.

Complexities:

1. Is a horizontal condominium considered a subdivision?

2. Would there be parks for condominiums?

3. Someone might take a liberal view and say: "The whole purpose of this thing is to provide space for people living in relatively dense subdivided areas and want greenery made available." (It may go to court).

4. Would title rest with the giver of the land?

5. In future legislation, should the ordinance be expanded to include schools and fire stations? (Schools and fire stations were included in the original draft by the legislators, but then omitted after a Committee report).

6. Regarding the "choice" of paying in monetary form if you do not dedicate land, do we sacrifice the land and take the money and not make available park lands? Build a stadium instead? Use the money for other than the original intent and purpose? Combine land with an adjoining school site on the edge of a subdivision?

7. Shouldn't it be the option of the City and not the developer to determine whether it shall be dedication of land or money? Otherwise, you could have urban development without parks or recreational area in the immediate vicinity.

8. Must we include the portion "provide land in perpetuity" within the ordinance?

9. To "provide land in perpetuity" might have been included with the type of landowning system that we have in Hawaii--large holdings by either private individuals or state, who grant development rights to others on long-term leases during which the land can be developed but who might, as a charitable estate, want to hang on to the fee title to the land.

10. There may be a situation of a large land owner granting development rights to an individual where the developer must turn to the land owner and ask him to provide the land in perpetuity. Then the land owner may, in the interest of moving the development of his land in a subdivision manner, provide for a perpetual use for park and playground facilities. In theory, in the event you have an eventual condemnation of this land, if it becomes blighted, and there is redevelopment or renewal of the area without providing park space in the plan that was originally granted title, would it revert back to the owner?

11. Do the enabling statutes allow credit for private parks and playgrounds?

12. The "payment in-lieu of" provision has not been tested in any other state at this time.

13. When fee is paid, what is the valuation of land?

14. In an area of 2,000 acres with partial development on an incremental basis, how do you develop the type of park needed in the best interests of the community? (as you move along or on a long-range basis?)

15. Golf courses and schools -- net area of dedication?

16. Maintenance (Mr. DeLos Seeley of the Department of Parks and Recreation was requested to do a study).

17. Would the developers have to pay for the additional costs such as improvements -- roads and utilities up to the park lot?

18. In the event the total area required and dedicated is less than three acres, could it be divided up into several smaller parcels?

Testimony against the proposal was received from the audience.

Mr. Journ T. Yee, Vice President of Finance Realty Co., Ltd., developers of the Makakilo City Subdivision in Ewa, stated that he would like to speak more for the prospective home buyers and owners than a home builder. He had a very brief statement which he did not read but submitted to the Director prior to the meeting which he summarized:

1. Parks and playgrounds are very desirable and we should have them.

2. Our attorneys feel that there are some reservations for their constitutional honor.

There are many questions to be considered:

1. Standards:

   a. Amount of land area required in terms of various zoning and how does this compare with previous proposals to amend the ordinance?

2. Can we afford it?

3. Who should pay for it?

   a. 75% of the people here can no longer afford single-family housing.

   b. Makakilo prices range from $27,000 to $30,000 -- the lowest priced home requires $850 per month earnings to qualify.

   c. The subdivider or home builder does not make enough profit. Therefore, each time that the City subdivision standards or requirements are added, the cost will have to be passed on to the buyer.

d. Problems of underground electric and telephone wiring.

e. What is more important--to provide much needed housing to a greater number of people, or provide other things which the home buyers cannot afford?

f. Some of the "cost" problems -- on-site improvements such as sewage treatment plant facilities, water system, access roads, underground electric and telephone utilities. On the mainland these are provided for by the municipality and paid for by taxing.

Mr. Yee still insisted that the basic problem is that there will be additional costs. The playgrounds are desirable but the added cost will reduce the number of people that can afford these homes. It is a matter of "who is going to pay for them". Regular tax revenues or the new home buyers? Site improvement costs are several times more than the value of the land. At about $1,200 per acre, the pro rated off-site improvement costs would be approximately $720 per home. Under the R-6 Residential zoning, the requirement is 5.9% gross area for parks. That would reduce the number of lots by something like 7.7% because roadways to serve the parks must still be provided.

Speaking in favor of the proposal was Mr. William Van Allen, representing Bishop Estate, He stated that the Trustees of Bishop Estate are in favor of giving land for the parks. However, they feel there is one very serious problem -- that of maintenance.

It is felt that there should be a safeguard to provide for maintenance of these public parks to be sure that this land does not lie fallow for five, ten or fifteen years. Perhaps a reversionary provision in the conveyance would assure adequate maintenance in order that the surrounding land is not deteriorated or depreciated in value as a result of poor maintenance by the City and County.

Also, they feel that it may be appropriate to raise the minimum park acreage to a larger figure so that the maintenance burden and money will not be a problem.

He suggested that the percentages be based on the net area rather than gross area to encourage adequate open space, adequate roadways, and discourage taxation on taxation.

In view of the questions raised by the Corporation Counsel, Mr. Van Allen suggested more study be made before proceeding further with the ordinance.

Mr. Yamabe inquired that if such an ordinance is enacted, whether Bishop Estate will make direct dedication to the City or would the dedication be made by the developers or subdividers. Mr. Van Allen replied that the Trustees would convey the land by deed. It would be of dedication to the City. The developers, of course, would have to provide the improvements under this ordinance. They would have to bring the roads and utilities up to the park lot.

Recognizing that the developer will add the additional costs to pass on to the development costs, etc., Mr. Yamabe questioned whether the developers would be burdened with the additional costs of having to pay for that additional land that is set aside for dedication.

Mr. Van Allen gave a negative reply and indicated that the land would not be a charge to the developer. It goes directly to the City and County as dedication by the land owner just as the Trustees dedicate the roadways and other easements that are required for a development, which would be the normal procedure.

Mr. DeLos Seeley, Department of Parks and Recreation, expressed endorsement of the department of the proposed amendment and urged early expediting of the amendment because experience of several years will be the basis for perfecting it.

At Mr. Yamabe's request, Mr. Seeley will, in the next several weeks,make a study of the ordinance in relation to what the responsibility of the Department of Parks and Recreation will be in maintaining the area, the cost of maintaining tot lots, etc.

Mr. Sakai stated that they are looking into this program along with the Department of Parks and Recreation and hope to come up with some standards to be presented in the next budget the latter part of this year.

Mr. Rutledge requested to have included in the ordinance, where it speaks of money in lieu of land, that such money be earmarked for maintenance in the parks which the City may acquire.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Brennan, closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

ACTION: In later consideration, the Commission deferred action for further study and information. Mr. Yamabe cast a negative vote.

ZONING
A-3 APARTMENT
DISTRICT
MAKAHA
NORTHEAST OF
MAKAHA
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
(MAKAHA VALLEY,
INC.)
69/Z-26

On August 21, 1969, a public hearing was held to consider a request for a change in zoning from R-6 Residential District to A-3 Apartment District for an area of land containing 13.746 acres of land situated 3,000 feet northeast of Makaha Elementary School in Makaha Valley in Waianae, and identified by Tax Map Key 8-4-2: portion of Parcel 5. Action was deferred pending a visit to the site.

ACTION: The Commission again deferred action, upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Bright. (Commissioners Yamabe and Ingleson refrained from voting).

CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT
WAIMANALO
NORTH OF
KULAIWI STREET
(PACIFIC CONCRETE
AND ROCK CO., LTD.)
69/CUP-10

The Commission again considered a request for a Conditional Use Permit to continue the operation of a quarry, rock crushing,sand, and batching plant on an area containing 33.34 acres, situated north of Kulaiwi Street in Waimanalo and identified by Tax Map Key 4-1-08: Parcel 3, within an AG-1 Restricted Agricultural District.

A public hearing was held and closed on August 21, 1969 at which time the Commission deferred action pending a visit to the site.

Mr. Chun reported that a field trip to the site was taken. Also, the home of a farmer, Mr. Wong, who had registered a complaint at the public hearing, was being moved by Pacific Concrete and Rock Co.

The Director recommended that the application for a Conditional Use Permit to continue the operation of a quarry and rock crushing and batching plant for a period of 20 years be approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. The requirements as set forth under Section 21-248 of the Comprehensive Zoning Code entitled, "Extractive Industries", shall apply.

2. All of the terms and conditions as indicated under the Land License No. A-101, Department of Hawaiian Homes Lands, shall apply except as modified by Section 21-248 of the Comprehensive Zoning Code and other conditions listed herewith.

3. The ingress and egress to the subject site shall be restricted to the 50-foot roadway presently being used for such purpose. Said roadway shall have an oil treated surface and shall be maintained in good order at all times.

4. A gate, at least 6 feet in height, shall be installed at the entrance road to the site at Kalanianaole Highway. Said gate shall blend in with the residential character of the area and shall be locked except during quarry operation.

5. Entry to the site shall be limited to authorized personnel and a sign so stating shall be posted at the gate.

6. Adequate safeguards shall be provided to prevent access by children by installing a chain link fence at least 6 feet in height along the makai boundary of subject site and along both sides of the 50-foot entrance road within 3 months upon approval of the Conditional Use Permit.

7. Trees and shrubbery of adequate height acceptable to the Planning Department shall be planted within 3 months upon approval of conditional use permit, along the inner portion of the chain link fence to screen the subject site from the highway and the residential area and to shield all sources of illumination from the subject site toward the residential area.

8. Drainage facilities shall be constructed in accordance with requirements of the City Department of Public Works.

9. A buffer strip at least 100 feet wide shall be provided makai of the subject site for the buffering of noise and other disturbances of the site from the residential area. The buffer strip shall be planted with ground cover, trees and shrubbery acceptable to the Planning Department within one year upon approval of the conditional use permit.

10. The quarry operation shall cease during Kona (southerly) wind weather upon inspection and determination by the Planning Department that the people living in the area will be adversely affected by dust.

11. Every precaution will be taken to minimize dust problem by frequent wetting of dry, dust-prone areas.

12. The facilities for quarry operations shall be constructed in accordance with the map entitled, "Proposed Layout of Crushing Plant, Waimanalo Quarry," marked "Exhibit A," and shall be made a part of the conditional use permit and changes shall be made only upon approval by the Planning Department.

13. The finished grade of the subject site upon termination of excavation shall be in accordance with the map marked "Exhibit B" and entitled, "Grading Plan and Section." Sufficient soil shall be provided and compacted to allow the reuse of the subject site for residential purposes.

14. If the site is to be excavated by increment, the completed increment shall be re-vegetated with ground cover, plant materials and trees acceptable to the Planning Department for aesthetic purposes and for adequate preparation for reuse.

15. The Planning Director of the Planning Commission may impose additional conditions as may be warranted to protect the health, safety or comfort of persons living in the area.

16. Upon finding that any of the conditions imposed are not being complied with, the City Council may authorize the Planning Director or the Planning Commission to revoke the permit or to suspend operation until compliance with said conditions is obtained.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission recommended approval of the Conditional Use Permit, subject to the 16 conditions stated above.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
MANOA
2642 PAMOA ROAD AND 2730 HIPAWAI PLACE
(SCOPE CORP.)
69/CUP-3

The Commission again considered a request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct and operate the following:

(a) three-story and four-story dormitory buildings for 850 students.

(b) a two-story commons building.

(c) a one-half story parking building for 252 cars

covering 6.045 acres and identified by Tax Map Keys 2-9-13: Parcels 12 and 51, and 2-9-23: Parcels 2, 3, 8, 13 and 14. The area is within an R-4 Residential District.

A public hearing was held on August 21, 1969, and action was deferred pending submittal of a revised plan by the applicant.

The Planning Director reported earlier receipt of the revised plan, and a letter of transmittal received just prior to the meeting, but that he had not had an opportunity to review the plans in detail. The extent

of the changes in the amendment to the plan involves essentially an adjustment of the parking areas -- the removal of parking from one of the sites and the placing of it on another site in connection with the administration, dining, and living facilities.

Mr. Chun suggested that since the applicant submitted its revised plan within the two weeks specified by the Commission, the plans be reviewed by the Planning Department. The Department was requested to consult with the Corporation Counsel in the event that legal questions are raised as to whether or not the hearing must be re-opened or a new hearing called. The applicant was informed to consult with the Planning Department as to procedure.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission deferred action for review of the revised plans by the staff and to report back to the Commission.

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION (URBAN DISTRICT) WAIPIO (MILILANI TOWN, INCORPORATED)

Prior to consideration of the Petition, Mr. Ingleson declared a Conflict of Interest and left the room.

The Commission again reviewed a petition filed by Mililani Town, Incorporated (requesting an amendment to the State Land Use Commission District Boundary Map by changing the land use district classification from Agricultural to Urban District) for approximately 2,500 acres of land located in the Waipio area. The Commission had deferred action at its meeting of August 28, 1969 for further information.

The Director reviewed the petition:

1. The request covers a proposal for redesignating approximately 2,500 acres of land from Agricultural to Urban District located in the Waipio area.

2. The City and County General Plan for Central Oahu indicates urban uses for 2,000 acres of Waipio lands. This was adopted August 30, 1962.

3. In April 1964, the Land Use Commission approved and classified 705 acres as urban.

4. Subsequent district boundary amendments have increased the total urban classification in the area to 760 acres.

5. The original request, dating back to March 21, 1962, was for a 3,000-acre General Plan revision.

6. The applicant, in his testimony at the last meeting, stated that if anything at all, he desires the makai portion of the lands requested, as shown on the map, and scheduled for beginning of the years 1971, 1972 and 1973. All of this portion is within the General Plan, but has not been included in any existing Detailed Land Use Map yet.

Mr. Chun agreed with Mr. Sharpless that the Commission should take the same approach in considering this recommendation as the Land Use Commission will take in looking at the request -- that the area recommended to the Land Use Commission be in conformity with what the developer intends to do within the near future, and as it is compatible with its present development.

ACTION: Mr. Yamabe moved that although the application indicates 2,500 acres, the Commission consider only that portion indicated on the plan for development for 1971, 1972 and 1973 on the makai side of the highway involving 600 acres. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brennan and carried.

The reason for Mr. Yamabe's motion was that he felt that while the applicant is requesting a change for 2,500 acres of land from Agricultural to Urban District, only 600 acres should be considered which is part of the adopted General Plan; no zoning has taken place in this area yeat; the Land Use Commission has the incremental boundary; further increments may be considered when the applicant returns with its zoning request.

Mr. Chun stated that in the event the Land Use Commission does not agree in changing the land use designation, it would not be within the jurisdiction of this Commission to consider any requests with respect to those lands which are still in Agricultural designation.

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION (URBAN DISTRICT) WAIPAHU (HSM VENTURES AND ROBINSON TRUSTS)

The Commission again reviewed a petition submitted by HSM Ventures and Robinson Trusts, et al, for an amendment to the Land Use Commission District Boundary by changing the district classification from Agricultural to Urban District for an area of land containing 316.4 acres situated between Kunia Road and Waikele Gulch, mauka of the H-1 Freeway in Waipahu, and identified by Tax Map Key 9-4-02: Parcel 17.

Mr. Ramon Duran, Executive Officer of the State Land Use Commission, in a letter dated June 23, 1969 to the Planning Director, requested: "In view of the time lapse and the rapid changes occurring on Oahu, would the

Planning Department and Planning Commission reconsider and re-evaluate their positions on this matter at the earliest opportunity."

Mr. Brennan questioned the request of the Land Use Commission and further questioned whether this has ever been done before.

Mr. Duran replied, "I don't think that we're asking that you change your recommendation but merely to re-evaluate. To my recollection, I don't know that the Commission has ever asked the County to reconsider their application or recommendation. However, there have been many instances where the Commission itself has reversed its original recommendation or changed it, and just a month ago one occurred on Maui."

Time Schedule of Action to date:

July 7, 1967

First Petition filed requesting reclassification of 352 acres from Agricultural to Urban. Data in the petition adequately justified forecasts for the Waipahu area population increase and the business opportunities and employment sources coupled with the increasingly improved pattern of highways and the diminishing available urban designated lands.

August 24, 1967

Planning Department staff recommended denial because of the absence of new compelling reasons to favor or oppose proposal; proposal somewhat spare in content; lack of urgency in changing the City's development policy; should reserve decision until 1969.

Planning Commission deferred action for 15 days for further study.

September 6, 1967

Planning Department staff recommended denial because (1) doubtful Waipahu will sustain recent phenomenal growth rate, (2) Island-wide total urban reserve is more than adequate, (3) alteration of urban districts should be reserved for 1969, and (4) portion of area lies in a blast area.

September 7, 1967

Planning Commission approved petition for reclassification of 352 acres from Agricultural to Urban.

October 25, 1967

Planning Department staff planner recommended denial and re-study of land now zoned for Residential.

October 28, 1967

Land Use Commission staff recommended denial because (1) no proof submitted that the area is needed for other than that which it is classified, (2) should prevent the shifting of prime agricultural land into non-revenue producing residential uses when other lands are available for urban need. However, the Land Use Commission staff did recommend that Parcel "C" above the H-1 Highway remain Agricultural but that the two remnant parcels "A" and "B" mauka of the Highway be rezoned to Urban in order that the H-1 Highway may serve as a logical district boundary between the prime agricultural lands and the urban uses within the Waipahu area.

Planning Director recommended denial. Planning Commission approved the petition.

November 14, 1967

Amendment of petition requested by petitioners deleting approximately 25 acres of blast zone area.

January 24, 1968

Land Use Commission staff recommended denial.

March 1, 1968

Land Use Commission staff recommended that the petitioned area mauka of H-1 Highway be denied since no overwhelming or compelling fact has been brought forth that would indicate this change could not be delayed until next year.

Land Use Commission by a vote of 6-2 denied the petition to reclassify 340 acres mauka of H-1 Highway and approved reclassification of 12 acres makai of H-1 Highway from Agricultural to Urban.

March 8, 1968

Land Use Commission voted in favor of a reconsideration of reclassification of the 340 acres.

March 23, 1968

Land Use Commission denied reclassification of the 340 acres mauka of H-1 Highway and approved the two parcels makai of the H-1 Highway.

Planning Commission deferred action for re-study.

July 16, 1968

Second petition filed requesting reclassification of 316.4 acres instead of 352 acres.

September 17, 1968

Planning Director recommended denial. There has been no persuasive reason for revising earlier staff recommendations.

September 19, 1968

Planning Commission recommended deferral and that the staff meet with applicant and request an extension to be forwarded to the Land Use Commission.

September 26, 1968

Extension granted.

October 3, 1968

Planning Commission approved reclassification of 316.4 acres.

October 10, 1968

Planning Director recommended denial for the following reasons:

a. The area in question is prime agricultural land.

b. There are suitable areas already designated urban in Waipahu which can be provided more economically and efficiently with existing public services and facilities.

c. The H-1 Freeway is considered an ideal barrier to separate agricultural and urban uses and control urban scatterization.

d. Desirable urban growth pattern would require encouragement of urban development along Pearl Harbor side of Farrington Highway.

e. The pattern of land ownership, particularly large estates, is the primary factor which discourages orderly urban growth.

f. There is no material evidence to revise the previous recommendation, but there is an urgent need for the

State Land Use Commission to undertake comprehensive review of land use at the earliest possible date, particularly in Waipahu where there is evidence of urban growth pressures.

Planning Commission approved reclassification of 316.4 acres based on the following reasons:

a. There is a demonstrated need for more moderately-priced single-family homes.

b. The development as proposed will be such that all public facilities and utilities, including sewer and water, schools, parks and playgrounds, and street improvements will be provided as essential elements of urbanization.

c. A consolidated urban development adjoining established Waipahu community will be more economical and efficient, particularly from the standpoint of public services, utilities and facilities including mass transit system.

d. The strict application of State Land Use Law may penalize developers who have demonstrated ability to construct moderately-priced single-family residences which are in demand.

e. Other areas on the Island of Oahu where urban growth has taken place should not be made primary criteria in demarcating boundaries of urban district.

f. Comprehensive review of Land Use District boundaries is presently essential and urgently needed. However, it should not be a factor in evaluating the desirability of the present application.

November 1, 1968

Land Use Commission staff recommended denial for the same reasons as one year ago on October 28, 1967.

Land Use Commission deferred action to September 12, 1969.

Planning Director recommended denial.

Planning Commission, at a public hearing, approved the reclassification of 316.4 acres to Urban.

December 10, 1968

Planning Director Skrivanek recommended approval because:

a. The site is contiguous to urban use and suitable to urban development.

b. The areas adjacent or nearby which are in the State Agricultural Districts are used for Military purposes which are more related to urban-type uses than to agricultural uses.

January 3, 1969

Mr. E. A. Williams of Eckbo-Dean-Austin-Williams recommended denial because developable land exists elsewhere.

January 17, 1969

Land Use Commission staff recommended denial as the petitioners have not submitted any significantly new evidence.

June 23, 1969

Extension granted.

The Executive Office of the State Land Use Commission requested a re-evaluation by the Planning Director and the Planning Commission in view of the time lapse and the rapid changes occurring on Oahu.

June 30, 1969

Extension granted.

July 2, 1969

Extension granted.

August 1, 1969

Planning Director Way recommended denial.

August 4, 1969

Planning Department staff recommended denial since circumstances have not changed.

August 24, 1969

Planning Director recommended denial as circumstances have not changed in the past year.

August 28, 1969

Planning Commission reconsidered and deferred action for one week.

At the August 28 meeting, the Planning Commission agreed that (1) re-evaluation should be considered, and (2) the applicants should be represented at today's meeting.

Mr. Stanley Mukai of Woodell, Mukai and Wirtz, representing HSM Ventures, asked if the Commission intended to decide whether or not to reconsider the decision of "approval" which was rendered in October 1968. He also reminded them that the Land Use Commission has set September 12, 1969 as the date for the vote on this petition and it has on hand the October 1968 favorable recommendation by this Planning Commission.

Mr. Chun replied that the three new members of the Commission would like to be informed as to the merits of the application and also determine for themselves the disposition of the application.

Mr. Ingleson explained that his request for "re-evaluation" was due to some changes that have taken place in the district boundaries in the planning area under consideration.

Mr. Mukai stated that he would be willing to present the same case which was presented in October 1968 although there have been changes -- the population has increased, the desire of the general public to own their own home has increased,and the cost of construction has increased -- all of which lend support again to the petitioners' argument that there is a real need for low-cost residential housing in this State and that the petitioners are capable of providing such housing.

When asked if his client could still provide a three-bedroom home for $21,000, he stated that his client had not informed him otherwise.

Mrs. Sullam and Mr. Ingleson, the new members, felt that since they had read the material furnished by the staff, they were ready to make a decision without further presentation. Mr. Chun felt that no further testimony was necessary. However, Mr. Mukai requested the opportunity of presenting additional testimony especially since the possible change in price of the homes had been questioned.

Although Mr. Chun was concerned that the Commission may be setting a precedent in reconsidering cases because of non-action by some other agency, he allowed the applicant the opportunity to present additional testimony.

Mr. Mukai stated that they had not intended to take a position but, as a matter of record, were requesting the Commission to stand by their October 1968 recommendation. He read the following letters in support of the application:

1. Mr. John Villaneueva, Chairman of the ILWU Local 142, dated September 4, 1969, indicating that by letter dated November 22, 1968, the ILWU now withdraws its objections with respect to HSM Venture Case No. 868-197 and endorses the petition as requested.

2. Waipahu Businessmen's Association dated September 4, 1969. The letter was submitted for the record.

3. Waipahu Community Association, dated September 4, 1969. The letter was submitted for the record.

Present were the following persons in favor of the petition:

1. Mr. George Okano, President of the Waipahu Businessmen's Association.

2. Mr. George Akahane, President of the Waipahu Community Association.

3. Mr. Frank Gibson, representing Robinson Trust.

4. Mr. Larry Matsuo, partner in the engineering firm of Park and Park. He was present to explain the WAIPAHU URBAN DISTRICT.

5. Mr. Herbert Horita, President of HSM Ventures.

Mr. Horita indicated that he had met with and received approval of endorsement of the petition from the following: the ILWU, Oahu Sugar Co., Department of Education, Parks Board, Waipahu Community Association, and Waipahu Businessmen's Association. He reviewed his "REPORT ON HARBOR VIEW SUBDIVISION AND LAND USE PETITION" dated November 18, 1968, making corrections and additions as hereby noted: (Report filed: LUC 65 - Waipahu - Robinson Trust).

<u>Page 2 - Item 5(a)</u>:

Water reservoir system -- Over $1 million. (compelled to put this in by the Planning Department).

<u>Page 2 - Item 5(b)</u>:

Sewer connection -- Approximately $1 million. (Paid for by HSM Ventures through association with the Robinson Trust owners).

<u>Page 2 - Item 6:</u>

Oahu Sugar Company, although growers of sugar cane, is endorsing the petition because they have ample sugar

cane land and are producing more cane and have more acreage than before.

Page 8 - Item 1:

Waipio-Mililani area -- of the initial 700 acres, they now have approximately only 550 acres.

Page 8 - Item 2:

Makakilo area has only 550 acres of developable land out of 1,229 acres.

Page 8 - Item 3:

Crestview - their planned sales price of $23,000 has increased to $30,600.

Page 9 - Item 4 (a):

Waipahu - also Sears Department Store in addition to GEM Department Store.

Page 9 - Item 4 (b):

Harbor View Subdivision Unit 6-B -- complete water service will be available October 15, 1969.

Page 9 - Item 4 (c):

Oahu Sugar Co. - Mr. Humme has indicated that their Master Plan for this area is anywhere from 10 to 15 years -- perhaps 20 years.

Page 9 - Item 5 (b):

Pearl City - average selling price is $32,500 to $43,000 and $1,300 per month income to qualify.

Page 9 - Item 6 (a):

Waiau-Kalauao - townhouse condominiums selling prices are now $29,500 to $42,000 with $1,200 per month income to qualify and payments of $250 per month.

Page 10 - Item 6 (a):

Waiau-Kalauao - single-family residences selling for $48,800 to $65,000 with $11,000 down payment and an income of $1,800 per month.

Page 10 - Item 7 (a):

Halawa-Aliamanu - apartment zoned lots which initially sold at $3 per square foot are now $4 per square foot. Another 130 lots which originally sold to speculating

contractors at $20,500 per lot are now selling from $53,000 in fee to $58,000 with 20% down and substantial monthly payments.

Additional information:

Waimalu area - 912 acres recently rezoned to urban of which Austin Estate owns 572 acres and the Bishop Estate 340 acres. Assumed sales price will be somewhere between $35,000 to $42,000.

In the latest Land Use Boundary review of August 1969, the only additional urbanized area in the Waipahu Urban District is;

117 acres above Momilani in Pearl City (to be used for the Pearl City School complex).

20 acres below the Waimano Home (for their own use).

230 acres for Federal and State Government (known as the Pearl City Peninsula).

23 acres for the interchange between Kam Highway and the H-1 Highway near Crestview.

230 acres which includes 100 acres of Leeward Community College, Federal and other State lands.

In summary, Mr. Horita indicated that there is no urban district reserve and, even if there were and it were developed, the people couldn't buy it because it would be too highly priced.

One of the problems of a developer is that there is no land available to build on unless it is bought third hand which puts the cost up. There are large landowners who do have literally hundreds of acres under urban use and have no intention of developing it except to sell in bulk, second or third hand, so that naturally there will be a high cost of development.

Mr. Rutledge then asked Mr. Horita if, as a developer and based on his experience, he thought it were feasible for the State government to take over large tracts of land and go into a joint venture with a developer so that people will then be able to get homes at a reasonable price.

Mr. Horita gave an affirmative reply if the government, in some manner, worked out a joint venture whereby they found the land, purchased it or condemned it, and made it available to a developer on which to build homes at a reasonable markup, then it definitely could be done.

Mr. Sharpless asked Mr. Horita to explain briefly how they have been able to offer housing in the area at a lower price.

Mr. Horita pointed out:

1. They have had more exposure to the problem than any other developer.

2. They were the first purchasers from the Robinson Estate.

3. They did not pay premiums and markups as second or third developers.

4. When you buy wholesale, you can sell cheaper.

5. Turnover gives the greatest profit. They will build 700 homes this year.

A discussion brought up the following questions and opinions:

1. In which direction should we expand the urban districts?

2. Actions of the various departments and commissions since the original filing of the petition.

3. The merits of the application.

4. Planning Department staff requested to make a study as to which way to expand.

5. Land Use laws written to:

   a. Protect prime agricultural land.

   b. Power over agriculture.

6. Vehicle necessary to bring urban land into the market.

7. How do you release lands that people are sitting on?

8. Action needed now to make low-cost housing available.

9. Alternatives other than agricultural areas.

10. Labor is too high for large agricultural development.

11. Commission is derelict in functions and duty if unable to provide means for low-cost housing.

12. Any type of housing or development must take place within a framework of reasonably good planning.

13. Once land becomes fee simple, there is the possibility that low-cost housing would be completely out of the question.

14. Lease of land is the most desirable method of providing home ownership. The only lands available for leasehold are agricultural areas.

15. Agricultural lands have been released gradually at tremendous profits to the agriculturist, according to the records.

16. The time has come to decide whether to protect a piece of land with good soil to grow sugar or to house people. Regardless of the opinion of the Land Use Commission, it is good planning and a step in the right direction to house the people.

17. The question is not agricultural land versus urban, but a balance. What do we need in this State? How can we best achieve it?

18. It is possible that in 15 or 20 years the land will be returned for planting purposes.

19. You can't protect agricultural lands unless you have some vehicle which would release other lands.

20. We have land inventory which we can't use. When there are people without a roof over their heads, then the first critical point of preference has to be low-cost housing.

21. When zoning is granted, development must begin. The increment idea was an excellent one.

22. The only wholesale land available for lease is the land presently owned by large estates.

There were now two questions before the Commission:

1. Whether or not the Commission wants to re-evaluate its position of October 1968.

2. Consider the application.

A discussion of the voting procedure brought about unanimous agreement that:

> Re-evaluation would be to re-discuss the details of the application for a change in the land use boundaries.

The reading of the minutes by the new members was evaluating the merits in addition to the additional new testimony and re-evaluation.

A motion will permit the discussion of the merits.

A vote to reconfirm is approving the merits of the application.

ACTION: Mr. Rutledge made the motion, "In light of the testimony, we have re-evaluated our position to the extent that we will re-affirm our position of October 1968 to recommend approval." The motion was seconded by Mr. Bright and carried. (Commissioners Sullam, Ingleson, and Yamabe cast negative votes).

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Bright, authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director:

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT KAULUWELA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT (HCHA HAWAII DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION) 69/CUP-18	(1) Prior to authorizing the calling of a public hearing, Commissioners Sullam and Ingleson declared a conflict of interest and completed a statement form for submission to the Mayor. An application for a Conditional Use Permit to allow for joint development of two or more adjacent lots for a Co-op housing project within the Kauluwela Redevelopment Project, identified by Tax Map Key 1-7-23.
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT HOUSING DISTRICT KANEOHE KANEOHE BAY DRIVE AIKAHI GARDENS (MID-PAC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND DAN OSTROW DEVELOPMENT CO.) PD-H-3	(2) Prior to authorizing the calling of a public hearing, Commissioner Ingleson declared a conflict of interest and completed a statement form for submission to the Mayor. A proposal for a Planned Development-Housing District to develop a townhouse complex consisting of 27 two-story apartment buildings totalling 148 units, together with a private community clubhouse and swimming pool, and off-street parking facilities for tenants and guests on approximately 25 acres of land situated on the mauka side of Kaneohe Bay Drive, opposite the City and County Sewage Treatment Plant in Kaneohe, identified by Tax Map Key 4-4-11: Portion of Parcel 3 within an R-3 Residential District.
ZONING B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT CIVIC CENTER QUEEN'S HOSPITAL SITE (THE QUEEN'S MEDICAL CENTER) 69/Z-12	(3) A change in zoning from A-2 Apartment District to B-2 Community Business District for land identified by Tax Map Keys 2-1-35: Parcels 1 and 3, and 2-1-36: Parcels 44, 50, 53, and 60, being the Queen's Hospital Site located within the Civic Center site of the Central Business District.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) LAIE, KAIPAPAU, HAUULA, MAKAO, KAPAKA, KALUANUI, PUNALUU, KAHANA, AND KAAAWA PLANNING AREA NO. 26 RESIDENTIAL USE

(4) An amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Laie, Kaipapau, Hauula, Makao, Kapaka, Kaluanui, Punaluu, Kahana, and Kaaawa, Planning Area No. 26, by changing the land use designation from Commercial to Residential use for land identified by Tax Map Key 5-4-04: Parcel 22.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT REVOLVING FUND EXTENSION OF LILIUOKALANI GARDENS

Resolution No. 317, requesting transfer of $27,000 from the Improvement Revolving Fund to the Department of Parks and Recreation for acquisition of 2,239 square feet of land, plus improvements, as an addition to Liliuokalani Gardens, Tax Map Key 1-7-20: Parcel 46, was referred by the City Council to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation.

The Director reviewed the staff report:

1. The property was appraised by the City and County Division of Land Survey and Acquisition at $25,000.

2. The appraisal figure was based upon the calculation of $10 per square foot or $22,390 for land and $2,610 for improvements -- a total of $25,000.

3. This estimate was for budgetary purposes.

4. The owner's offer was $27,000.

5. The Division of Land Survey and Acquisition, in a letter to the Department of Parks and Recreation on July 2, 1969 recommended approval of any settlement between their figure and the owner's.

6. The Planning Department staff recommends approval of Resolution No. 317.

Since it was Mr. Rutledge's belief that the appraisal figure was excessive, he made a motion to recommend denial of the proposal. (There was no section to the motion).

ACTION: Mr. Yamabe moved that this matter be deferred for an opinion from the Corporation Counsel as to whether the Planning Commission has the legal power to question the price of property to be acquired by the City and to use this price question as the basis for disapproving a

request for the acquisition of property; and to request the presence of a representative from the Division of Land Survey and Acquisition at the next meeting on Thursday, September 11, 1969 to justify the basis of the appraisal. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rutledge and carried.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMENDMENT) EWA BEACH-IROQUOIS POINT

The Commission again considered a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Ewa Beach-Iroquois Point by changing the land uses as follows:

(1) Designating 12.1 acres of land along the mauka side of Fort Weaver Road between Kimopelekane Road and a proposed 56-foot roadway from Medium Density Apartment use to Residential use;

(2) Designating the 5.0-acre parcel along the proposed 56-foot roadway from Low Density Apartment use to Residential use; and

(3) Designating 4.5 acres of Low Density Apartment use along the mauka side of Fort Weaver Road between the proposed 56-foot roadway and U.S. Coast and Geodetic Observatory to Residential use.

A public hearing was held and closed on July 10, 1969. At its meeting on August 28, 1969 the Commission deferred action for a visit to the site.

Mr. Chun reported that the field trip to the site was made yesterday.

Mrs. Sullam suggested that a recommendation be made to the City Council to allocate funds to conduct an in-depth study of the Detailed Land Use Map for this area by engaging professionals such as planners, architects, etc., and to investigate the possibility of utilizing Federal funds, etc.

In this respect, Mr. Chun recommended that the staff consider the possibility of obtaining Federal funds through the 701 program or, if necessary, to request funds from the City Council to do a study.

Mr. Ingleson made a motion that the proposed amendment be denied for the following reasons:

(1) There appears to be inconsistency between the Waipahu Land Use Commission request and this request; and

(2) The report provides no new information since the action taken by the Commission last year.

He also recommended that the Planning Director review the Detailed Land Use Map for the entire area and a decision made for future planning.

Because of the numerous rezoning requests in this area, Mr. Brennan recommended that the motion include a restudy of the areas zoned for urban uses and, where there has been no development of the urban areas, to consider reverting back to agricultural uses.

ACTION: Mr. Ingleson's motion to (1) deny the proposed amendment to a portion of the Detailed Land Use Map for reasons recommended in the staff report of June 17, 1969; (2) recommend that the Director review the Detailed Land Use Map for the area; and (3) recommend that the Director restudy the areas zoned for urban uses and where no development had occurred to consider reverting the lands back for Agricultural uses, was seconded by Mr. Bright and carried. Mrs. Sullam refrained from voting.

MISCELLANEOUS VARIANCE ANUENUE (RAINBOW ISLAND) SEATRAIN LINES, INC. (STATE OF HAWAII, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION) ZBA-119(1969)

The Zoning Board of Appeals at its meetings on August 14, and August 28, 1969 considered the application by the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation for a variance from Sections 21-501 and 21-551 of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, relating to principal uses and structures permitted in a Residential District and R-6 Residential District to permit water front industrial uses on an area of land comprising approximately 55 acres at Anuenue (Rainbow) Island which is on the northwest side of the island and Diamond Head side of the Bascule Bridge. A public hearing on this matter was held by the Zoning Board of Appeals on August 28, 1969 in accordance with Section 5-515(3) of the City Charter, and the request for the variance was approved on the basis that it met the three conditions of hardship.

Mr. Rutledge expressed concern over certain actions taken by the Zoning Board of Appeals regarding this application and educed the following facts:

1. The State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation, made a request without any plans for the area and asked for what is equivalent to spot zoning.

2. The request was granted without the opinion of the Planning Director.

3. The Planning Commission was not consulted.

4. There is some question as to whether or not the State owns the land. There should be a plan for the area.

5. The Corporation Counsel should look into the matter and action withheld until all rules have been complied with.

6. Is there a delineation of authority and/or jurisdiction of the Planning Commission and the Zoning Board of Appeals?

7. The area is designated for Industrial and Residential uses on the General Plan. The area, however, is zoned R-6 Residential.

8. A plan was presented to the Zoning Board of Appeals indicating generally industrial uses. A variance to permit the installation of industrial type operation with an office, off-loading dock site facilities, and a storage area was requested.

9. Seatrain Lines, Inc. completed this construction contrary to the zoning ordinance as far as residential development is concerned.

10. Although some Commissioners felt that the Zoning Board had no authority to effect the application, the Zoning Board of Appeals may receive any application provided the applicant meets the requirements as stated in the Charter.

11. The request for a variance was granted contrary to the advice of the staff and Corporation Counsel who requested denial because the three conditions of hardship were not met under Section 5-507.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Brennan, the Commission requested that the Corporation Counsel conduct a thorough investigation of the variance. In the meantime, the Director was requested to withhold any procedures that might place the stamp of approval on the action of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted.

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie M. Abbott
Hearings Reporter

Special Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
September 11, 1969

The Planning Commission held a special meeting on Thursday, September 11, 1969, at 8:41 a.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT:

Philip T. Chun, Chairman
Edward Brennan (left during meeting)
Roy R. Bright (left during meeting)
Lewis Ingleson
Arthur A. Rutledge
Mrs. Fredda Sullam
Thomas N. Yamabe II (left during meeting)
James K. Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio
Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Loretta Chee, Staff Planner
Leonard Moffitt, Staff Planner

PUBLIC HEARING
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
KANELOA ROAD
WAI NANI WAY
KUHIO ROAD
JEFFERSON SCHOOL
GROUNDS

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the Development Plan and Detailed Land Use Map of Waikiki by deleting a portion of Kaneloa Road, providing for an extension of Wai Nani Way, and for providing the creation of a cul-de-sac off of Kuhio Road, to enable the consolidation of Jefferson School grounds, the area being identified as Tax Map Key 2-6-28: Parcel 23.

The public hearing notice was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of August 31, 1969, and copies of the notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various civic and community associations and to interested parties.

Background of the proposal was explained by Leonard Moffitt, Staff Planner.

The proposal results from a request from the Department of Accounting and General Services of the State to provide for an expansion or the further development of Jefferson School property in Waikiki.

The State owns an area adjacent to the Jefferson School which is now vacant and which they want to develop for school purposes.

Kaneloa Road, which bisects the school grounds, would create a hazardous condition for children if there are school buildings on both sides of the road.

The State suggests a City-State land swap.

There is a need to provide access and circulation systems which would be safe for the students.

The possibility of extending Wai Nani Way down to Kuhio Avenue.

The proposal to create a cul-de-sac -- the result of access needed to The Parkview, a 12-story condominium.

TESTIMONY AGAINST THE PROPOSAL:

1. Senator Percy Mirikitani, a resident of The Parkview (and representing the tenants of The Parkview who were also present) testified:

a. Previously, in a discussion with the DOE in reference to closing off Kaneloa Road, the tenants were assured that Makee Street and part of Kaneloa Road would remain, giving DOE two entrances and not disturbing the ingress and egress of The Parkview.

b. The Parkview tenants had appeared before this Commission prior to construction and were assured the area would not be changed. Based on that assurance, over $2 million was spent in constructing The Parkview Condominium with the front of the building facing Makee Road.

c. According to the present proposal, (1) the back of the building would become the front, facing garbage and service truck areas; (2) the original front of the building could no longer be used, problems arise with mail, reception, lounge areas, utility, water, electrical, elevator and electronic security systems which were built into the front area; (3) the entrance to the apartment building would then be via garages; (4) the school grounds then would become part of the front of the building; and (5) the value of the building and individual units would be lowered considerably because of these problems.

d. Ten feet of the corner of the building was

taken to widen Makee and Kaneloa--a major decision which was made without notice to the tenants.

e. A number of rights were contracted for with the City in a Building Permit for the usage of the road and which were paid for in the improvement program.

f. Recently, a building permit was issued for a boarding house which is being built right next door to the deluxe condominium, lowering the standards. Also, according to the City plan, the new building is being given a private road to allow ingress and egress.

g. From a cost standpoint, there is a fence at a cost of $25,000 which blocks off the road from the school. There is no need to change anything except to cut off Kaneloa Road at the end of the boundary of The Parkview building, leaving the school two entrances for ingress and egress and no need for a cul-de-sac.

h. Senator Mirikitani stated that they were protesting the proposal because, (1) it is impractical, (2) from the traffic standpoint it doesn't make sense, (3) in ordinary logic it is "stupid", and (4) they would appreciate the Planning Commission really looking into the matter and considering it from the aspects which he just presented.

Interrogated by the Commission, Senator Mirikitani replied:

It was possible and he would be very delighted to meet with the DOE, explain the case to them, and perhaps come up with some agreement.

Tenants of The Parkview participated in the Improvement District.

The Improvement District included the widening of the street, input of sewer facilities and other street inputs and utilities.

He did not know at this time whether the Improvement District was 100% or 50-50.

At the time the City was installing a sewer line

in Kapahulu, The Parkview had to put in the sewer plus utilities (power system) plus an underground telephone system. If anything happens, the ground will have to be dug up -- Makee as well as Kaneloa.

There are 50 apartments, 50 stalls, no guest stalls.

There is no objection to eliminating street parking, assuming Makee is left as is, or widened.

TESTIMONY AGAINST THE PROPOSAL:

2. Mr. William S. Johnson, by letter:

Mr. Harold Edmonds read a letter in opposition to the proposal, written by a resident, Mr. William Summers Johnson, dated September 10, 1969. See File PA#15 - 1/Kaneloa Road (State-DOE)

TESTIMONY AGAINST THE PROPOSAL:

3. Mr. Harold Edmonds, President and representing the Board of Directors of The Parkview, testified:

a. He could only reiterate everything Mr. Johnson said in his letter.

b. He produced a map drawn up by the Manager of The Parkview showing a fire hydrant at the front of the building which would not be available to the Fire Department if this proposal is adopted.

c. Recommended abandonment of the "second street".

TESTIMONY AGAINST THE PROPOSAL:

4. Mr. Mason Hironaka, Real Estate Officer, Trust Division, First Hawaiian Bank:

a. "We have circulated our petition for request that Kaneloa Road as it abuts our property or affords frontage to the properties owned by the Liliuokalani Trust and the Joseph Paiko, Jr. Trust Estates, merits your serious consideration. We feel that there will be a tremendous loss in value and the utility of the properties involved.

We would certainly urge the Commissioners to consider our request that the deletion of a portion of Kaneloa Road be reconsidered, and that the portion of Kaneloa Road as it effects the proposed extension of Wai Nani Way to Paoakalani be kept intact as is.

b. Although there is no ingress-egress for the Estate that I represent, if this deletion takes place, there would be accessibility to the property but the utility of the Paiko property would be greatly hampered in that is presently enjoys a long street frontage.

c. If Wai Nani goes through and Kaneloa is abandoned, the design of the building would have to be such that it would have to face Wai Nani. You do not have the so-called 'corner influence'.

d. There are two parcels with four lots. Actually there are 5 lots including #75.

e. Any development would have to consider Wai Nani Way as the frontage.

f. We have worked comprehensive plans for the entire area. Present plans call for Paiko Estate joining Liliuokalani Estate in the development. We have Master Plans for the entire holdings of Liliuokalani in Waikiki and we are working toward that end.

g. We have not, at the present time, provided for any widening of Kaneloa Road in our planning. However, I am sure in the event Kaneloa Road were widened, I don't believe there would be resistance on the part of this Estate. Both Liliuokalani and Paiko Trust Estates have gone on record as encouraging improvement and bringing streets and roads up to standard in Waikiki.

h. Apparently, the staff has not discussed this matter with the property owners and representatives in this particular area as to the many ramifications involved.

i. The 200' frontage on Kaneloa versus the 160' frontage on the proposed street have never been discussed with us.

j. We wouldn't lose any property but we would lose accessibility and the utility of the

property. In other words, we would suffer severance or loss of the two-street frontage.

k. Paiko Trust has frontage on Wai Nani Way which is not a street but is delineated on the map as a paper road.

l. I had no knowledge that Wai Nani Way was shown for abandonment on the development plan. I certainly would like to protest because if you abandon an accessibility we're going to end up with land-locked parcels."

TESTIMONY AGAINST THE PROPOSAL:

5. Mr. Ralph A. Schrader of Schrader Realty & Investment Co.:

a. "I have a contract and a building permit, issued within the last month prior to CZC to build an apartment house on the Yuen Jan Seto lot which is the lot that is blocking Wai Nani Way.

b. We're about to start construction. Is the City going to come in and condemn this lot right now?

c. I wrote a letter September 8, 1969, and enclosed a map. My proposal would be that Kaneloa Road end in a cul-de-sac on the site of the school grounds in the same sense as Senator Mirikitani would like to have it end in a cul-de-sac on the other end of the school grounds. If you place a barricade across this right now, you'll find it wouldn't interfere with anything.

d. Mr. Seto had a problem here. He had 5,000 feet completely surrounded by the City with nobody to consolidate with. It was either use his land or in effect lose half the value of it.

e. I am going ahead with the building of the building."

NO ONE TESTIFIED IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL

Mrs. Sullam asked for an explanation of the general pattern for dropping children off around

the school and Senator Mirikitani obliged via a map.

Mr. Iwani Tominaga from the Department of Accounting and General Services, and Mr. Richard Inouye from the DOE identified themselves at the request of Mr. Yamabe.

Interrogated by the Commission, Mr. Inouye of DOE offered the following information:

1. There would be no hardship to the DOE if a portion of the land primarily in the area where Makee Street is completed right now is taken (whatever amount is required to create a street).

2. Neither would it cause a hardship to the DOE as far as the other proposed plan is concerned -- the one that would go completely around the area where the cul-de-sac is shown.

3. DOE is willing to do almost anything to get Kaneloa closed so that they can pick up the additional two acres.

4. I have no authority to say whether the State office would pick up the tab. We haven't made any decision there.

5. We have not made any formal commitment on any of this land trade except that we proposed certain traffic solutions because we wanted to close Kaneloa.

6. In summary, the position of DOE is that as long as that portion of Kaneloa separating the school grounds is closed, we would give high consideration to accomplish other solutions as far as traffic is concerned in the area.

TESTIMONY AGAINST THE PROPOSAL:

For the record, a letter from the Trustees of the Liliuokalani Trust dated September 10, 1969, objecting to the proposed abandonment of Kaneloa Road was filed. (PA #15 Amend. 1/Kaneloa Road, State-DOE)

Upon motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission closed the public hearing and the matter was taken under advisement.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Ingleson, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, the Commission deferred action until more information can be obtained on traffic. It was also suggested that a representative from the Traffic Department be requested to appear at the next meeting to answer questions on traffic.

IMPROVEMENT REVOLVING FUND RESOLUTION NO. 317 ACQUISITION FOR ADDITION TO LILIUOKALANI GARDENS

This item, to approve funds to be transferred from the Improvement Revolving Fund to the Department of Parks and Recreation for the purchase of 2,239 square feet additional land at a cost of $27,000 had been deferred at the Planning Commission meeting of September 4, 1969, for further information.

Mr. Robert Ho, Land Acquisition Officer with the Division of Land Survey and Acquisition of Public Works, appeared to explain the basis for the appraisal of this property:

1. On April 2, 1969, Mr. Ted Green, Director of Parks Department, by letter to Mr. Tomonari, Chief of the Division of Land Survey and Acquisition, requested information as to the cost of this particular property for budgetary purposes.

2. An approximate figure was given of $25,000. $22,000 for the land (roughly $10 per square foot) and $3,000 for the building.

3. Mr. Ho's understanding was that it was for budgetary purposes, and if they wanted an appraisal, they should have hired an outsider.

4. Subsequently, the property owner made an offer to the City of approximately $27,000.

5. Mr. Ho did not consider comparables but merely used his own expertise and past experience.

6. When the Parks Department asks for an appraisal for budgetary purposes, Mr. Ho looks at the property and, on his own experience of the market, makes an estimate to satisfy the Parks Board so that they can

go to the Council and ask for money.

7. Mr. Ho then gave the following examples of recent private transactions made by abutting land owners and at least five blocks or more apart:

EXAMPLES: - Residential Properties

(1) 795 Pua Street (near Palama)
39 years old - 600 square feet long
1,634-square foot land area
Sold for $18,000
January 1969
By Jordan Kana to W. Y. Yim

(2) Gulick Avenue & Pahukui Street
45 years old - front store 560 sq. ft.
residentail 508 sq. ft.
1,878-square foot land area
Sold for $34,000
August 1968
by Uehara to Uesaki

(3) 2524 Pohonui Street - near Kalihi
31 years old - 704 square feet
3,500-square foot land area
Sold for $28,500
September 1968
By Kenneth Chun to Ted Kwai

From the aforementioned examples, the Commissioners raised the following questions:

Might there be other reasons for the purchase than for home use?

Do these properties abut a commercial area?

Might the properties be an absolute necessity to someone for an addition or some other reasons that might add value?

What is the size of the Liliuokalani Gardens?

Is there some compelling reason anyone knows of as to why the five acres of Liliuokalani Gardens is so important?

Since neither Mr. Ho nor the Commissioners knew of anyone who has purchased anything in that immediate area of that size and paid $10 per square foot for residential property, it

was questioned as to why the City should be expected to pay that price.

Mr. Ho's reply was that the HRA bought a lot of property at $7 to $8 per square foot and business property is hard to find for less than $10 per square foot in town.

It was first suggested that the whole matter be tabled until the City hires an appraiser. However, it was later decided to interrogate Mr. Ted Green who provided the following information:

It has been in the Master Plan since 1960 to acquire all the property between the now-existing Liliuokalani Gardens and School Street; to open the gardens up and provide a better access. Acquisitions and investigations have taken place and the subject land has been offered for purchase.

Five years ago, a parcel on the Ewa side of the stream was acquired at $2.50 per square foot.

A parcel adjacent to the park, which hasn't been acquired yet, has been estimated at $6 per square foot by Mr. Tomonari's office.

The parcel in question has been appraised by the Division of Land Survey and Acquisition at $10 per square foot.

The appraising is left up to the Corporation Counsel's office, Land Acquisition section. They hire appraisers.

Mr. Green stated that they are now in the process of raising the money with which to purchase this additional land.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding parking area possibilities and the problems of cliffs, flooding areas, and high elevations.

The Director pointed out the need to consider, in the acquisition of land, utilizing the land for dual purposes -- in this case the expansion of a park and garden area and a parking facility to serve both. This policy is a savings to the taxpayers.

One of the Commissioners pointed out:

> A portion of these gardens, close to the proposed acquisition, is a beautiful historical site where children have been swimming for hundreds of years.
>
> It is only two minutes walking distance from downtown Honolulu.
>
> It is a secluded spot of repose and great beauty.
>
> The expansion, or opening up, of Liliuokalani Gardens is a worthwhile endeavor.
>
> The principle has been established that the Commission is concerned as to how the public's money is being spent.
>
> In this great age of affluence, it would be a shame not to acquire the site because we were too cheap.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Brennan, the Commission approved with certain reservations the request to transfer $27,000 in funds from the Improvement Revolving Fund to the Department of Parks and Recreation for the purchase of a certain 2,239 square foot of land for the extension of Liliuokalani Gardens.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMEND)
WAIPIO
MILILANI TOWN

Before proceeding with the meeting, Mr. Lewis Ingleson disqualified himself from any participation in the deliberations because his firm is performing architectural services for Mililani Town. He filed a Conflict-of-Interest statement for submission to the Mayor.

(Ingleson absent)

A public hearing had been held on September 4, 1969, and closed, and the Commission deferred action for further information. At that time, the staff was instructed to get together with the applicant to find out whether or not some of the disagreements could be resolved.

The Director oriented the Commission:

There were three principle issues outstanding:

1. Identification of property for medium-density and low-density use.

a. The Commission proposed low-density development for one parcel and substituted a medium-density development for the other parcel so that there was virtually an identical exchange in terms of the overall density with reference to those two areas, 10 and 12.

b. In further discussion with the applicant, it was learned that there is an area of approximately 7/10 of an acre more that would be put into conservation at the edge of the gulch and could serve as somewhat of a buffer to property below.

2. The open space along the Waiahole Ditch.

a. There was a substantial alteration in the apartment district and a commensurate reduction in the open space area. Plans indicated there would be no change on the commercial side but rather a reduction primarily on the apartment side.

b. Conceptually, the plans were adjusted somewhat on the open space approach.

c. In terms of the overall approach, the general acreage remains the same -- 350 acres total.

d. It simply amounts to a redistribution of the acreage. We can look with favor upon this and recommend so to the Commission.

e. Approximately 200-foot wide open space area with some additional corridors through on the order of 100 feet or so in width.

f. The ditch itself, an easement of about 50 feet, ties into the overall general pattern of open space.

g. Relating to the open space matter, is the proposal that we originally had to keep it in open space. Now, we agree with the open space going to a single-family residential use and for church purposes.

3. A portion of the area is outside of the urban district. Therefore, before any development could proceed, there would have to be an adjustment in the urban district boundary.

Discussion on the question of medium-density versus low-density revealed:

Although zoned for medium-density apartments, the applicant proposes low-density apartments because of improvements which had already been installed and which were adequate only for low-density apartment use.

The original proposal for medium-density area remains the same. However, the developer has chosen to develop it as a low-density or town-house type of use.

Differences pointed out between A-1 and A-2 per CZC: (the area of principle concern is the Height Limit)

	Density	Height Limit	Units per Ac.	LUI	Floor area Ratio
A-1	Low-density	30'	20	50	40%
A-2	Med-density	40'	50	63	100%
A-3	Med-density	350'		68	100%

History on improvements.

On No. 10, streets, laterals, sewer systems had not been installed. The main in the principle roadway would be the only question with reference to size. The water main and sewer main should have a capacity of the mains that you would actually tie into. The point was whether the developer had expended a sizable amount of money that would have seriously affected No. 10, for instance.

Property adjacent to No. 10 would also be affected.

The Director expressed concern about the high-rise on No. 10 and stated that "we would prefer the 2-story limitation of the low-density apartment in that area."

Adjoining parcels -- No. 9 -- was zoned hotel/apartment in 1957 by request of Hiram Fong,

President of Finance Factors. The main reason the zoning was granted under the old code was because he had requested to build at least 20 to 50 units within a couple of years. Since that time, nothing has been built. The hotel/apartment zone is equal to an A-3 now.

Mr. Yamabe suggested proceeding with the application with the exception of areas 9, 10, and 12 which would need further study.

Mr. Yamabe wanted it clearly understood that it will be remembered the developer will be coming back for A-2 and not for A-3.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, the Commission accepted the Director's recommendations as agreed to by the developer except with respect to parcels 10 and 12. Parcel 10 will be medium-density Detailed Land Use Map and 12 will be low-density Detailed Land Use Map.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING B-3
CENTRAL HONOLULU
MULTI-STORY
COMMERCIAL
WITH DWELLING UNITS
(DR. KIYOSHI
INOUYE)

On August 6, 1969, a public hearing was held and closed.

ACTION was deferred by the Commission at that time pending further information.

The request was made by the applicant for rezoning from B-1 Neighborhood Business District to B-3 Business-Residential District in order to construct a multi-story development with commercial units located on the ground levels of the building and dwelling units above at 1020 - 1022 South King Street, Central Honolulu District, and identified as Tax Map Key 2-4-02: 31 with an area of 21,553 square feet.

Chairman Chun reminded the Commission that at one meeting they intended to consult with the Council as to the intent of the B-3 Residential District.

ACTION: Upon motion by Mr. Ingleson, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, this matter was deferred for two weeks for consultation with the City Council as to the intent of the B-3 Business-Residential

District.

IMPROVEMENT
REVOLVING FUND
RESOLUTION NO. 326
ACQUISITION
MAUKA CIVIC CENTER
$133,000

(Brennan absent)

The Director presented the request:

The request concerns transfer of funds from the Improvement Revolving Fund for acquisition of land in the mauka block of the Civic Center site. The Council Resolution No. 326 was to transfer the sum of $133,000 from the Improvement Revolving Fund to the Building Department for acquisition of remaining parcels in the mauka block of Civic Center site. This amount would supplement $36,200 carried over from fiscal year 1969 and $1 million presently appropriated for fiscal year 1970. The total estimated value of the 12 parcels involved is $1,169,200 and this figure represents the lower of two appraisals made by independent appraisers hired by the City.

The Director then oriented the Commission via a map, pointing out the proposed South Street Connector, Beretania Street, King Street and Alapai Street. The map is a proposed development plan which was adopted by the Planning Commission. However, it has not been finally adopted by the City Council. A portion of the South Street Connector would include the Alapai Street right-of-way.

No discussion followed.

ACTION: Mr. Yamabe moved, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, and carried, that the Commission recommend the approval of Resolution No. 326.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING A-3
APARTMENT DISTRICT
MAKAHA
NORTHEAST OF MAKAHA
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
MAKAHA VALLEY, INC.

A public hearing was held and closed on August 21, 1969. The Commission deferred action for a visit to the site.

The following points were discussed:

1. The Commission felt that plans for high-rise buildings along the base of the mountain would create a solid concrete wall and obliterate the entire cliff. They would rather see a blended-in effect of mountain and structure, having buildings spread out to form a view of mountains between buildings rather than a solid wall appearance.

2. The Commission did not wish to delay action on this application; however, realizing their limited placement of restrictions on this proposal (other than provided for in the CZC which they believed should be amended), there must be developed a vehicle place on zoning in Makaha Valley, otherwise a similar Waikiki situation could arise here.

The Director suggested the possibility of amending the zoning ordinance to have all uses in apartment as a conditional type of use in which the Planning Commission could then apply conditions regulating the specific site design, location, spacing, and size of structures.

Mrs. Sullam believed the developer would not mislay any advantage to make the community an attractive one or impair his ability to sell his proposal, and would be respective of the Commission's suggestions.

The Chairman also recognized areas of the CZC which needs changing; however, prior to the enactment of any amendments, the Commission must act according to the provisions of the CZC.

3. In view of the discussion, and although the Commission did not know how much voluntary response it would receive from the developer, the Director was requested to relay the feelings of the Commission on this matter to the developer.

ACTION: Mr. Rutledge moved, seconded by Mrs. Sullam and carried, that the Commission recommend the approval of this proposal. Commissioners Brennan and Yamabe were not present during the Commission's final discussion and action on this matter.

RESOLUTION
DIAMOND HEAD
AREA
ZONING R-1

(Yamabe, Brennan and Bright absent)

The Director presented a resolution concerning the Diamond Head area introduced at City Council by Councilman Charles Campbell which was referred to the Planning Commission and Planning Director for their review and recommendations (in two parts):

1. A proposal to acquire all Diamond Head Terrace Tract properties within the area bounded by Poni Moi Road, Diamond Head

Road, Coconut Avenue and Kalakaua Avenue, plus 14 Diamond Head Terrace Open Tract lots along the beach described as: Tax Map Key 3-1-33: Parcels 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 50, 51, 53, and 56.

2. A proposal to change the zoning designation for the entire area bounded in red as described in Resolution No. 239 and adopted as Bill No. 102 to R-1 Residential from R-3, R-6, and A-4.

The Director oriented the Commission with background:

1. June 20, 1969, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 239 requesting recommendations from the Planning Commission and Planning Director on a proposal to change a specific Diamond Head area to park and recreational use.

2. Recommendation was made and the City Council voted approval of Bill No. 102 on August 5, 1969, and the Mayor signed it the same day in order to provide the legal basis for denial of building permits for two proposed developments known as Diamond Head Seas and BBH Apartment areas.

3. The area is now designated as a park on the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map.

4. The two parcels referred to for acquisition are:

   a. Diamond Head Seas property (55,000 square feet)

   b. BBH proposed apartment area (nearly opposite Makalei Place entrance off of Diamond Head Road)

5. Although referred to as apartments, they are in fact duplexes. Duplexes are permitted in R-6 Residential District. Diamond Head Seas proposal was for 11 units (10 units in duplexes and a single-family dwelling).

6. The creation of a park decided a long-standing question over the future land use of this area.

7. The legal and financial steps necessary to convert the area to park and recreational use have not been agreed upon to date.

8. Purchase by the City and County of the Diamond Head Seas and the BBH properties has been approved.

9. The Mayor has appointed a Planning Advisory Committee for the Waikiki-Diamond Head area to study all problems in this planning district.

10. Councilman Campbell is proposing a solution to the problem of financing the acquisition.

11. Acquisition:

    a. Stage-type acquisition indicated.

    b. Market value approximately $2.2 million (for all properties described, including one high-rise apartment building at the corner of Coconut and Kalakaua Avenues).

    c. In addition, market value of the 14 lots is $739,000. Total market value $2.9 million, based on current State Tax Assessments.

12. Rezoning:

    a. Rezoning would provide for effective control over the area in terms of any further development of larger tract parcels into smaller or more concentrated use.

    b. The R-1 District calls for one acre minimum lot size. However, it would permit normal repairs or alterations and some reconstruction on existing lots of record.

    c. Since it is designated for park purposes, these normal repairs, maintenance and renovations, as may be requested by property owners, would come before the City Council for their consideration.

d. The Councilman's resolution states that the Planning Director and Planning Commission consult with the Mayor's Planning Advisory Committee before any zoning changes are recommended. (Inserted to provide feedback and time for more detailed analysis of any problems that may arise.)

Referred to the Planning Commission, Planning Department for consideration:

1. The City Council has a bill before it that has been vetoed by the Mayor.

   a. When the City Council sent the Mayor their recommendations for acquisition of the entire area for a park, he vetoed this and indicated in his veto message that he would be favorably inclined to acquisition of the makai portion of the property with some consideration of other means of preserving the mauka portion.

2. Councilman Campbell's resolution:

   a. Introduced but has not yet passed first reading.

   b. Referred to the Finance Committee.

   c. Brought back to the City Council.

   d. Now referred to the Planning Commission:

      Must have comments before next week, September 18, before they can take any action on the Bill, which has been vetoed by the Mayor.

Discussion.

ACTION: Mr. Rutledge motioned and Mr. Ingleson seconded that the Commission defer the matter until a meeting of the full Commission could be held. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henrietta B. Lyman

Henrietta B. Lyman
Secretary-Reporter II

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
September 18, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, September 18, 1969, at 1:35 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT:

Philip T. Chun, Chairman
Edward Brennan
Lewis Ingleson
Arthur A. Rutledge
Mrs. Fredda Sullam
Thomas N. Yamabe II
James Sakai, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT:

Roy R. Bright
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT
CIVIC CENTER
(QUEEN'S HOSPITAL SITE)
THE QUEEN'S MEDICAL CENTER

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider an application for a change in zoning from A-2 Apartment District to B-2 Community Business District for parcels of land located within the area bounded by Beretania Street, Punchbowl Street, Miller Street, Vineyard Boulevard, Lusitania Street, and Lauhala Street, comprising an area of 578,987 square feet, and identified by Tax Map Keys 2-1-35: 1 and 3, and 2-1-36: 44, 50, 53 and 60. The zone change will include the entire area bounded by Beretania Street, Punchbowl Street, Miller Street, Vineyard Boulevard, Lusitania Street, and Alapai Street.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of September 7, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicant, applicable governmental agencies, and to property owners. No letters of protest have been received.

The following discussion occurred:

Way: The Central Honolulu Detailed Land Use Map showing the Civic Center complex is subject to change as it has not yet been adopted by the City Council; however, it was approved by the Commission during the latter part of last year. The area shaded in blue is designated

for public facility use. The specific proposal for the zone change is bounded by Lusitania, Miller, Punchbowl, Beretania and Alapai Streets. The initial proposal was for the Queen's Hospital property site as indicated in yellow. The portion cross-hatched in yellow is the Smyth Memorial Library area. Adjoining this property along Lauhala Street and Circle Lane is the property owned by the Medical Group, as shaded in green. The area shaded in blue is owned by the Board of Water Supply. The parcels not colored are in other ownerships. The initial request was for these areas; and the department has been working with the applicant for some time. The department felt it was appropriate to expand the initial zoning application to incorporate the entire area as proposed. On the Detailed Land Use Map, there will be generally along the Alapai alignment, the proposed South Street Connector which will be a widened roadway tieing into the freeway and serving as the boundary for this portion of the Central Business area.

The principal reason for the zone change was for some specific improvements and developments on the applicant's property. The development plan submitted indicates the concept for the development of the property.

Outlined in pink are the existing buildings; this is the entrance and the parking lot to the hospital complex; the Pauahi Wing addition presently under construction, as shaded in brown; and the proposed Liholiho Tower. The area shaded in green indicates future development and plans have been prepared showing some of the specifics of the site locations. Additionally, this is an aerial prospective sketch showing the existing buildings, proposed structures and the structure under construction. The proposal of the Medical Group is also included on the site plan, bounded by Circle Lane, Beretania and Lauhala Streets.

Reports from the Department of Public Works and the Board of Water Supply indicate that facilities are adequate for the proposed use and while there has not been a specific traffic study done at this time however, indications are that the traffic problems, because of the additional generation of traffic, can be resolved. The applicant has proposed to undertake a traffic study in relation to the parking structure when the construction of the facility becomes eminent. This will be of great

assistance to the Planning Department and the Traffic Department. At that time, an evaluation can be made of the impact the proposed parking structure will have on the local street system.

Mr. Yamabe questioned Mr. Way on what other zoning districts permit hospital operations.

Mr. Way recalled that there are a number of districts where hospital uses are permitted as well as under Conditional Use Permits.

Yamabe: What about institutional uses?

Way: We don't have districts for institutional uses. Institutional uses, in a sense of schools and libraries, are permitted in virtually any district.

Brennan: As it relates to the parking structure, does this come under the 1-400 code?

Way: The parking requirements for the hospital would be on the order of 1-400, as I recall.

Brennan: Would the parking structure, if it is 1-400, would the calculation include the entire area of the buildings under roof. Does this relate to the existing buildings as well as the proposed buildings?

William Enriques, Staff Planner: The requirements are based on 1-400.

Way: We have not verified the total parking needs because we do not have sufficient detailed plans at this time to indicate what the floor space would be in total; but the parking is shown in the structure and at various locations on the site. This actually will not be verifiable until the final architectural plans for the final units are prepared and then we would be assured that there will be adequate parking provided. We don't have the number in terms of floor space right now.

Brennan: But if you did have the numbers, would it apply to the present buildings on the property as well?

Way: Yes, we would look at the total floor area.

Sullam: I am somewhat concerned about some of the heights of the buildings. Will it interfere with the view plane?

Way: The preliminary discussions and thinking on this relate primarily to the structure that would be situated at this location (pointed out on the map). In terms of looking towards Punchbowl, we would point out that it would be below Vineyard and there is quite a difference of elevation at this point and similarly that case is true here. The exposure above, somewhat of a horizontal view line, might be on the order of 6 to 7 stories, but it does set down somewhat. This matter has been discussed in meetings of the Civic Center Policy Committee. Generally, the site planning concept conforms with the ideas that this Committee has with reference to site lines and view planes.

As further information, the Planning Department is just now working on the details of the view plane control ordinance for the Civic Center Punchbowl area. While we can't particularly say that it will not interfere, at least in terms of the thinking thus far in relation to the view plane ordinance, it does appear to conform. It has the blessings of the Civic Center Policy Committee which was concerned with this matter.

Chun: Who owns the parcels along Lauhala Street on the makai side?

Way: There are two parcels under private ownership and developed for apartment use.

Enriques: Those are in private ownership and are developed for apartment use and both are three stories high.

Brennan: Will this be an incremental development or is this to be done at once?

Way: Incremental with the brown area under construction and the green area to be constructed possibly in the near future.

Yamabe: Regarding the two parcels as owned by individuals, have they agreed to the change from the A-2 Apartment District to B-2 Community Business District?

Way: We have not received any protests from either of the property owners and it is my recollection that they have been notified of the proposed change.

Yamabe: Wouldn't the present apartment use be nonconforming then?

Way: Yes.

Yamabe: How old are the apartments?

Ingleson: At the most, 10 years old.

Heinz-Guenther Pink, principal broker of Pink Realty, and also a resident in the Magellan Apartments located at Miller Street and Magellan Avenue, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

I represent several owners who have written me letters because the public hearing was published only once in the Star-Bulletin and I only saw it this morning and we have not been notified as the Planning Director said of this proposed change. All the people I represent live in the Magellan Apartments located at the corner of Miller Street and Magellan Avenue--410 Magellan Avenue (pointed out location on the map at the request of the Commission).

The reasons why we object are as follows:

We have a brand new zoning ordinance and we all try to comply with the zoning ordinance which has been, as mentioned by most of you, a "masterpiece." If there are all these spot zoning and nonconforming uses, then it is the end of it.

We also have a height moratorium between the State Capitol and Punchbowl and there is supposed to be a height limitation of four stories on apartment buildings. Now the applicant proposes to have a 10-story building and this will obstruct the view tremendously.

I live at the corner penthouse of the Magellan Apartment and even the ugly structure of the parking facility built by the applicant obstructs the view of the State Capitol. The taxpayers have spent millions of dollars for the beautiful State Capitol and I don't think you should impair that view. The same trend is to save Diamond Head, save the view towards Punchbowl, and save the view towards the Capitol. How can you then take the responsibility and spot change as soon as the Capitol is behind it. If I came to you with a very needed cause, maybe in a Rural Protective zoning, which is now R-6, that we are not even permitted to subdivide and have flag lots. We have parcels of 36,000 square feet and if we come to you to have an extension or a variance, we wouldn't get it. So I request, in all fairness, not to change the zoning

because the applicant has ample space to remain low rise. They have tremendous space. I can overlook it from my side. Why should we clutter it up with high rise? That is the reason why the owners of the Magellan Apartment and the residents in the vicinity are strictly against it and I, as a realtor, am strictly against it. If you have a zoning ordinance, keep it; otherwise, give everyone a chance to change the zoning law and give him a variance.

Brennan: How high is the Magellan Apartment?

Pink: It is 10 stories high and it is already above the freeway. We have quite a height elevation and I would like to invite the Commission to visit my place and see how it destructs the view from the penthouse located on the 10th floor, and from the higher side of Punchbowl.

Yamabe: Am I correct to assume that your primary concern is that you lose the view from your apartment down makai?

Pink: This is not my primary complaint. My primary complaint is, if there is a zoning ordinance, we should keep it; because by changing the zoning, the view makai will be lost. I have a feeling, such as in Makaha where as soon as Chinn Ho came in, the Commission changed the zoning and made everything possible for him. Why, then, if we have applied for a variance for the corner lot across the street from Makaha Shopping Center, the variance was denied for the poor people because they apparently didn't have enough money.

The good doctors these days now have money and I don't think that the subject property is an ideal site for a hospital with the freeway so close by, because of the tremendous amount of traffic and the traffic will be increased. We have enough office structures and enough business zoning. If you go down Beretania Street, you will see that the buildings are dilapidated, so why don't you update these buildings.

Rutledge: You made the inference that this Commission gave Chinn Ho's zoning in Makaha and that the poor man does not have enough money to get the zoning. I want to know how much he was short and to your knowledge, how much does it cost to get zoning.

Pink: As an example, there is an area consisting of 36,155 square feet with a 100-foot frontage at Sunset Beach and you couldn't get it rezoned.

Rutledge: My point was you said that you didn't have enough money and I thought the inference that you meant was that they didn't have enough money to pay for the zoning. Did you mean that they didn't have enough money to pay the lawyer or didn't have enough money to pay the Planning Commission?

Pink: What I meant is that when someone with substantial capital like Queen's Hospital or Chinn Ho comes in and appears, everything is approved before it comes before the Commission. Whereas, if a poor man wanted a change in zoning or spot zoning, he usually doesn't get it.

Rutledge: How high do you think the building should be so it would not be obnoxious?

Pink: I think the height limitation should be four stories as indicated in the ordinance and it should be kept that way.

Ingleson: What is the status of the view plane ordinance?

Way: We're expecting to report out in November the findings and recommendations of the study. It is presently in the initial data gathering stage. It had been started previously and work has been interrupted in the past years and until the development of the Civic Center master plan, much of the work has been tabled until that plan is complete. The Civic Center master plan has been completed and somewhat accepted as the general conceptual plan for the Civic Center area and this along with some updating and field surveys will serve as the basis for the view plane. I would say that at this moment, we're not more than in the inventory stage of not more than 15% to 20% along the path of a recommendation. The Queen's Hospital property would be included in this study.

Rutledge: If it is so far away from having any recommendations, I don't think this item should even be on the agenda, because regardless of what we hear today, we will have your recommendation and they may require another hearing.

Way: There will be a number of hearings and would take some time for consideration.

George Winter, Resident of the Magellan Apartment and Employed at IBM: My arguments coincide with Mr. Pink's, but I just wanted to let you know that there are other people who think it is unfair that three years ago, the zoning was such and a short three years later, just because the applicant wants to build a 10-story structure, we feel we have to accommodate them. I think we should consider the people in the surrounding area and I don't think it is fair to go above the 4-story limitation and we should keep the zoning as is.

Ingleson: How many apartments are there in the Magellan Apartments and of those how many are protesting?

Winter: There are 74 apartments. Apparently it was announced in the paper only once and I did not find out about it until 11:00 today. I think if we took a poll of the people in the Magellan Apartment, maybe it will help the Commission in reaching a decision. I think it is very important that the zoning is not changed. I live on the 8th floor of the apartment.

Rutledge: Have you any idea of how much higher the Magellan Apartment is than the Queen's Hospital? It seems to me that you are on the other side of the highway and the highway is over the roofs of the hospital.

Winter: This is true; however, there is somewhat of an illusion of the height because the present four-story parking structure blocks out the skyline from the 8th floor and if we're talking about adding 6 stories to the 4 stories, this is effectively blocking out the Capitol building. I think we have to consider the people who invested their money in that area under the assumption that three years ago this was the zoning and this is the way it will be and now we're turning around and saying to have 10 stories and I don't think it is fair.

Rutledge: Are you acquainted with the Regency Apartment under construction in Waialae-Kahala? That is an eyesore and do you think this is a similar situation that you have in mind with the proposed 10-story structure?

Winter: I'm not in total agreement with all the high-rise structures that have been erected in Honolulu and I don't think perhaps the trend should be continued. I think we should look closer at the situation and I don't think we should make any more mistakes. As Mr. Pink pointed out, there is an area which is not developed and perhaps the applicant should look at that.

We do have a problem with the noise on the freeway. Personally I had to put in an air conditioner in my bedroom so I could sleep at night. Queen's Hospital obviously does not know that we could not afford to put a unit in each room; therefore, they should centrally air condition the rooms to buffer out the noise of the freeway so that is another consideration which the applicant has not anticipated.

W. J. Henderson, Administrator of Queen's Hospital, spoke in favor of the proposal. His statement, which was read to the Commission, was submitted for the record.

Brennan: How many buildings do you anticipate that you're going to construct in the overall plan? I think you're talking about 13 acres and how many buildings do you anticipate and during what period of time do you anticipate these will be completed?

Henderson: The original plan was done in 1963, when we met with the Civic Center Planning Committee. At that time the area in brown (pointed to the map), identified as Pauahi Wing, was established as a double wing with one wing moving forward into the Civic Center. This was approximately 12 stories high. After our first meeting with the Planning Committee, we realized what they were attempting to achieve and at considerable expense, because we already developed all of our plans and architectural details, we have completely changed our master planning and relocated the entire structure to the right of the facility (shown in blue).

For the area shaded in brown, identified as Pauahi Wing, we have a statement by our Board of Directors that we shall make every effort from now as long as we could visualize in the future, to maintain as an open area looking makai toward the Civic Center.

The green area toward the rear is a physicians' office building. The plans at the present time are at a stage of 99% complete.

The plans for the green 2-story building are near completion. The area shown in blue is a plan that is contemplated for approximately 7 to 10 years to the future. There remains one other wing that is not identified easily which will be done in the future beyond what is visualized at the present time.

Brennan: Describe each building and the time schedule visualized for it.

Henderson: Pauahi Wing is anticipated for completion in December, 1970. The wing in the middle is in final architectual planning and completion of the structure is scheduled in two years which is the 10-story building. This will house 90 physicians bringing them into the concept of care in one location. The small unit on the right of the map is the mental health unit which is two stories high. The building before this mental health unit is unidentifiable at the present time because it would represent a movement of some 10-15 years in the future and what that building will house, we could not predict at this time. These are existing two-story and three-story buildings and it is anticipated that these will remain the same for a number of years and we are only concentrating on making adjustments in the area which is out of the view plane of the Capitol building. The building which is unidentifiable will not exceed 10 stories.

Brennan: What would you anticipate would be the general floor area of all the buildings--the 10-story building, and so forth? How many square feet under roof?

George Paulus, Architect: Not counting the parking structure itself, I believe the area would then be 750,000 square feet.

Henderson: Our concern, perhaps, exceed that of all legal concerns about parking and we plan that the parking shall be considerably in excess of the requirements of the 1-400 ratio.

Brennan: Are you talking about the parking structure itself or on the ground?

Henderson: One portion will house 850 cars and the rest of the area will take care of 350 cars so that we will have somewhere between 1,100 to 1,200 parking stalls.

Chun: It is my understanding that the zoning requires one parking stall for every 400 square feet of floor space. With 750,000 square feet, I come out with approximately 1,875 parking stalls for just the structure and if we consider the existing floor space area and apply that same ratio, we come up to a total requirement in excess of 3,000 parking stalls.

Henderson: Did you say that the ratio is one parking stall per 400 square feet?

Chun: Yes, in the B-2 zoning district.

Henderson: Apparently, I was concerned that we were reviewing a square footage and that we were considerably over the parking requirements, so I think we will have to review this with the Director and arrive at calculations because our tabulations are that we were considerably over what is required.

Yamabe: Is there a possibility of reconsidering your plan and reducing the height of some of the buildings, primarily the 10-story building for the physicians?

Henderson: It is very difficult. We could have built these buildings in 1963 and 1964. As a matter of fact, we have our master planning back in 1962 when we started this and in 1963, our plans were fairly firm as to what we intended to do, and in the entire time since our meeting with the Civic Center Policy Committee, we have adjusted our plans, delayed our construction dates in an effort to be most cooperative with them and do what is best to enhance the view of Punchbowl, to retain as much low density as possible, and we reduced Pauahi Wing from 12 to 8 stories, reduced the physicians office building from 13 or 14 stories to the present 10 stories. The problem now is how do you accommodate the needs of the community.

Yamabe: My question was not to reduce, but is it possible to get the same amount of space under cover, but to keep it low rise.

Henderson: We have made every effort to do that but, at this time, we have reduced it to the lowest rise. We think it is compatible to provide the services which are needed. In our total square foot acreage of 13-1/2 acres, we have a fair amount of land and we have taken by policy decision, a large portion of that saying that we will not use it for a facility of any kind because it infringes into the Capitol building and into the Civic Center and those are all of the areas from the ground portion of the Pauahi Wing to the makai side, which is a considerable amount of area. Again, this is our effort to keep pace with enhancing the Civic Center and having a place of beauty.

Yamabe: With respect to that particular area, I recognize that you don't wish to get into high rise and the

view plane, but I thought there might be a possibility of getting into a three- or four-story building which would not mar the profile of Punchbowl, but not leaving it completely open, and whether or not this was explored.

Henderson: These were explored with the Civic Center Policy Committee and they encouraged at great length to move to the outside of the view plane to Punchbowl and we reduced all of that buildings in that area. At one time, we anticipated Pauahi Wing for a four- or five-story wing, but we completely abandoned that because it does make a considerable encroachment into the perimeters of the beauty of the Capitol building.

Yamabe: Am I correct to assume that in that particular area, the Committee does not wish you to construct any buildings?

Henderson: I think they would be pleased if we did not. The existing buildings outlined in pink are three stories maximum to the Ewa side and one other wing is four stories which is the highest.

Yamabe: If it were possible to construct in that area, not any higher than the existing building, would you be able to construct the proposed ten story to possibly five stories?

Henderson: There are two problems:

(1) The areas are very small although it looks large on the map; and

(2) Those areas are not compatible with the physician office in that those are service areas consisting of boiler buildings, laundry area, work shop and air conditioning cooling system so that the area itself is much more restrictive than it appears to show on the map.

The physician office building is entirely office with the exception that there will be a clinical laboratory and a radiological department.

Ingleson: Is that an out-patient operation?

Henderson: Yes, it is the same as putting a group of physicians together who are all independent, but we will centralize all the services which will reduce costs and we would then make it adjacent to hospital facilities which would make it easier to accommodate

patients because it is changing so fast. We're trying to get all of the continuity of planning a comprehensive program which includes all out-patient services and in-patient services which patients today have been interested in. The mental health in this community is a much greater problem than most people realize. Particularly, this community is getting to realize those social problems and this is why we planned this mental health unit to take care of mental illnesses, alcoholics, drug addictions, etc.

Ingleson: Is the mental health center primarily an out-patient center?

Henderson: The building proposed to be constructed is primarily an in-patient facility for 50. Our out-patient program is being conducted in the middle of the facility, as shown on the drawing.

Ingleson: I wonder why the physician office building which is really a central physician building in the overall plan of the facility--is there a specific reason why there is a center in the complex?

Henderson: Yes, one of the things that we're finding in the health care is the tremendous shortage of manpower and particularly, a tremendous shortage of physicians. The physician is the key to providing that health care and idea is if you can get the out-patient movement and the bed patients so that you move to a central corridor where you provide all of the major facilities of operating rooms, laboratories, pathology, X-ray therapy--all of those things. The building shown in the blue square represents placing in the precise center of all of the patient facilities, the shortest movement to save the patient, in his time of stress, from being moved to the operating room.

In my opinion, and I have traveled extensively over the country, this is one of the most progressive plans that was developed in providing care to the patient, centralizing and, at the same time, in an effort to reduce the cost which is one of the major problems in this day. This is a very high priority and the key in the approach to providing the necessary care. By underground tunnels, you tie together the entire facilities which is the easiest method that we can get patients to the central facility that they need. It is attempted in this building to reduce and maintain duplication of services to an absolute minimum.

The other problem before us is that health care has taken on such an enormous pace in the last two years that I don't know what it will do in another five to ten years with health care problems in this community. It relates not only to facilities, but it relates to manpower shortages as well. There is built into this organization the idea of moving to an enormous educational program of training all different types of technicians and we have already considered this in the program. At the present time, we have considerable training in surgical technicians, surgical assistance, X-Ray technicians, laboratory technicians, so we have a tremendous effort to keep pace with the need that is suddenly upon us.

Sullam: How long do you think this complex with its space will be adequate to your organization? In other words, how long would this space be adequate before it becomes obsolete?

Henderson: Considerable effort has been made on our part to do so and we are in the process at this time establishing upper limits of what our organization will serve in this community in a specific location. The next move is attempting to satellite and spread the facilities so that adjacent communities can provide the basic care that is required and patients then who have serious disabilities can be moved to a center such as this to be provided that care. Whether or not this will be achieved in this community will be very difficult because we are a small community and people like to have all the conveniences available to them. So I would say that this organization would accommodate itself for about the next 20 years and within that time, we should seek other means of providing health care for the people in the community.

Yamabe: Is the physicians building to be used as a clinic operation?

Henderson: Yes, if you go to a physician's office who is a sole practitioner, one of the great problems you find is that he can provide you with some basic professional attention, but as soon as you need some X-ray or laboratory work, you need something beyond the scope of his office. He sends you to one building for an X-ray and another building for laboratory care, so we're taking all of these physicians who are isolated in private practice around the community and trying to draw them to a

center, so actually what happens and I think we have all read about government promoting the idea of getting physicians grouped together to make the best use of all their skills and, at the same time, providing paramedical personnel, all supplementary personnel who will do much of the work to relieve them to take care of your illnesses if you come into the hospital. So we will end up very much as the Medical Group is now. It has consolidated its physicians into an area and attempts to provide all the care you need in one spot. So we're taking all the physicians who are spread out in the community--the Young Building, the Ala Moana Building and many of them just in independent offices and bringing them into one center and providing them with the latest and best equipment that we possibly can to care for each individual that comes to this site.

Yamabe: Am I correct to assume that this isn't part of the Queen's Hospital other than the fact that this is a desirable plan, such as the physicians being closer. Is this primarily an office building for the doctors?

Henderson: Yes. The time has passed when the physician can do everything in his office. The physician today needs all kinds of diagnostic tools and these tools are provided in one central location. So he is no longer the isolated doctor taking care of an isolated patient. We're all becoming a coordinated movement in health care and a doctor is a member of the team to provide these services. It is a changing trend and I think we're going to see more of it in the next few years in this community.

Yamabe: Do you visualize that other hospitals will have other types of structures which will be housing these doctors from the downtown area, rural area, suburban area, to be housed around hospitals, such as St. Francis, Castle, etc.?

Henderson: I cannot predict but I would say that almost every hospital--Wahiawa, Castle, St. Francis, Kuakini, etc.--I strongly suspect that all of these hospitals are in the process at this time of developing precisely this kind of facility. It is the one way that we can do a better job of providing health care and, at the same time, reduce costs. I hope that most people in the community are aware of how much I am trying to reduce costs and this is one of the directions that we are attempting to move.

Yamabe: Then you are actually renting the spaces to the doctors?

Henderson: Yes.

Yamabe: Do you think that there will be a need for expanding the actual need of the hospital beds, equipment, and other facilities related directly to the hospital operation?

Henderson: Pauahi Wing will have 202 new beds and the mental health unit will have 50 additional beds. We presently have 450 beds and we will replace 165 of those beds which are inadequate so we will need roughly 80 to 100 beds. This is a very nominal increase in beds in light of the population explosion in this community. I don't like to predict but I wonder if more people will be taken care of on an out-patient basis for things that they're being hospitalized for a day, and I strongly suspect that in five years, we will educate them to the point that if you go to your physician, your physician will send the patient home with so much of our treatment, rather than being put in the hospital which is very expensive and it runs up the total health costs. We have seen this kind of trend in our emergency department. Our emergency department is almost to the point where it is totally overwhelming; 20% of them are patients who have been critically injured and 80% are those walking in needing some kind of care, but the majority of them are returned to their home with medication. So we're in a state of transition.

Yamabe: You have indicated that there is a critical need for hospital beds; however, I recognize that you must operate on a paying basis. Therefore, am I correct to assume that instead of expanding in the area of providing more hospital beds, you will go into this type of operation not only for convenience for the doctors and for the people, but economically it would be more profitable for the hospital.

Henderson: No, it will be more profitable for the patient in that on an ambulatory basis, the cost to the patient will be reduced. The Queen's Hospital is an organization which is not operating on a profit. Three years ago we operated $14,050 in the black; that is, out of a $10 million budget. There is no organization, profit or non-profit, that can operate in the red so I'm saying that the movements that we are making are to the profit of the patient.

This will be reduced costs to him to keep him out of the hospital. As you well know today, when you go into a hospital, the mainland cost for a semi-private bed is $80 a day, and the semi-private bed at Queen's is about $44 to $46 a day. We're trying to stay away from the $80 a day cost.

Brennan: Based on the fact that this would be a central hospital area or medical area, I wonder from your experience, since you have traveled through the mainland, is it in the community's best interest to centralize everything as it is right now and I'm referring to the population explosion, and are we also not looking at major facilities in East Honolulu and also in the Leeward side? You mentioned that you were going to bring people in that would have temporary quarters out in the other areas and then bring them centrally into this. This brings to my mind the transit system and I was wondering on what projection were you taking this into consideration, or are you projecting that everything will come into this particular area?

Henderson: At the present time, in excess of 50% of the patients that are hospitalized at Queen's Medical Center come from an area in the distance greater than 3 miles from our center. We anticipate with this kind of planning and with the next question that was asked earlier if we can achieve this, I think we can achieve it.

Those patients now coming to the Queen's Medical Center for an appendectomy or for a gall bladder operation, I suspect that these patients will be cared for at these hospitals that we're talking about. The Queen's Medical Center does open heart surgery and has been doing it for the past ten years and I would hope in terms of the good of the community, that no hospital in this entire State would ever do open heart surgery because it is very expensive and requires a tremendous source of manpower and equipment. I would say then that all of the patients who have these enormous serious illnesses should be cared for in this hospital and all of the appendectomies and all of the gall bladders, etc., would be cared for in the community type of facilities that we talked about. I would say that that move is 10 years away before that actually is accomplished.

At the present time, we are in discussions with Wahiawa Hospital, Kahuku Hospital, Castle Memorial Hospital, which represents the outlying areas, to

see if we could plan and develop with them, that they will develop facilities that will take care of the people in their community with the lesser illnesses. All of their patients who have heart attacks or any kind of a heart condition, we're hoping that they would send them to a central center such as this. I would hope that these 3 Leeward Hospitals will not buy a $150,000 X-ray therapy machine and I would hope that they would send all their patients to one unit. We are in process, at the present time, with the Medical Group, Kaiser Foundation, Straub Clinic, Castle Memorial Hospital, Wahiawa and Kahuku Hospitals and we're talking to them in terms that we already have a tremendous 2-million volt radio therapy piece of equipment; that we would coordinate and move all of these people to one unit and they will be cared for in out-patient, and if they have to be hospitalized, they will be in this unit. We are getting good cooperation on this. The Medical Group, Straub Clinic and Kaiser Foundation indicated at this time that they will not plan to develop a radiation therapy unit and that they will cooperate in this kind of planning.

Brennan: You must have a rule of thumb as to what it takes population wise for major hospitals to be established. What would be desirable? What kind of numbers do you use?

Henderson: I think it is 2 beds per 1,000 persons which is generally what has been expected and is considered reasonable in a hospital community. I think we may see a trend toward people treated on an out-patient basis.

Rutledge: How much floor area will this ten-story building occupy?

Henderson: It is 10 stories and we have a gross area of 100,000 square feet so it must be 10,000 square feet per floor.

Paulus: The lower floors are larger than the upper floors of some 10,000 to 12,000 square feet. The total square footage is approximately 130,000 square feet, and divided by 4, will give the number of car spaces.

Rutledge: I'm interested in the ground space that the building will occupy, so we might say approximately 12,000 square feet. Is there another possibility of finding another 10,000 or 12,000 square feet and building something between so it wouldn't block the view of the people.

Henderson: The original building was a single tower. Although it does not appear on the map, the center building was developed into a twin tower concept so we could bring it down to a 10-story structure. When we first designed the building, it was a 19-story structure and so by following your line of thinking, reduced it to 10 stories.

Rutledge: You mentioned that the other hospitals will not put in certain facilities and you could make your hospital the central area for open heart surgery, etc. This is good. But what if a patient at Kaiser Hospital needs open heart surgery, how will he get into your hospital?

Henderson: Kaiser doctors may have privileges at Queen's Medical if they apply for them. I cannot answer for sure and I cannot recall whether there are Kaiser doctors with privileges but our rules permit they may have the privilege at Queen's Hospital if they apply for them and if they meet the qualifications like any other physician.

Yamabe: I don't see it on the plan but is there a possibility that you might create an acceleration or de-acceleration lane on your entrances where you have the exits?

Henderson: It does not show on the map. In our first approach to this, I would not accept any approach to our parking except one and it has to do with precisely what you said. (He pointed out the entrances and exits). I didn't realize it was going to happen that 90% of the traffic may by-pass the entrance and come on the freeway and Lusitania Street has become a considerably lessened traveled street.

Yamabe: Are you closing the Punchbowl entrance?

Henderson: No, we are attempting to get more ways to have access to the property. Another reason is that it is in the master plan (pointed out the accesses). This is due to the conversion of traffic into the center portion and to divert traffic so it could be spread out a bit. (Pointed out the parking area).

Yamabe: I'm sure that the Traffic Department discussed this with you, but with all the ingress and egress, I'm sure this will minimize traffic on Punchbowl Street. On many occasions, I have encountered traffic on Punchbowl with people coming out of the hospital and cars all lined up on Punchbowl Street.

Henderson: What we are attempting to do is to take traffic in one area and put into that area. I think that will be achieved. We have initiated a traffic study and we have completed the first phase of it with the Traffic Department and they have had counters on our entrances and exits all last week. We're on our first phase on this and we have already obtained a traffic consultant who has done the first phase of the study and we will enter into the second phase within 10 days or so.

Yamabe: Then I assume that you will consider any recommendations made by the Traffic Department.

Henderson: Yes.

Sullam: I'm under the impression that a State study was made of the hospital facilities. I think there was one made on Oahu. How does this hospital dovetail with the other hospitals and I think it will be a good idea to look into that report; I mean what is their thinking before we make any decisions because we might have an idea of expansion here and I think we would want to know that before making a decision.

Way: I don't have that information.

Henderson: The Health Facilities Planning Council have already made this study and all of the plans we have proposed are in keeping with the recommendation, so I think they will be happy to make available the material to you. I think Kaiser Hospital is included in that report.

Pink: I realize that you all have been sold on the idea on the emergency of having good hospital facilities, but if it comes to the point of the critical case where it will come to Queen's Hospital, I think it would be a very bad spot for them because:

1) Traffic noise and the dust situation is tremendous. Queen's Hospital is surrounded by the freeway which has tremendous traffic and if you go on Punchbowl, and try to get into the hospital, if you have an emergency, it is hard

to get into the hospital. I think that if we have an extensive care unit, it should be somewhere in the country that is more beneficial to the heart patient.

2) The question of parking has not been answered satisfactorily so far.

3) I think this building is not mainly improving our beds, but only for the convenience of some physicians.

4) It obstructs the view of the Capitol and the view of Punchbowl.

Mr. Brennan's motion to close the public hearing and to take the matter under advisement was seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

Rutledge: The staff has a lot of work to do with reference to what has been presented and to get recommendations together.

Chun: I think that the Commission has a lot of work to do before reaching a decision.

Ingleson: I would like to know what is the proposed structure bounded by Lauhala Street, Circle Lane and Beretania Street.

Way: That is the Medical Group complex. This would be a parking facility and office building complex.

Enriques: It is approximately a 10-story building with three stories to be used for parking and seven floors of physicians offices.

DISCUSSION

Chun: I believe some question was raised as to the possible staff review of the general plan of the hospitals.

Brennan: In view of the additional information, I would like to withhold approval at this time for further information from the staff. There are several factors that I would like to be considered:

1) The additional movement by the Medical Group from Punchbowl into the area with a similar commercial proposition--doctor's office. I

wonder if there can't be some kind of consolidation where it wouldn't be necessary to have two buildings in the same general area. Incidentally, there was no discussion on the second medical building.

2) The parking situation--the accesses and egresses. There should be an actual traffic study on what is intended here especially where Punchbowl is concerned. Further information should be submitted as to number of rooms, bed facilities, etc.

The overall general plan of having a medical center is good, but a well planned proposition is better. This matter should be deferred.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, deferred action for further staff study. X

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
LAIE-KAAAWA
NORTHEAST TO KAWAEWAE
WAY AND TO THE REAR
OF THE HAUULA
SHOPPING CENTER
(RESIDENTIAL USE)

A public hearing was held, under the provisions of Section 5-515(2) of the Charter of the City and County of Honolulu, to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of Laie-Kaaawa District by changing the land use designation from Commercial to Residential use for a parcel of land situated northeast of Kawaewae Way and to the rear of the Hauula Shopping Center, and identified by Tax Map Key 5-4-04: portion of Parcel 22.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of September 7, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, the surrounding property owners, and to the Laie Community Council. No letters of protest have been received.

Ian McDougall, staff planner, reviewed the staff report. He explained that there was a previous request to change the land use designation from Commercial and Residential to Medium-Density Apartment use which was withdrawn. An aerial photograph shows the subject parcel located mauka of the Hauula Shopping Center and which is presently vacant. The only means of physical access to the property is through a local street. The property is about 10 to 15 feet in elevation above the Hauula Shopping Center.

The following discussion occurred:

Brennan: What specifically is the size of the area behind the shopping center?

McDougall: It is 2 acres. The actual lot involved is 2.8 acres. The zoning and the Detailed Land Use Map cover 2 acres. The Detailed Land Use Map designation does not coincide with the property line. So there is a variation between the property line and the existing Detailed Land Use Map designation.

Ingleson: What are the dimensions of the property itself, but not on the Detailed Land Use Map.

McDougall: The property itself on the Laie side is 209 feet, and adjacent to the shopping center it is 506 feet.

Then there is an existing 24-foot roadway easement adjacent to the area which is actually a paper easement. Access will be from Kamehameha Highway.

Sullam: How many lots are possible if subdivided under the R-6 designation?

McDougall: We have not checked the subdivision layout as there may be problems in calculating the number of lots. It may be done with a dogbone type of roadway. The zoning mauka of the property is R-6 Residential at present.

Speaking in opposition to this proposal was Raymond Ponzo, representing Jonathan Manor, owner of the property. He requested that a decision be postponed indefinitely.

From the map displayed of the shopping center and the existing building, he indicated that one tenant in the building has requested another 19,000 square feet of floor area and plans have been drawn and sent to them in the mail. He believed that the best way to do this was to use the area under construction (pointed out on the map). This plan was drawn on August 6, 1969, a month before the public hearing was published in the newspaper, which would provide additional parking at two locations with deliveries to be made in the back of the building. Although he could not say, there is the possibility that as the area grows, other tenants may wish to enlarge their area. The IGA Market, occupying 10,000 square feet, may wish to enlarge their area and the only way this can be done is by utilizing the commercial area.

Brennan: In servicing the stores in the Center area, there is no real entrance?

Ponzo: There is a paved area which goes all the way to the rear of the stores.

Brennan: Are you now talking about warehouse use?

Ponzo: No, the proposed building is for store use, a variety store--the Wigwam Department Store. They have 6,000 square feet which is too small and they would like to have a total area of 25,000 square feet. The lease negotiation started in June of this year.

Brennan: Are you talking about expansion of the shopping center?

Ponzo: Yes.

Brennan: And that expansion would relate itself to the area directly in front as well? In other words, the same tenants would have access or frontage?

Ponzo: Yes, they have frontage now and they would keep the same frontage and the only thing would be to knock off the rear wall of the store and enlarge it. The elevation would be about 4 feet in front of this line (pointed out on the map) where the incline starts and then it comes up about 3 feet or 4 feet from the pavement and the embankment goes up. The proposed addition would be all on the same level as the existing shopping center because the whole area had to be graded.

Yamabe: Are you in negotiation right now and there is no firm communication as far as expansion is concerned?

Ponzo: Not to my knowledge as this is being done by our home office in San Diego. I have seen nothing in writing. I have seen plans for the additional 19,000 square feet and the lease terms spelled out, but I have seen nothing of a firm lease from our home office of 25,000 square feet.

Yamabe: Would it be possible for you to provide us with whatever information you might have, such as a letter of request or negotiation or whatever you might have.

Ponzo: Yes.

Yamabe: Your client's representative, at the last few meetings ago, had requested withdrawal of the application. Do you know what the reason was?

Ponzo: Yes, because that had already started and we had planned to use a portion of the property.

Yamabe: My recollection was that the application was for a change to apartment use.

Ponzo: Yes, that action was initiated by Jonathan Manor over a year ago and I thought that was forgotten until I was told to pay $100 for the public hearing notice. I'm the Vice-President of Jonathan Manor.

Yamabe: If there is such a person, is Mr. Manor aware of the fact of the additional request for additional space for Wigwam?

Ponzo: This started back in June, 1969, but it was at least a year ago when we retained an attorney to apply for the apartment zoning. This was way before the Wigwam Department Store requested for additional space. About a month ago, I was informed that there would be a public hearing for apartment use of this property and that was when I told the attorney to withdraw the application because we already started the negotiations with the Wigwam Department Store.

Yamabe: You indicated that you would like to have this application postponed indefinitely and I would appreciate if you could give us some idea as to what you mean by indefinite so it would aid in my deliberation.

Ponzo: At first, I thought maybe for a few months and after hearing someone testify on the previous application about the population explosion, I felt maybe there might be a need to consider the property again. The tenants have been paying a lot of taxes as commercial zoned property for about 5 years; we intend to use it as commercial zoned property and we purchased it as commercial zoned property, so I can't understand why the property should be changed to some other use if we don't infringe on any of the neighbors in any way. It will be the same height as the existing buildings.

It would be hard for me to define indefinite. By indefinite, I hate to put a certain time limit. If the Commission is going to zone the area residential and suppose in 1970, Kahuku IGA Super

Market would like to expand his present structure. So, I'm trying to protect our investment and I'm not trying to deprive anyone of their investment.

Sullam: When is this Wigwam expansion going to take place?

Ponzo: This will be very soon, probably before the end of the year when construction will start, but I do not know about the other tenants. I say the end of the year hoping that the Commission will act favorably.

Brennan: I'm assuming that when you say indefinite, you're expecting expansion, but you're really asking that there be no change.

Ponzo: Yes, that is what I'm asking at this time.

Rutledge: I just received a (draft) copy of the Rules and Regulations of the Planning Commission which, I believe, the Commission should be guided by. Rule No. 9 which is Indefinite Postponement states that "when a question is postponed indefinitely, the same shall not be acted upon again or revived at any subsequent meeting in the calendar year in which such question was so disposed."

Brennan: Are you also involved in the adjacent property that is to be considered by the Commission?

Ponzo: No.

Ingleson: What are the requirements for construction in a B-2 district which is adjacent to residential zoned land with reference to fencing, and so forth.

Way: There is a buffer zone requirement. I will check into this.

Brennan: Regarding the whole area which Mr. Ponzo is requesting to be left in commercial use, is the parking sufficient to cover the needs?

Way: This plan was just submitted and this will be taken care of at the time an application is made for a building permit.

No one spoke in favor of the proposal.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

MOTION: Mr. Ingleson moved that this matter be deferred since this proposal is closely related to another item on the agenda for which action has been deferred for receipt of further information. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

The following discussion occurred:

Way: Specifically, what type of information does the Commission desire.

Ingleson: Now that we will have a report on Item #3 relating to Kahuku Shopping Center, I would request that the staff reports be handled as a separate item rather than as one report.

Brennan: Inasmuch as we're taking some commercial land and putting some in, it was my impression that we zone based on need. Has the staff found that in this particular area, there was a need for additional commercial?

Way: In terms of general land use, we have looked at the whole area in relationship to the commercial area, short of doing a market analysis. It is difficult to say that there is a need for two or three acres of commercial use. When the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map was prepared, there was approximately the same amount of commercial in the area and assuming that this was reasonably valid, it was on this basis that we felt in effect we could have about the same amount of commercial land as we have right now, but with the adjustment according to the topography and what we felt were some rather complicated access problems.

Yamabe: I think by doing some research on this proposal, such as whether this area lends itself to the type of commercial operation, whether it is usable for a commercial operation, etc., and once this is determined, I think it will take care of agenda item No. 3 (Kahuku Shopping Center). Because of the fact that it was presented by the Planning Director, one of the reasons for recommending the other area was that you were deleting the number of acreage from that area.

Chun: I think that in the original staff report, the staff did say Item No. 2 did not lend itself to commercial use.

ACTION: The Commission deferred action on this application.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
KAIPAPAU-HAUULA
KANEOHE SIDE OF
HAUULA SHOPPING
CENTER
(COMMERCIAL USE)
KAHUKU SHOPPING
CENTER, LIMITED
BY: HIROSHI SAKAI,
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW

The Commission again considered a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Kaipapau-Hauula by changing the land use designation from Residential to Commercial use for 2.4 acres of land situated on the Kaneohe side of the Hauula Shopping Center in Kaipapau and identified by Tax Map Key 5-4-19: 53.

A public hearing was held and closed on August 14, 1969. The Commission deferred action for receipt of further information.

Mr. Ian McDougall, staff planner, briefly reviewed the proposal. He indicated that the parcel comprising 2.4 acres is located adjacent to the Jonathan Manor property. Access is provided on Kamehameha Highway and Kawaipuna Street. The applicant has submitted a sketch of the proposed restaurant structure and a plot plan of the proposed development with a restaurant located in the center of the parcel surrounded by parking. The staff recommendation is to approve the request on the basis that there would be a removal of similar amount of commercial on the mauka side of Jonathan Manor property. In effect, it is an exchange of commercial property from Jonathan Manor's property to the Kahuku Shopping Center property.

The following discussion occurred:

Brennan: Under the circumstances that exists, what would the staff recommendation be now inasmuch as Jonathan Manor had indicated that they would like to have their property in Commercial use.

McDougall: I think we have to review the entire situation and I think a 2-week period would be sufficient.

Ingleson: What is the topography of this site?

McDougall: It is fairly flat.

Mr. Rutledge's motion that this matter be referred back to staff for further study was seconded by Mr. Brennan.

Sullam: Generally, this type of thing where it is just zoned for commercial and the applicant waits around to see what he can do with it and builds something hoping that it will be a success and then it turns out that a shopping center is not an asset to the community. It is poorly designed and I think a shopping center should be integrated into the community, and it should be placed where people want to go and wander around. It shouldn't be a place where you just go in and out because it is so ugly. We must think of ways of controlling shopping centers.

Chun: I think we're talking about the wrong thing now because we're not talking about the shopping center; however, your point is well taken.

Sullam: But this is a restaurant thing and there is the shopping center. I think the entire complex should be examined and to find out what the components are.

Brennan: From the drawing submitted, it looks like a drive-in restaurant. Is that the concept because it was indicated that parking will be provided all around.

McDougall: All we can tell at this time is the information that was submitted that it was a restaurant. The applicant did not indicate whether it will be a drive-in restaurant. The building is about 80 feet by 100 feet and located in the center of the subject parcel.

Sullam: I still feel that this has to be considered in the complex of the entire shopping center because there will be a shopping center that goes in there ultimately.

ACTION: Mr. Rutledge added to his motion that the staff consider the request of Mrs. Sullam. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yamabe and carried.

PARK DEDICATION ORDINANCE DEDICATION OF LAND FOR PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS OF THE PAYMENT OF MONEY IN LIEU THEREOF

The Commission again considered a proposal to adopt an Ordinance to amend Chapter 22, R.O. 1961, by adding thereto a new article to be numbered Article 6, relating to Dedication of Land for Parks and Playgrounds or the Payment of Money in lieu thereof, as a condition precedent to final approval of a subdivision.

A public hearing was held and closed on September 4, 1969. The Commission deferred action for further information.

Since the public hearing, the Director reported that the following letters were received and read the letters for the record:

1) Home Builders Association

2) Bishop Estate

3) Department of Parks and Recreation

4) Corporation Counsel

The following discussion occurred:

Legal Counsel A. Sato: In connection with the proposed changes in the ordinance, the Commission may recall that at the last meeting, the possibility of providing land in perpetuity and also the dedication of land for parks and playgrounds were considered. Section 46-4 seems to give the counties an option of either providing land in perpetuity or the dedication of lands for parks and playgrounds.

In the initial draft, only the dedication portion was included. We are now considering putting in the provision for the land in perpetuity or the lands for parks and playgrounds. Also in our revision, we would suggest that the third method of setting up funds for parks and playgrounds be provided for in the ordinance. In the original draft, a fourth method was suggested which is the combination of fee lot lands. We omitted this portion because the statute does not specifically authorize a combination type.

We might also add that the California statute provides a combination type whereby the Hawaii statute does not. The proposed Section 22-6.6 with reference to combining dedication for payment of fee would be omitted in the proposed ordinance.

Chun: Has this draft been made available to the Commission?

Sato: No, this was not given to the Commission because it is still in working stage and I just want to present the highlights and then consider the suggestions and incorporate them. Of course, we must work with the staff on this.

Rutledge: I remember at the last meeting, the Corporation Counsel was to get pertinent information as to what was done in other states and to put it together.

Chun: I agree that until the Corporation Counsel has a draft of the ordinance, it should not be brought to the Commission until such time. I further suggest that any correspondence sent to the Commission by interested parties by forwarded to the Corporation Counsel, that they may take those suggestions and consider it in the drafting of the ordinance.

Rutledge: I also suggest that if the Corporation Counsel does get information from elsewhere as to what is being done and if that information is gotten together, then I think we might want to get a Subcommittee of the Commission to meet with the Corporation Counsel and make a report on what may be practical.

Chun: Mr. Rutledge is hereby appointed Chairman of the Subcommittee, with Mrs. Sullam and Mr. Ingleson.

Yamabe: I was under the impression that Counsel did want to consult if there were possible alternatives and to get the consensus of the Commission and, if this is so, then maybe the Subcommittee could consider this. I would appreciate if there are areas of alternatives, this could be submitted to the Commission.

Brennan: There has been, as it relates to this dedication proposition, the feeling by developers that this would be a pass-on proposition; in other words, if we take, assuming 10%, they feel that this would be related directly to raising the price of a subdivision and the landowner does not benefit and, if possible, wherever they have had a formula of dedication and if there are statistics available, I wonder if the land values have changed in these specific areas. I wonder if it is possible to get any statistics on this.

Sato: In answer to that question, I think the Legislative Committee, in considering this particular Section 46-4, have dedicated that the cost or burden should be passed on to the subdivider and this seems to be the legislative intent. In answer to the second part of the question, I have some correspondence and information from other states and it might be virtually impossible to get that type of information as to how much cost would be passed on to the buyers in that particular area.

Yamabe: I realize the enabling act states subdividers, and reference is made to subdividers; however, at the last meeting, it was indicated by Bishop Estate that if there is to be any dedication, Bishop Estate would be happy to make dedication and I assume this to mean that the landowners themselves would dedicate this possibly without getting to pass that portion of cost to the subdivider. Therefore, I don't know what is precluded and what is included in the law itself, but I would like to have Counsel explore the possibility of having the landowners, if there is a possibility, to make direct dedication where it would not involve additional costs to the subdivider. I realize that there are some additional costs to the subdivider, some of it will be borne by the consumer and so forth, but it should be borne by the landowners as well. So if you can find some ways and means that sharing of the costs could be incorporated in the ordinance, I would appreciate this.

Sato: In reference to Bishop Estate, Mr. Van Allen went on record that Bishop Estate is agreeable in the concept of the ordinance and that Bishop Estate went on record that they would dedicate land. Under the proposed ordinance, it would be in line with the enabling act. We give them the option of either (1) providing land in perpetuity, or (2) dedicate land for parks and playgrounds so they can do one or the other. We wanted to include both provisions; otherwise, we might run into a constitutional law problem. I say that because the statute provides two methods and if we chose one, although it is possible that the legislators thought that we could select one or the other, I think it is better to have two methods.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, deferred action to have the Subcommittee meet with the Corporation Counsel and the Planning Department to discuss ways and means and to report back to the Commission.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN (AMENDMENT) WAIKIKI DELETING A PORTION OF WAINANI WAY, EXTENSION OF WAINANI WAY, CREATION OF A CUL-DE-SAC OFF KUHIO ROAD

The Commission again reviewed a proposal to amend a portion of the Development Plan and Detailed Land Use Map of Waikiki by deleting a portion of Kaneloa Street, providing for an extension of Wainani Way, and for the creation of a cul-de-sac off Kuhio Road, to enable the consolidation of Jefferson School grounds, the area being identified as Tax Map Key 2-6-28: Parcel 23.

A public hearing was held and closed on September 11, 1969, and action was deferred for staff consultation with the Traffic Department.

The following discussion occurred:

Leonard Moffitt, Staff Planner:

I will review briefly what happened at the last meeting. The request was to delete Kaneloa Road so that the school grounds could be expanded without a street going through it. The Department of Accounting and General Services offered to give to the City some land for some kind of an access road in the rear for exchange of City owned land.

The problems arose at the last meeting of providing access to the people living in the Park View Apartment who protested. They indicated that the property facing on Makee Road and shown on the official adopted Development Plan and Detailed Land Use Map shows that Makee Road was to be abandoned. The question arose as to whether this could be done since they claimed that they were not involved in the hearing.

In light of the protests and a question which was raised as to whether there could be some other alternatives which would provide them the access and the frontage on to the access road rather than having the access only at the rear, a proposal was made by the Commission and this was discussed with the Traffic Department and they proposed another alternative. Representatives from the Traffic Department and the Department of Accounting and General Services are present today.

The alternatives that were suggested by the Commission shows a one-way road running around the Park View Apartment property. This would go mauka on

Makee Road, ewa on Kaneloa Road, and makai on the portion of land which was offered to the City by the State and then coming back to Kuhio Avenue. This proposal was examined by the Traffic Department and in discussions with them, they considered it a very possible alternative. However, they raised the question of possible turnaround accidents coming in for left turns or even right turns off of Kapahulu Avenue. Cars coming in would have to slow down, more than the cars in the back would expect, to make an additional, almost a 180° turn, to go into there. There is a small area now, but when it is a 70-foot road with a tremendous amount of traffic, this could cause some problems. So in looking at this to see whether something else might be done to accomplish the same purposes, we suggested another alternative. The State agencies might prefer this because it involves only 32 feet which would take a small portion away from them.

The other alternative would be a 40-foot road which would take more land away from the State but, we think in this case, we have eliminated much of the traffic problems. This would be a two-way street rather than a one-way street with access off of Kuhio Street at that point where the State had offered some land. This would come clear around, but be blocked off from going back into Kuhio so that the turnaround would be at this end and this would provide access to the new hotel that is being constructed, plus the complete access off Parkview Hotel so that, in effect, they would have access on three sides or face on to a street on three sides. That is the major consideration at this end.

There are two other aspects that we need to consider:

1) Running Wainani Way through. If you recall, there is a building permit which complicates this matter and it would mean that we have to recommend very quickly that the City condemn the right-of-way since the person is ready to build if this is approved. If it is not approved, then there is still time of providing access.

2) This part is the least important in terms of the school, but it was proposed that if Kaneloa Street is abandoned, this portion should be abandoned (pointed to the area on the map). If, however, we cannot go all through Wainani Way, then we come back to the original State proposal which was to come up and connect with a certain portion of Kaneloa Street.

Yamabe: Did you have an opportunity to discuss this matter further with the person who represented one of the large estates, who raised the question on the frontage.

Moffitt: That is the Liliuokalani Trust and the Paiko Trust. I did mention to the representative from Paiko Trust after the meeting and have heard nothing from them. He was informed of the fact that he does not have double frontage. He was not aware that there is a buyer for this piece of property, the sale of which is being held up by the Finance Director until this matter is resolved by the Planning Commission. A portion of Wainani Way is abandoned and owned by the City. It is not a street, although it exists and is paved, because it does not go any where. A house blocks the road. The abandoned street is approximately 65 feet by 120 feet.

Rutledge: Has this been discussed with Mr. Mirikitani and others in the apartment building?

Moffitt: They were not informed of this new proposal. They were informed that we were coming up with a proposal to present to the Commission today. They asked for access on the remaining frontage and this is what we are proposing that they continue to have the access that they now enjoy.

Rutledge: I don't think it is fair to the people and I think that they should be informed and the new proposal discussed with them, and then the proposal should be presented to the Commission with their views. After all, these people objected and then a new plan is presented to the Commission to act on and these people don't even know about it and I don't think this is right.

Brennan: Mrs. Sullam made a point that isn't Wainani Way adjacent to the school grounds--the 7,000 square feet

Moffitt: It is vacant land now. The school owns it. The City owns the abandoned street.

Brennan: Logically, instead of selling it, should it not go to the school grounds?

Moffitt: Yes, if it is not going through.

Brennan: Paiko Trust owns the adjoining area at the corner and I understand you to say that you have an offer for this. Are the Paiko people aware that this is for sale?

Moffitt: No, they are not aware.

Chun: I believe that the statute provides that when an abandoned road is for sale, it is first offered to the abutting land owners and cannot be put up for sale. I don't think that Paiko Trust would have an opportunity, except for that small area which abuts their land.

ACTION: Mr. Yamabe moved that this matter be deferred to have the staff contact representatives of the Paiko Trust, Liliuokalani Trust, Department of Education, Park View Apartment, and other interested parties to discuss the new traffic proposal and to report back to the Commission of their views on the proposal, and further to explain the situation to the representative of the Paiko Trust.

Sullam: Instead of having the turnaround at the end, maybe the turnaround could be at this location (pointed out on the map) and the park could come up here which would actually enhance the apartment. There is a nice shade tree and there is a rear entrance and the area is fairly nice so if you have the turnaround at the front, it would give it a feeling of elegance to have the park.

Chun: There is a rooming house there.

Sullam: That is the problem. I guess there is probably no way of getting into it unless we get into another street.

Chun: The street does not go all the way back.

Ingleson: What is being done on the triangular area on the corner as shown in green?

Moffitt: It has gone back to the State for school use. It is not a City park. It is now the area where the kindergarten children play and is fenced in for school use.

George Moriwaki, Department of Traffic: Our concern was mainly one of safety. The intersection is quite close to Kapahulu Avenue and what makes it even worse is that Kuhio Avenue is scheduled to be widened in the future and, when that happens, the volume of traffic on Kuhio Avenue will undoubtedly increase. This is one of the reasons why we did not want the opening to be as close as it was proposed to Kapahulu Avenue.

Sullam: Is there any other way of getting into the rooming house instead of on Makee Road?

Moriwaki: No.

Ingleson: How many lanes would a 40-foot right-of-way accommodate?

Moriwaki: Two lanes plus one parking lane with a pavement width of approximately 28 feet. Our concern also is that since this is a high rise, there will probably be heavy trucks going in and out. The trucks legally could be as wide as 9 feet, whereas the ordinary vehicle is much narrower, and for that reason, we are concerned about the width.

Yamabe: What if there is no parking on the street?

Moriwaki: Even with no parking, assuming there were two trucks trying to pass each other, each truck being 9 feet for a total of 18 feet, would leave 2 feet in between assuming you go to a 32-foot type of roadway. Although this is possible, the Traffic Department is concerned with traffic safety. We do not recommend something like that in an area in which we know there will be heavy trucks going in and out.

If we have a 32-foot roadway, there would be 20 feet of pavement and if they drive slowly and carefully, they can get by because there will be a 2-foot clearance. However, I would recommend 28 feet.

Sullam: Did you take into account the tree that was in front of the apartment which is on Kaneloa Street?

Moffitt: We were concerned about it and that is one reason for trying to get rid of the turnaround. In the original proposal, the reason it goes around is to save the tree. We don't know if we will succeed but we will try. The 32 feet will save the tree but it is questionable whether the 40 feet will save it.

ACTION: Mr. Yamabe added to his motion that the staff also consider methods to retain the tree. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brennan and carried.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
MAKIKI
EAST CORNER OF MAKIKI STREET AND NEHOA STREET
(CONVALESCENT HOME)
THE CHINESE CENTER

Prior to consideration of the Conditional Use Permit request, Mr. Ingleson declared a conflict of interest and left the room.

The Commission again considered a request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct and operate a convalescent home on a 44,875 square-foot parcel of land situated at the east corner of Makiki Street and Nehoa Street in Makiki and identified by Tax Map Key 2-5-01: Parcels 9 and 10.

A public hearing was held and closed on August 14, 1969, and the Commission deferred action for further information from the Traffic Department.

Mrs. Loretta Chee, staff planner, read the letter submitted by the Traffic Department. She also reported that the applicant had conducted its own traffic study which was distributed to the Commission.

Replying to questions from the Commission, Mrs. Chee stated that the Traffic Department did not mention the possible expansion of Hanahauoli School. However, Hanahauoli School reported that there is an approximate school enrollment of 185 students, and the average number of teachers and other employees is 18. They have recently acquired a small parcel of land to the rear which they are adding to and they will provide 11 parking spaces. Originally, they did not have any parking spaces.

There is a 3-foot master plan road widening on Nehoa Street. No street widening is planned for Makiki Street which is a 54-foot roadway. One of the conditions in the Conditional Use Permit is that the applicant dedicate the 3-foot road widening on Nehoa Street.

Despite all the hearings held on this application, Mr. Rutledge was of the opinion that he was not ready to make a decision and requested that this

matter be deferred to consider all aspects of this application because of the fact that a convalescent home will be located in a residential district and objections were raised by residents. Mr. Brennan agreed that this application be deferred.

Mrs. Sullam reported that one of the protestors expressed concern about the residential quality and the height of the project. She requested that the height be reviewed.

Mrs. Chee indicated that under the Conditional Use Permit, there is the flexibility for height regulations, but it is preferred to keep the height comparable to the requirements for residential districts. The development plan submitted shows a height of 25 feet, which would be within 12 feet and the 45-degree plane envelope.

In response to Mr. Brennan's inquiry of whether the Planning Department is involved under the Conditional Use Permit as to whether it relates itself to need, the Director stated that for zoning, it relates primarily to the effect upon the neighborhood, but is not intended to identify the need. In this case, the Department is recommending approval of the Conditional Use Permit with a number of conditions to be imposed.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Brennan, deferred action on this application until the next meeting.

GENERAL PLAN
DETAILED LAND USE
MAP (AMENDMENT)
WAIAWA, PEARL CITY,
WAIAU, WAIMALU,
KALAUAO, AIEA AND
HALAWA
PLANNING AREA NO. 32
PARK USE

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, authorized the calling of a public hearing to consider an amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Waiawa, Pearl City, Waiau, Waimalu, Kalauao, Aiea and Halawa, Planning Area No. 32, by changing the land use designation from Residential use to Park use for an area comprising 4.4 acres situated within the Kaonohi Ridge Subdivision, Lots 220-225, Unit 2B, and identified by Tax Map Key 9-8-11: portion of Lot 3.

STREET NAMES
LOWER NUUANU
HAYASHI SUBDIVISION

The Commission, upon the motion by Mrs. Sullam, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, recommended approval of the following street name for a roadway within the Hayashi Subdivision in Lower Nuuanu:

HUAKE PLACE - Deadend roadway off Bates Street proceeding in a mauka direction.
Meaning: Full and plump, as a healthy person; well proportioned.

MISC
SEATRAIN
VARIANCE
ANUENUE
ISLAND

The Commission discussed the Seatrain variance granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals on August 28, 1969.

Rutledge: Has anything been done on Seatrain?

Sato: There was no direct communication to the Corporation Counsel. Has there been a specific request made to the Corporation Counsel directed to Mr. Devens?

Rutledge: Has there been any correspondence between the staff and the Planning Commission or any one since the granting of the variance by the Zoning Board of Appeals? Was there any communication between the Zoning Board of Appeals that waives their coming before the Commission? What I mean is did the Director inform the State that it was all right to go ahead and forget this procedure?

Way: No, there has not been any correspondence. The State has submitted a request to the Planning Director for rezoning of a portion of Anuenue--Rainbow Island. They also submitted a General Plan for the development for consideration by the staff. The Skylane Inn variance submitted to the Commission for information is under a different circumstance because a variance was required before applying for a Conditional Use Permit.

Rutledge: Seatrain is an industrial venture operating in a residential zone. I'm concerned about whether or not we have any administrative procedures. Does the Planning Commission have any rules as to administrative procedures that we operate by? I asked this earlier and I was handed a draft of the Rules of Parliamentary Procedures. The Commission should have them. I wonder if all the time we spent at these meetings were in frustration and also no minutes. I was given a copy of the Administrative Procedure Act. Maybe we should have some procedures.

Chun: Is this draft, as indicated by Mr. Rutledge, being worked on by the Corporation Counsel or is it the actual rule?

Sato: It was brought to my attention that the draft was prepared by Wendell Kimura in 1966, so apparently three years ago this was drafted.

Chun: I think the rules and regulations were given consideration months ago and I think at the Planning Conference, we talked to Mr. Sato and Mr. Devens that work should be done on a more detailed basis by which the Planning Commission may act. The present rules and regulations say nothing.

Sato: I was asked by the Planning Director (1) to see if it was passed; and (2) redraft whatever we have and bring it back to the Commission.

Way: This was one of the first points we have observed during the first part of the year and which was discussed with several members at various times. This is something we wanted to move ahead with because of the procedures covering all of the specific requirements that might appropriately be required. We also discussed this with the Corporation Counsel and believed that it was important that we move ahead with the preparation of some of the administrative procedures.

Brennan: Regarding Seatrain, I would think that it would be in our best interest if at least we could get some portion of the testimony of the minutes, as it relates to Seatrain to show that everyone acted in good faith, at the next meeting.

Chun: I would like to suggest to the Planning Director that pursuant to receiving the minutes of the meeting on Seatrain, I do definitely recall that we asked the Corporation Counsel to thoroughly investigate and requested that written communication of an opinion and a report be made by the Corporation Counsel.

Rutledge: I would like to point out further that I feel strongly about this. I don't feel that we have been operating legally. It is mandatory that administrative procedures be set up and as far as I know, nothing has been done and I'm suspicious of the State and the way they operate. I understand the Appeals Board did not even listen to the staff and did not let them testify--that is capricious and arbitrary.

Chun: There are rules available and I have already asked the Corporation Counsel to review the Rules and Regulations and to bring it up to date pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act.

MISC.
INFORMATION
SKYLANE INN
VARIANCE

Regarding the correspondence submitted to the Commission by the Skylane Inn requesting a Conditional Use Permit, Mr. Yamabe requested that the staff explore the variance which was granted to the Skylane Inn by the Zoning Board of Appeals. He believed that a request was made to the Zoning Board of Appeals simply to secure approval for a variance from the one-mile distance restriction. He felt that if such a variance must be approved by the Board, there must be something wrong in the ordinance itself. If it is an arbitrary distance, maybe the distance should be changed and an examination should be made of the ordinance.

MISC.
DISCUSSION ON
MOBILE AND
PREFABRICATED
HOMES

Brennan: Sometime back at the Planning Conference, we discussed the fact that mobile and prefabricated homes were coming into being and more and more we're reading about the local companies or major stockholders and I can only think that we can anticipate using this type of structure in Hawaii. I request that the Director look into the proposition of what type of ordinances would be necessary in the event that it will be necessary so that the Commission and the Director will be furnished with all the necessary information if we ever become involved in this.

Chun: We already have the necessary tools.

Brennan: It seems to me that from articles I read, approximately 20% of construction going on in the mainland is related to the mobile concept and, if this is so, then I think at least we should be prepared to cope with this concept, and if we should accept it, then at least this Commission and the people involved should know what types of ordinances are necessary. I would like to go further and get all the information from the mainland cities that are presently using it, and if we can get hold of pictures and other necessary information.

Way: The research done so far is that, as long as the housing and building codes are met, there is no problem of the mobile home. At the present time, the only prohibition we know of is the mobile trailer court type of operation. This is not allowed under the Comprehensive Zoning Code. But I can see a complex of mobile homes which would come in as a Planned Unit Development or a typical subdivision, with 5,000 square feet meeting all side yard requirements or a cluster type approach insofar as mobile homes are concerned. But in

meeting the codes for foundations, utilities, connections, etc., there are really no problems under the present code.

The only problem I know of is a mobile home or trailer court, in which case there are no provisions in the Comprehensive Zoning Code for that. It may be that there are State regulations that pertain to prohibiting trailer court type of concept.

Brennan: Then it is your presentation that our ordinance is sufficient other than the court yard concept.

Way: Generally, there is no problem in terms of fire, plumbing, electrical and other aspects.

Ingleson: You stated that it would be possible to own a vacant parcel and to come in for a mobile home if they meet the zoning requirements.

Way: Yes, and also the requirements for foundation, utilities, and so forth.

Ingleson: I think that Mr. Brennan is looking at the question of housing and in discussions I have had recently, the question came up as to providing housing at reasonable costs. One factor was the cost of land. Is there any information available other than searching through the files as to whether vehicles are available to make land available?

Rutledge: If the City can condemn land for park uses, then we could condemn land for housing, such as in the case of HSM Ventures. If the City could take a portion of that land prior to its being zoned, and there are many of them, then we can get something for the people.

Is there anything wrong with this Commission going to the public for volunteers to do research on many of the items that come up? I think there are citizens in this community who would like to participate and maybe we can get a citizens research committee to work in conjunction and get some of these things done. This way we can show the community the need to hold public hearings at night and explain why there is this need.

Chun: We cannot hold public hearings unless we have some idea of a solution ourselves. I think we must have a proposal first and from that proposal, I think we can come out with something solid to work on.

Brennan: When we had the public hearings on the Comprehensive Zoning Code, we had excellent suggestions from the developers and there might be citizens who might come up with good ideas.

Chun: We must have some sort of proposal ourselves to start on. I think we should first look over the Comprehensive Zoning Code again and I think we can all go on by ourselves and do that.

Ingleson: I think that having discussions on housing and so forth is good and frankly, I would like to see more of this because there are problems which are of much more magnitude which we are spending so much time on and in the future I would like to open the floor for much more discussions and look at the problems.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Mitzie M. Abbott

Mitzie M. Abbott
Hearings Reporter

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
October 2, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, October 2, 1969, at 1:40 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT:

Philip T. Chun, Chairman
Edward Brennan
Lewis Ingleson
Fredda Sullam
Thomas N. Yamabe II
James Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Herbert Mark, Staff Planner
Leonard Moffitt, Staff Planner

ABSENT:

Roy R. Bright
Arthur A. Rutledge

PUBLIC HEARING
GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
WAIAWA TO HALAWA,
PLANNING AREA #32
KAONOHI RIDGE
(PARK USE)

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Waiawa to Halawa Districts by changing the land use classification of Lots 220 to 225, Unit 2B of the Kaonohi Ridge Subdivision, identified by Tax Map Key 9-8-41: Parcels 10 to 14 and 21 from Residential to Park use.

The public hearing notice was published in the Sunday Star Bulletin and Advertiser of September 21, 1969, and copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community and civic organizations in the Aiea-Halawa district, to the owner and the developer of the land, and to interested parties. No written protests have been received to date.

Staff planner Leonard Moffitt oriented the Commission to the location of the subject area and presented the following information:

1. Subdivision plans for the development of a portion of Kaonohi Ridge Subdivision have been approved and construction is now in progress to develop approximately 301 single family residential homes and 223 townhouses on approximately 161 acres of land.

2. Within this subdivision development, the developer, AmFac-Trousdale offered to the

City for $1.00, five lots or 4.4 acres of land for park use. The City Council has accepted the offer and the City is now in the process of acquiring the land.

3. By Committee Report No. 790, the City Council requested the Planning Director to initiate the necessary amendment to the General Plan to redesignate the subject area to park use.

4. By letter dated October 2, 1969, the Department of Parks and Recreation requested the Planning Commission to approve the proposed amendment to designate the subject area from residential to park use.

5. The adopted General Plan Detailed Land Use Plan for this area provides for an extensive development of park areas in the center of each residential block; however, the approved subdivision plan provides for a different layout plan as shown on the map displayed.

6. Based on an anticipated population of 2,000 persons for the present development area and an additional population of 1,300 for subsequent developments, the total population of this subdivision area is expected to be about 3,300 persons.

7. Applying the standard of one acre per 1,000 population for neighborhood parks, the proposed park site of 4.4 acres should be quite adequate to serve this new community.

No one spoke either in favor of or in opposition to this proposed amendment.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Brennan.

<u>MOTION</u>: Mr. Brennan's motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Waiawa to Halawa Districts by changing the land use classification of land identified by Tax Map Key 9-8-41: Parcels 10 to 14 and 21, within the Kaonohi Ridge Subdivision from Residential to Park use was seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

In the ensuing discussion, Commissioner Ingleson inquired as to how the residential subdivision was permitted when the General Plan Detailed

Land Use Map designates the subject area for park use.

The Director explained that the subdivision plan was approved under the previous residential zoning classification of Rural Protective. In addition, an opinion from the Corporation Counsel reaffirmed an earlier opinion given that the Planning Director may not withhold approval of a proposed subdivision solely on the ground that the area has been general planned for public park use.

ACTION: A vote was taken and the motion to recommend approval carried unanimously.

LAND USE COMMISSION PETITION MANOA OFF HUELANI PL. URBAN USE (CLYDE E. GRIGGS)

The Commission reviewed a petition filed by Mr. Clyde E. Griggs with the State Land Use Commission requesting an amendment to the Land Use Commission District Boundary by changing the district classification of a parcel of land situated off Huelani Place in Manoa, identified by Tax Map Key 2-9-33: Parcel 6, containing an area of 1.7 acres from Conservation to Urban District. The zoning on the land is P-1 Preservation District except for a small strip at the lower portion which is zoned R-4 Residential.

Staff planner Herbert Mark read the staff report giving background information about the property and existing land uses of the property and the surrounding areas, topography of the land, soil analysis, access, and availability of utilities. (The detailed staff report is filed in Folder No. LUC-82 ('69).)

Briefly, the findings on the land are:

1. Two single family residences are located on the lower end of the property with the site heavily wooded.

2. Single family residences exist on the northeast and southeast boundaries of the property.

3. The slope of the land is from 20% to 40% at the lower portion, from 40% to 45% at the mid portion, and from 70% to 75% at the upper portion.

4. The base of the property is at the 400-foot contour line and the top at about the 600-to 650-foot contour line.

5. The soil in the area consists of rockland and well-drained silt loam and silty clay loam developed from volcanic ash and cinders susceptible to sliding.

6. Access to the site is over an "L" shaped private driveway off Huelani Place which is a 16-foot public road. The driveway width varies from 20 feet to 12 feet nearest the property.

7. All utilities could be made available to the site with the exception of sewers. Presently, there are no drainage facilities along Huelani Place.

8. A proposed two-lot subdivision of the property was denied by the Deputy Planning Director in January, 1965,and reaffirmed by the Planning Director in April, 1965, on the basis that the road access was inadequate and did not meet City standards. The Zoning Board of Appeals upheld the action of the Planning Director in September, 1965.

9. The petitioners had submitted letters verifying that the Board of Agriculture and Forestry had established the Honolulu Watershed Forest Reserve Line at the 600-foot contour.

Mr. Mark further reported that should the property be zoned R-4 Residential in accordance with the adjoining zoning classification and subsequently subdivided, a 44-foot or 56-foot access road to the property would be required. In addition, under the Comprehensive Zoning Code requirement, flag lots are not permitted and the lots would not be able to meet the minimum lot frontage requirement of 70 feet.

Slides showing the private easement areas, the front view of the property with the existing houses, the back view, and other views of the property were shown. Also shown to the Commission was a photograph taken from afar showing the established character of the subject area where the level of existing homes is well below the subject property.

The staff's recommendation was denial of the petition for the following reasons:

1. The proposed amendment does not conform to the existing General Plan which designates the area as Preservation use.

2. The site requested for Urban designation varies from 20% to 40% slope so that a portion of the site exceeds the 20% guideline for Urban use.

3. The expansion of the Urban District to the 600-foot contour level would seriously disrupt the natural environmental quality of an established residential area. The development of the lower Pali would destroy natural growth and scenic open space that helps to create the attractive Manoa environment.

4. Approval of this application may set a precedent for other development to the 600-foot contour level.

In the discussion that followed, additional information was brought out as follows:

1. The 20 to 25 percent slope area extends for about 150 feet and the area contains a little less than one-half acre. Two homes already exist on this lower area.

2. Under the present classification as a Conservation District which is under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Land and Natural Resources, only one residence is permitted on the lot regardless of its size.

3. Should the area be changed to an Urban District and zoned R-4 Residential, the minimum lot area requirement per dwelling is 7,500 sq. ft. if the cross slope of the zoning lot is 25 percent or less; 10,000 sq. ft. if the cross slope exceeds 25 percent but is 30 percent or less; one-half acre if the cross slope exceeds 30 percent but is 35 percent or less; one acre if the cross slope exceeds 35 percent but is 40 percent or less; and two acres if the cross slope exceeds 40 percent. Based on the preceding requirements, one additional home could be built on the subject parcel; provided, that the minimum lot area requirement can be met, and in the event of a subdivision, the 70-foot lot frontage can be met.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission concurred with the Director's recommendation for denial of this petition based on the

reasons stated and to so communicate with the Land Use Commission.

At the suggestion of Commissioner Yamabe, the Commission requested the Director to explore areas with slopes in excess of 20 percent grade which might not be too hazardous for residential development. In this connection, the search need not be confined to Urban Districts only but such areas which can be placed under the jurisdiction of the Planning Director.

The Director noted that the Comprehensive Zoning Code permits residential development on slopes in excess of 20 percent grade; provided, however, that there is a corresponding increase in the lot size and the proposed use is appropriate for that zoning district.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
MAKIKI
MAKIKI AND NEHOA STREETS
THE CHINESE CENTER (CONVALESCENT HOME)

Prior to consideration of this application, Commissioner Ingleson who had declared a conflict of interest previously, left the room.

The Commission again considered an application for a conditional use permit to construct and operate a convalescent home on two parcels of land containing a total area of 44,875 sq. ft. located at the mauka-Diamond Head corner of Makiki and Nehoa Streets in Makiki within an R-6 Residential District. The applicant proposes to construct a three story structure containing 64 rooms for a total of 120 beds and the necessary service facilities areas. Off-street parking will be provided at the rear of the property and an adjoining parcel.

The Commission held a public hearing on August 14, 1969, and after closing the hearing, deferred action for information pertaining to traffic.

The Director oriented the Commission to the location of the subject parcel and pointed out the existing uses and the present zoning of properties in the surrounding area. He gave the following information:

1. Lands situated on the mauka side of Nehoa Street are zoned R-3 and R-6 Residential while lands on the makai side of Nehoa Street are zoned A-3 and A-4 Apartment Districts. A few parcels are still zoned R-6 Residential.

2. The General Plan Detailed Land Use Map designates the area on the mauka side of

Nehoa Street for residential use and the makai side for apartment use.

3. The area mauka of Nehoa Street is predominantly single family residential in character except for two parcels which are used for multi-family purposes, one containing 21 units and the second containing 6 units and operated as rooming houses. These are uses created prior to zoning of the area for a single family residential purpose.

4. With reference to the parking facilities available at Hanahauoli School, the School has reported that it has an approximate student enrollment of 185 students and the average number of teachers and other employees is 18. Parking available on the grounds are 11 spaces for staff and 5 for visitors.

5. The Traffic Department has reported that off-street parking is permitted on both sides of Nehoa Street except during tow away hours and on both sides of Makiki Street. Its observation of the Makiki-Nehoa intersection indicates that the existing traffic facilities can accommodate the proposed change, the proposal will not create an adverse traffic situation, and the traffic flow for this type of development will not coincide with peak hour traffic.

Mrs. Sullam noted that there are convalescent homes located in residential districts and inquired whether there has been any reaction from the residents as to compatibility with or any problems created to the surrounding uses.

The Director could not give a positive response to her question since no such survey has been under taken by the staff. The Department also has not received any comments or expressions of concern from residents adjoining existing convalescent home operations.

Mr. Brennan indicated that this particular area is an old established residential area situated within the proximity of some very important school facilities and as such, he believed that the next few years will see a changing situation for the area. He made a motion to recommend denial of this application based on his belief that the proposed use should not be located in this particular residential area and that the

establishment of the proposed use in the area could become an encumbrance later on.

The motion died for lack of a second.

The Commission deferred this matter until the end of the agenda.

ACTION: The Commission decided to defer action on this matter until the next meeting when there are sufficient number of members to give full consideration to the application. The motion for deferral was made by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, and carried. Mr. Ingleson was not present at this time.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
MANOA
2642 PAMOA ROAD &
2730 HIPAWAI PLACE
SCOPE CORPORATION
(DORMITORY USE)

The Commission again considered an application for a Conditional Use Permit to construct three- and four-story dormitory buildings for 850 students including a two-story commons building and a half story parking building on two separate parcels of land at 2642 Pamoa Road and 2730 Hipawai Place in Manoa within a R-4 Residential District. The public hearing held on June 12 and continued on August 21, 1969 was closed and the Commission had deferred action pending staff review of revised plans submitted by the applicant, the Scope Corporation.

The Director presented the staff's findings as follows:

1. For Site A which has access both from Pamoa Road and Kolowalu Street, the original proposal included the construction of two dormitory buildings, a commons building with dining hall facilities, a parking garage and indoor recreational facilities. The revised plan indicates a commons building with dining and kitchen facilities and a two-story parking structure providing a total of 284 spaces.

2. For Site B which is situated at the end of Pamoa Road, the original proposal included the construction of two dormitory buildings, a parking garage and recreational facilities, including a swimming pool. The revised plan shows that the entire site is devoted to dormitory facilities with the swimming pool at a different location. There are no commons facilities and parking.

3. Although elevation plans have not been submitted, it appears that the building heights would have to be about six or seven stories in order to accommodate 850 students. This height is considerably in excess of the 25-foot height limitation in a residential area.

4. The lot coverage for Site B is about 33% so it would still be within the 50 percent limitation, but for Site A, the lot coverage is nearly 80 percent which is in excess of the 50 percent limitation.

5. Parking to accommodate the dormitory buildings is now situated about 600 feet away which is 200 feet farther than standards of the Comprehensive Zoning Code which permits off-site parking facilities within a distance of 400 feet from the principal use.

On the basis that the revised plans do not comply with the CZC requirements for the granting of a Conditional Use Permit, the Director recommended disapproval of this application for a Conditional Use Permit under the revised plans and to forward this recommendation to the City Council.

The Director then acknowledged receipt and read the following letters of opposition:

1. Mr. Mark Lester, President of the Manoa Valley Community Association recommended that the Planning Commission not approve the proposed development.

2. Mr. Donald G. Aten stated his opinion that the request is being made only because the land is cheaper than apartment zoned land and that the developer can make a "fast buck" at the expense of the physical integrity of the residential area.

3. A petition signed by about 100 residents in the Manoa area reiterated their strong objection to the proposal and noted that the adjusted plans will not solve any of the basic problems relating to traffic, parking, access, and density present in the original plan.

In order to clarify the three basic points cited by the staff, Mr. Howland Swift, representative of the applicant, was requested to answer questions posed by the Commission. Mr. Swift stated that:

1. Elevation plans were not submitted because the building plans basically are unchanged from the original proposal.

2. None of the buildings will be over 25 feet in height from the highest spot on Site B. They would all be lower than tree top level. The majority are three stories and the four story ones would occur in dips of the land where they would fall within the height regulation.

3. The landscaping has been changed to provide a more denser buffer area from the adjoining areas.

4. The land where the parking garage is to be located is considered to be lower than the adjoining land, therefore, by excavating about three or four feet, the one deck parking garage would actually be no higher than houses in the area.

5. The commons building will be a story and half, containing a mezzanine area.

6. They are willing to provide an enclosed walkway at the back of Noelani School so that there would be no mixture of elementary school students with the University students or to provide a narrow paved sidewalk along Pamoa Road.

7. They have obtained a written permission from the University to have pedestrian accesses from both sites directly to the University. The University would actually build the walkway from Site B right along the edge of the St. Francis Convent School.

8. They anticipate about 284 cars some of which will be visitor cars. They will control visitor traffic and parking.

9. The revised parking proposal was to overcome the Planning Department's objection of traffic on Pamoa Road. They felt that the most logical solution would be to have traffic use Kolowalu Street so that there would be no traffic at all on Pamoa Road. Only service vehicles would occasionally use Pamoa Road.

10. In answer to the comment made about the cost of land, the cost directly affects the rates the college students would have to pay for rent. If the cost of the land is high, the students would pay a higher rate but if it is lower, they have a lower rate.

The Commission then discussed whether they are to take action on the revised plan or the plan that was originally submitted and considered at the public hearing.

It was the Chairman's recollection that the original plan or Plan A was withdrawn by the applicant, therefore, the only proposal before the Commission for consideration at this time is Plan B which is a modified Plan. A.

ACTION: Mr. Brennan made a motion to recommend denial of this application for a Conditional Use Permit with accompanying plans indicated as Plan A and Plan B on the bases that the requested use does not conform to good planning because of its proximity to the two schools, and noncompliance with certain aspects of the Comprehensive Zoning Code; and to recommend to the Director that in his discussions with the University of Hawaii, that the University coordinate with the Planning Department and come forth with specific recommendations as to where it believes dormitories should be built within the University area. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Sullam and carried unanimously.

ZONING B-3
BUSINESS-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
CENTRAL HONOLULU DISTRICT
1020-1022 S. KING STREET
DR. KIYOSHI INOUYE

The Commission again considered a proposal to change the zoning from B-1 Neighborhood Business District to B-3 Business-Residential District for a 21,553 sq. ft. parcel of land situated at 1020-1022 S. King Street in the Central Honolulu District. The development proposal is the construction of a multi-story building with commercial units on the ground floor and dwelling units above.

A public hearing was held and closed on August 6, 1969 and the Commission had deferred action to discuss and obtain an interpretation of the legislative intent of the B-3 zoning district.

The Director was unable to obtain an interpretation.

The Commission recalled the legislative intent of this district as stated in the Comprehensive Zoning Code is primarily for business uses with some

residential uses and not primarily residential uses with some business uses as proposed by the developer.

The consensus of the Commission was that this area could be placed into mixed uses of both residential and commercial without adversely affecting the orderly growth and development of the community. The B-3 zoning seems more appropriate than the present zoning of B-1 or the B-2 district which permits more intensive types of commercial uses.

Mr. Yamabe expressed his concern that unless the Commission establishes some standards for determining where the B-3 districts are to be designated, the Commission might be confronted constantly with requests for B-3 zoning throughout the City. It was his understanding that the B-3 district was created to apply to areas where there is a specific need, for instance, downtown Honolulu, to attract people back into the area and not to apply to all commercial area.

The Director commented that for the present situation, the standards applicable could be that the area is transitional in character, having mixed commercial and apartment facilities, and the area's relationship to the mass transit facilities including the transit stops.

The Commission agreed that standards for applying the B-3 zoning district should be established and recommended to the Director that he develop some standards which could be used by the Commission in determining whether or not a particular area could appropriately be zoned for B-3 uses.

<u>ACTION</u>: Upon the motion by Mrs. Sullam, seconded by Mr. Brennan, the Commission recommended approval of the change in zoning from B-1 Neighborhood Business District to B-3 Business-Residential District for a parcel of land situated at 1020-1022 S. King Street in the Central Honolulu District.

MISC.
RESOLUTION BY COUNCILMAN CHARLES CAMPBELL
WAIKIKI-DIAMOND HEAD
RE: PROPOSED ACQUISITION AND REZONING OF DIAMOND HEAD TERRACE TRACT AREA

The Commission again discussed the Resolution introduced by Councilman Charles Campbell proposing the following:

1. Acquisition of all Diamond Head Tract properties within the area bounded by Poni Moi Road, Diamond Head Road, Coconut Avenue and Kalakaua Avenue plus the fourteen Diamond Head Terrace Open Tract lots described as follows: Tax Map

Key 3-1-33, Parcels 2 to 8, 12, 13, 14, 50, 51, 53, and 56; and

2. Changing the zoning designation for the entire area bounded in red as described in Resolution No. 239 and adopted as Bill No. 102 to R-1 from R-3, R-6, and A-4.

The City Council had referred the proposed Resolution to the Planning Commission for its review and recommendation.

The Director gave background information relating to the area. Essentially the facts are:

1. The General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for this planning area was changed recently to reflect park use for the areas extending from Poni Moi Road to the lighthouse on both sides of Diamond Head Road.

2. The City Council proposed the acquisition of all lands within the park designated area but the Mayor vetoed the proposal. The City Council did not override that veto.

3. Councilman Campbell's proposal is to acquire a much smaller area and zone the remainder as R-1 Residential.

In discussing the Resolution, the following points were brought out:

1. According to the Director, whether the intent of the R-1 zoning is to freeze the area from further development for eventual acquisition for park purposes is a matter of policy still to be determined because the City Council has expressed one intent while the Mayor has expressed another. However, the Council and the Mayor, as well as the Planning Commission and the Planning Department are in agreement that the area should be designated for park purposes. The question still to be resolved is the designation of an acquisition area.

2. Mrs. Sullam asked whether the present land use plan for the area is an attempt to preserve Diamond Head or merely a decision to extend Kapiolani Park. If it is to preserve Diamond Head, then consideration should be given to preserving the other slopes as well.

The opinion of the Commission was that the plan is to serve a dual purpose of having a park and at the same time preserve the scenic route of Diamond Head.

3. The Director reported that the R-1 zoning requires a minimum lot area of one acre. Construction or reconstruction of homes on lots with less than one acre would be permitted on the bases of being non-conforming lots of record. The "use" (permitted residential use) then would be permitted even though the lot would be below minimum requirement of one acre. However, front, side and rear yard requirements as well as height limitation set by the Comprehensive Zoning Code must be met. A variance precedure through the Zoning Board of Appeals would be necessary to deviate from all applicable provisions. Repairs and renovation of existing dwellings are permitted to a certain extent. There is further control by the fact that because the area is designated for park use, before a building permit is issued for construction or renovation work, the request is referred to the City Council for a recommendation to purchase the property or to issue the building permit.

4. According to the Director, funds have not been appropriated in the present Six-Year Capital Improvement Program for acquisition of the areas designated as park. However, this should not preclude the programming of funds in the consideration of the next six year Capital Improvement Program.

5. The Director believed that Councilman Campbell's proposal is an attempt to seek a compromise since the Administration and the Council are not in agreement about acquiring the entire park designated areas in the immediate future.

6. The Director read Councilman Campbell's Resolution. The three significant basis for the Resolution are:

   a. The action by the Council and the Mayor of designating the area under discussion to Parks and Recreation constitutes a long-term public policy commitment to ultimately develop the area for (1) an extension of Kapiolani Park and/or (2) preservation of the existing open-space character of this area of Diamond Head State Monument.

b. The City and County of Honolulu wishes to explore in detail all possible methods for financing the acquisition of properties in this Diamond Head area by combining funds from agencies of the Federal, State, and City and County of Honolulu, private organizations, and individuals.

c. The Mayor has recently appointed a Planning Advisory Committee for the Waikiki-Diamond Head area to study problems of this planning area.

The Director reported that the Committee held its first meeting but discussion centered primarily on organization. To accomplish certain purposes of the study which is still to be defined, a time schedule of about five to six months for completion can be anticipated.

Commissioner Brennan was disturbed by the proposal which separates the area into two--one area to be acquired and the other area to be zoned to a more restrictive type of use. If the intent is to eventually acquire the entire area for park, he felt that the proposal to acquire the first area should also apply to the second area; otherwise, people would lose confidence in zoning which can arbitrarily be changed with no explanation as to why this was done. People should have confidence in government.

Since actions taken in the past indicated the need to preserve the scenic site of Diamond Head, Mr. Brennan proposed the creation of a Historic, Cultural and Scenic District for this area.

Mrs. Sullam was inclined to favor this new district. If the area were to be placed in this new district, she proposed that the other slopes of Diamond Head be included also. In this respect, she felt that a representative from the State Department of Land and Natural Resources should be asked to attend the next meeting of the Planning Commission and explain the study done on the visual preservation of Diamond Head to see whether or not some of the thoughts expressed could be incorporated in the City's proposal for the area.

The Director indicated that detailed studies would have to be done before determining whether or not to apply the Historic, Cultural and Scenic District to the area. He felt that the procedural aspects and the stringent requirements for uses in the district might prove cumbersome for the property owners. Additionally, reference is made to buildings

of a historic nature and although the area can be considered scenic, it is questionable whether the buildings have any scenic, historic or cultural significance.

Mr. Yamabe felt that the Commission could not possibly take action today without further explanation or information on the following which he considered needed answers:

1. The Council, the Commission and the Administration apparently are in agreement because the area was designated as park, but the City fathers now seem to have second thoughts. If there has been a change of heart, the Commission should be so informed and of the reasons for the change. He agreed with Mr. Brennan that the City government should maintain integrity in its actions.

2. The indications are that there will be future acquisition of the entire area for park purposes and yet the Resolution indicates the acquisition of only a small segment of the whole. What is the actual acquisition proposal for the area?

3. As mentioned by the two Commissioners, the possible use of the Historic, Cultural and Scenic District should be explored.

Mr. Ingleson added another point for consideration. Since Councilman Campbell introduced the Resolution, he asked whether Mr. Campbell could give the Commission additional information regarding his thoughts for introducing such a resolution.

Mr. Brennan requested information relating to the cost of acquisition of the area proposed by Councilman Campbell and his reasons for proposing the zoning of the remaining area; that is, whether this was done with the intent of eventually acquiring same or with the intent of firmly burying it in the R-1 zoning.

By the fact that park use has been established for the area and the City has agreed to purchase two parcels of land in the area because the owners were ready to begin construction, the Director indicated that the City's intent is eventually to expand the park.

If the intent is as stated, Mr. Brennan felt that all the property owners should be treated equally and the City should not purchase a property because the owner is ready to build and penalize others by freezing their area through the R-1 Residential zoning.

Should the Commission recommend the acquisition of those parcels mentioned in the Resolution, Mr. Chun asked whether the Commission is bound by that recommendation when the CIP amendment proposal is brought before the Commission for action or can the Commission reconsider its action at that time.

The Director did not believe that the Commission's action would be binding.

The Commission then brought out another thought for consideration. Should the Commission recommend the proposed zoning change to an R-1 Residential district, this action could be considered a repudiation of its recommendation of park use for the area. In any event, before the R-1 Residential zoning can be made, the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map must be changed to reflect residential use because any rezoning must conform to the General Plan.

In reply to Mr. Ingleson's question, the Director indicated that the Historic, Cultural and Scenic District is an overlay type of zoning and may be established in any zoning district but the underlying zoning regulations would still be applicable.

ACTION: Mr. Brennan's motion to defer this matter for receipt of additional information relating to the cost of the proposed acquisition area and a response from Councilman Campbell as to whether he had given consideration to the Historic, Cultural and Scenic District for application to the area was seconded by Mrs. Sullam and carried.

The Commission requested the Director to provide additional information to those questions asked by the Commission during the course of the discussion.

STREET NAMES
KALAUAO
KAONOHI RIDGE,
UNIT I
PACIFIC VILLAGE
PROJECT

Upon the motion by Mrs. Sullam, seconded by Mr. Brennan, the Commission recommended approval of the following street name for a roadway situated within the Pacific Village Project at Kaonohi Ridge, Unit I, at Kalauao, Oahu:

UALO STREET -- Roadway running between Kaonohi Street and Moanalua Road.
Meaning: To call out, as for help; to resound.

MISC.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE CHART

For the Commission's information, the new Organizational Structure Chart for the Planning Department was presented to the Commissioners.

Replying to questions from the Commission, the Director indicated that under the new organizational structure, there is a line of communication between the applicant and the department relating to plan review, conditional uses, and so forth through the Implementation Branch. To accommodate increased work load, he envisioned the expansion of this branch by setting up other teams. The General Plan branch has several teams of planners some with diverse background including sociology and physical planning.

Mr. Yamabe suggested that the Department consider seeking assistance from other agencies, such as the University of Hawaii's Department of Sociology with greater resources, not only for the information that might be received but to cut some cost to the City.

Mrs. Sullam suggested that the Department amplify its communication to the public a little more, other than the usual public notices in the newspapers, on matters involving zoning changes, adoption of detailed land use maps and so forth.

MISC. TRANSCRIPT OF THE SEATRAIN VARIANCE REQUEST

At the request of the Commission, the transcript of the Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting of August 28, 1969, relating to the Seatrain variance application was circulated to the members.

The Director reported that a rezoning request for the subject property is presently under study by the staff. The application was made by both the Department of Transportation and the Department of Land and Natural Resources about 10 to 14 days ago.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima

Carole A. Kamishima
Office Services Supervisor

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
October 9, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, October 9, 1969, at 1:35 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT:

Philip T. Chun, Chairman
Edward Brennan
Roy R. Bright
Lewis Ingleson
Fredda Sullam
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Leonard Moffitt, Staff Planner
Loretta Chee, Staff Planner

ABSENT:

Arthur A. Rutledge
Thomas N. Yamabe II
James K. Sakai, ex-officio

MINUTES:

The minutes of the regular meeting of May 1 and the special meeting of May 7, 1969, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mrs. Sullam.

PUBLIC HEARING
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT-HOUSING DIST.
KANEOHE
KANEOHE BAY DRIVE
AIKAHI GARDENS
(MID-PAC DEV. CORP. & DAN OSTROW DEV. CO.)

Prior to holding of this public hearing, Commissioner Ingleson declared a conflict of interest, filled out a statement form for submission to the Mayor and left the room.

A public hearing was held to consider an application to create a Planned Development-Housing District for a development known as Aikahi Gardens on approximately 25 acres of land situated on the mauka side of Kaneohe Bay Drive opposite the City and County Sewage Treatment Plant in Kaneohe and identified by Tax Map Key 4-4-11: portion of Parcel 3 within an R-3 Residential District.

The notice of public hearing was advertised in the Sunday Star Bulletin and Advertiser of September 28, 1969. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the different community and civic organizations in the Kaneohe district, to residents in the surrounding area and to interested parties. No written protests or comments have been received to date.

The Director oriented the Commission to the location of the proposed development which is in close proximity to the Aikahi Shopping Center which is now under construction, Aikahi School and Park, the fire station, and opposite the City and County Sewage Treatment Plant.

The staff report distributed to the Commission members indicated generally that:

1. Comments on the proposed development are favorable from the various governmental agencies--Fire Department, Building Department, Board of Water Supply, Department of Health, Department of Public Works, and the Department of Traffic.

   The Department of Public Works further commented about the close proximity of the subject development to the Sewage Treatment Plant with its odor problem and that this should be considered before the application is approved.

2. The proposed development will consist of 27 separate two-story townhouse apartment buildings with 4 to 8 units per building for a total of 148 units.

3. The townhouses are grouped together in rather large blocks; each block is bordered by access roads and peripheral open parking with a central open landscaped area for active and passive recreation.

4. The land area of 1,092,800 sq. ft. permits the use of the Land Use Intensity rating of 39. The plan as designed exceeds or is less than the requirement where applicable in relation to Floor Area Ratio, Open Space Ratio, Living Space Ratio, and Recreation Space Ratio.

5. The plan conforms to the requirements of the Comprehensive Zoning Code in density, number of parking spaces, area of open space, living and recreation space, lot size, lot width, and yard spacing. There is also ample area for open space use including green areas, clubhouse, and swimming pool area.

6. Future widening of Kaneohe Bay Drive is to be settled between the developer and the State Highway

Department. No access from the development area to Kaneohe Bay Drive will be permitted at a point near the proposed interchange of the State Highway System.

The staff recommended approval of the planned unit development project with the imposition of the following conditions:

1. Creation of buffer zones where the PD-H District adjoins the single family residential districts on the Kailua and Kaneohe sides which are not separated by an intervening secondary or major street or a permanent open space at least 100 feet.

2. Screening of off-street parking areas and areas for storage and collection of trash and garbage to be approved by the Planning Director in accordance with plans submitted to him.

3. The entire development to be landscaped in accordance with plans approved by the Planning Director.

4. Plans for pedestrian walkways and tot lots to be submitted to and be subject to the approval of the Planning Director.

5. Area lighting plans to be submitted for approval by the Planning Director.

6. Scale drawings of all signs showing size, location, and illumination to be submitted and approved by the Planning Director.

7. All utilities to be underground.

8. Complete grading and site plans to be submitted and approved by the Planning Director.

9. Purchasers to be made aware that there is a sewage treatment plant nearby on Kaneohe Bay Drive. Further that provisions be provided to insure that the City shall not be held liable for any damages incurred by the property owners.

10. Legal documents to be drawn up to insure perpetual maintenance of grounds and buildings similar to that as specified in the special permit section for cluster development.

11. Grading, drainage and site improvement plans to be approved by the City.

Questioned by the Commission about the sewage treatment plant, the Director reported that:

1. The treatment plant site is immediately opposite the development area for a distance covering about 40 percent of the frontage of the development area.

2. There is an odor problem occasionally.

3. The plant is capable of handling the complete development.

4. The plant is presently not working at full design capacity and this is one of the reasons for the odor problem because there isn't enough sewage flow.

5. Provisions for correctional measures to improve the present operation of the plant by developer participation with the City, can be made a part of the condition for approval.

6. The prevailing wind comes from the northwest direction across the treatment plant to the planned unit development area.

7. The injection of the condition to insure the City against any liability for damages relating to environmental health hazard or odor from the treatment plant was done with the intent that the developer would make this stipulation in the legal documents to purchasers of homes in this development.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposed development.

Mr. Daniel Martin Ostrow, co-developer of this project, mentioned about his residential development of 350 homes at Clubview Estate in Ahuimanu where the model homes were constructed right across the street from the sewage treatment plant. While developing the area for the past 2-1/2 years, he has had no trouble and is not aware of any smell emanating from the plant. People tended to be surprised to learn that the treatment plant is right across the street. For this area at Kaneohe Bay, he has full

confidence that he can develop a nice neighborhood with high class townhouses at a much lesser cost than individual houses to purchasers. He did not feel that the location of the sewage treatment plant across the street would be a handicap in their development plan for the area.

In the interrogation that followed, Mr. Ostrow stated that:

1. He is aware that people have complained about the odor from the Kailua Sewage Treatment Plant but he does not smell an odor.

2. The City, through Mr. Albert Zane the Chief Engineer, has promised to do something about correcting the odor problem.

3. Ultramar Chemical Water Laboratory was retained by the developers to evaluate the sources of odor from the Kailua Sewage Treatment Plant and to assist in resolving certain problems. Ultramar indicated that the odor problem can be corrected and made several recommendations. (A copy of Ultramar's report to the developers was submitted to the Commission and placed on file.)

4. The conditions mentioned by the Director were discussed with them. The conditions are acceptable and they will abide by them.

5. There will be a maintenance cost to purchasers of homes in this development. First Management has submitted a bid giving an estimated maintenance cost of $27 to $35 a month for each home. This cost covers the maintenance of the lawn, the pool, garbage collection and so forth.

6. Similar to a condominium development, a citizens organization composed of all purchasers of homes in this development will be organized to manage the operation and maintenance of this project area.

7. Each purchaser will own a house and a piece of ground and will have a fractional interest in the rest of the ground, swimming pool, clubhouse, etc.

Mr. Pat Onishi represented the architect for this project, Lewis Ingleson and Associates. He explained the planning and design concepts which led to the development of this planned unit project and by referring to the site plan and architectural renderings displayed, related these concepts to the project.

Their two basic concepts were:

1. To make the most efficient use of the land that is available for this project; and

2. To create and overall environment which would make this a desirable place to live as well as to enhance the Kaneohe Bay area.

In the planning stage, they strived for:

1. Separation of pedestrian and vehicular circulation, both visually and physically.

2. Maximum development of green spaces to enhance the environment as well as to provide recreation for the residents through creation of:

   a. Small court yard areas for passive activities;

   b. Medium type open spaces for small group activities; and

   c. Large green spaces for active group interaction.

   Also, within the green spaces, providing for convenience of adult supervision for children at play.

3. Creation of roadways to maintain a residential community character by:

   a. Limiting access;

   b. Minimizing the exposure of cars to the street scene;

   c. Alleviating the possibility of speeding motorists; and

   d. Centrally locating garbage pickup areas to avoid the street scene of garbage cans on garbage pickup days.

In the design concept, they planned for:

1. Individual townhouses with self-contained residences of 2 and 3 bedrooms each with 1-1/2 to 2-1/2 baths, kitchen and living areas, individual laundry area and a private fenced patio.

2. Arrangement of the units to provide for a service entrance through the private patios to the parking roadways. The formal entrances open up to the green open spaces.

3. A recreation center with a recreation building containing a catering kitchen, dressing rooms and storage areas, a 30 x 50 swimming pool, and games area for ping pong tables and shuffle boards. Also included are ample areas for group functions and sandboxes for toddlers.

4. Materials selected for the project are stucco and rough resawn wood siding. The roofs will be cedar shakes.

The planning and design concepts were implemented by:

1. Creating four super blocks bordered by access roads and open parking.

2. Arranging the townhouse buildings so they form the perimeter of each super block with the green spaces forming the core.

3. Guest parking would occur at the ends of each block.

4. Meandering walkways would lead guests and pedestrians through landscaped mounds within the green spaces.

5. Heavy landscaping of those areas bordering existing single family dwellings.

6. Designing the primary roadways with landscaped medial strips to retain the residential community character and also to force motorists to slow down in order to negotiate slight bends in the roadways.

7. Placing all utilities underground.

8. Having ample area lighting throughout the project.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Onishi stated that there are four access roadways off Kaneohe Bay Drive and they are approximately 24 feet wide.

There was no further testimony from the public.

The Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement on motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mrs. Sullam.

In later discussion, Mr. Brennan expressed concern that the entrance roadways into the planned unit development were too narrow and recommended that they be widened with possibly a medial strip to separate the ingress and egress lanes. Coming off a main highway, he felt it much safer to have a slightly wider entry. He had no objection to the interior roadway system.

The Director indicated that the 24-foot width provides for four moving lanes in and out of the development. This proposal was approved by the Traffic Department and the State Highway Department. In this instance, the Commission can place additional conditions with the granting of the proposed development.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Bright, the Commission recommended approval of the planned unit development with the conditions mentioned by the Planning Director and the inclusion of another condition that the accesses and egresses off Kaneohe Bay Drive be widened and having medial strips.

GENERAL PLAN
DLUM & DP
AMENDMENT
WAIKIKI
CHANGE IN CIRCULATION SYSTEM
& EXPANSION OF
JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

The Commission again reviewed a proposal to amend a portion of the Development Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waikiki by deleting a portion of Kaneloa Street, providing for an extension of Wai Nani Way and providing for the creation of a cul-de-sac off Kuhio Road to enable the consolidation of the Jefferson School grounds.

The Commission held a public hearing on September 11, 1969, and after closing the hearing, deferred action pending staff consultation with the adjoining property owners and State agencies to see whether or not a more workable and acceptable plan could be developed.

Mr. Leonard Moffitt, staff planner reported that he met with the representatives of the Department of Education, the Department of Accounting and General Services, and the Traffic Department, the protestants who appeared at the public hearing, and also the consultants for the Liliuokalani Trust and the Paiko Estate in an attempt to resolve some of the problems. Several alternatives were discussed and the plan which was most acceptable with the least amount of problem is the plan displayed. The recommended changes are as follows:

1. Elimination of Kaneloa Road which bisects the school grounds;

2. Extension of Wai Nani Way from Pualani Way to Kuhio Avenue as a 60-foot right-of-way;

3. Establishment of that portion of Kaneloa Road between Paoakalani Avenue and the extended Wai Nani Way as a 44-foot right-of-way rather than as a 40-foot width as presently designated;

4. Creation of a 40-foot cul-de-sac off Kuhio Avenue and extended in a loop to meet Makee Road with a hammerhead turnaround just before reaching Kuhio Avenue. There is to be no access to Kuhio Avenue directly from Makee Road at this point.

5. Designation of the entire Jefferson School grounds from apartment and park uses to school use.

Mr. Moffitt explained that the cul-de-sac was recommended at 40 feet instead of the standard 44 feet because the existing 12-story Park View apartment and other developments in the area do not allow for a sidewalk on that side of the street. There will be a sidewalk on the other side of the street along the school property. The belief is that a great amount of traffic would not be generated into the area so that one sidewalk should be sufficient.

He stated that the proposal to extend Wai Nani Way will affect only one property owner who has a building permit for construction of an apartment; but he is waiting for a decision on the Wai Nani Way extension plan before committing his funds in construction. The remaining lands are State owned and will be given to the City in exchange for City property.

In studying the development potential of the area and the need to provide for a good traffic circulation pattern, the belief is that Wai Nani Way should be widened and extended to Kuhio Avenue. This would take some traffic off Paoakalani Avenue which is planned as a 60-foot right-of-way. The cost of purchasing the one parcel to permit the extension of Wai Nani Way is far less than the cost of further widening Paoakalani Avenue which must then carry the heavy volume of traffic through the area. When Kuhio Avenue is widened to a 70-foot right-of-way, it would also carry the major load of traffic. Should the often discussed one-way street system be initiated, the extended Wai Nani Way will become a part of that system.

The remaining portion of Kaneloa Road up to Paoakalani Avenue was retained and proposed as a 44-foot right-of-way to provide access to developments proposed by the Paiko Estate and the Liliuokalani Trust. Other property owners in the area registered no protest or comment to the proposal although they were notified.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Moffitt stated that the monkeypod tree on Kaneloa Road is near the entrance to the school grounds and must be removed when the roadway is widened. The school officials are aware of the situation and have attempted to save it but it appears unlikely that it can be saved.

With reference to the proposal for only one sidewalk for the cul-de-sac, he explained that a second sidewalk would require the movement of the roadway towards the school ground because there is no room for a sidewalk on the side where the buildings are constructed right to the edge of the road. In an attempt to avoid taking too much school land, the one sidewalk was proposed. There is also the problem of an existing fire hydrant and utility lines on the school grounds side that would be affected if additional school land is taken.

Mr. Percy Mirikitani, representing the Park View tenants, was recognized by the Chair.

Mr. Mirikitani who met with the staff indicated that the revised traffic plan is acceptable but he suggested that the Commission give consideration to the following:

1. If the cul-de-sac is used as access to the school grounds, a hazardous traffic situation might be created in the morning and in the afternoon when parents discharge and pick up their children.

2. The garbage trucks also make a daily morning pick up on Kaneloa Road near the monkeypod tree at about the same time the children are going to school.

He suggested that a recommendation be made to the Department of Education to change the parents route for discharging children to possibly off Kapahulu Avenue and off Wai Nani Way and to fence the driveway off Kaneloa Road so no school traffic could come into the area.

Regarding the plan for one sidewalk, he had no objection to placing the sidewalk on the school property side.

In response to the Chairman's suggestion that his group send to the DOE a letter containing the recommendations mentioned, Mr. Mirikitani stated that such a letter has already been drafted.

Mr. Moffitt informed the Commission that he did discuss with the school officials, the two points mentioned by Mr. Mirikitani. The new plan is to have the garbage trucks make their pick up by entering the school ground from Pualani Street to the cafeteria. The major pick up for children is to be in the parking lot off Kapahulu Avenue. Should Wai Nani Way extension be constructed, the pick up and delivery of children going to Pohukaina School will be off this street.

<u>ACTION</u>: The Commission recommended that the proposed amendment to a portion of the Development Plan and the Detailed Land Use Map of Waikiki as presented by the Director be approved with the further recommendation that the staff communicate with the Department of Education on the two suggestions mentioned by Mr. Mirikitani and that every effort be made to save the monkeypod tree. The motion was made by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mrs. Sullam and carried.

ZONING B-2
COMMUNITY
BUSINESS DIST.
LAIE
NEAR THE
POLYNESIAN
CULTURAL CENTER
ZIONS SECURITIES
CORPORATION

The Commission again considered a proposal to change the zoning from R-6 Residential to B-2 Community Business for a strip of land totaling 0.85 acre located along the rear boundaries of an existing business lot on Kamehameha Highway and the residential lots off Iosepa Street near the Polynesian Cultural Center in Laie identified by Tax Map Key 5-5-14: portions of parcels 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32 and 34. A public hearing was held and closed on July 17, 1969, and the Commission had deferred action for further study and information from the developer of the area.

Mrs. Loretta Chee, staff planner, explained the proposal to extend the existing business zone to include a strip of land up to the boundary of a residential subdivision. The proposal is in conformity with the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map which designates the subject area as commercial. A revised site plan submitted by the applicant was displayed. Questions asked by the Commission were answered as follows:

1. The applicant has indicated its desire to retain the residential development adjoining the proposed shopping center and off Iosepa Street although the area is designated on the DLUM as commercial.

2. At some future date, the applicant would like to utilize an adjoining residential zoned property on the Kahuku side of the existing business zone for commercial use. This area is presently designated for residential use.

3. In 1967, the applicant submitted plans for a shopping center and had the area rezoned to business; however, due to difficulty in obtaining financing and the existence of water and sewer lines on the property which prevented the placement of the structures as originally planned, the shopping center was not developed. The applicant therefore redesigned the plan and created a strip of residential lots which are soon to be developed with duplex units. In subdividing the land, a strip of residential zoned land was left between the existing business zone and the residential subdivision.

4. The entrance to and exit from the shopping center are off Kamehameha Highway and not through the

residential area off Palekana Street as originally planned. The intent was to keep the flow of traffic away from the residential streets.

5. The revised plan shows a service road for trucks and off-street loading areas in the back of the structures.

6. The State Highway Division has commented that there is a traffic hazard at the existing highway curve but that no matter what is proposed for that section, there would still be the same hazard.

Since the shopping center is to service the immediate neighborhood, Mrs. Sullam felt that there should be an entryway in the back for people to walk to the center.

Mr. Marvin Stone from Zions Securities Corporation answered Mrs. Sullam by stating that most shoppers do not walk but use their automobiles to travel to shopping centers. However, for those who desire to walk, the adjacent vacant lot can be used as access.

Mr. Stone then explained the shopping center layout plan showing the buildings in a row with parking in the front. To avoid construction over existing sewer and water lines, the buildings had to be placed farther back on the property thus necessitating the utilization and subsequent request for zoning of the residential strip to business.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Stone stated that the entire shopping center comprises about four acres. The first increment is presently under construction and will contain about 15,000 sq. ft. under roof with about 50 off-street parking spaces. The total development under roof will be about 37,000 sq. ft. A lawned area will later be converted to parking. The service driveway has been provided in the back of the structures with several loading and unloading areas. They did not believe that the adjoining residents should have a shopping center facing them; and to discourage commercial traffic from using the residential streets, they rearranged the shopping center to face Kamehameha Highway with accesses off the highway.

The Commission then discussed the traffic situation and the access plan.

The Director reported that the State has no immediate plans for widening Kamehameha Highway. According to their projection, there is no need for widening before 1985. This projection was made about two years ago prior to the announced development proposed in the North Shore area.

Mr. Brennan suggested to the Director that he apprise the State Highway Department of the possible increase in traffic through the area as a result of the development proposed at North Shore.

The Commission noted separate driveways for ingress and egress purposes and felt that one wide driveway for both in and out movements might be safer. Mr. Stone's response was that the separate exit and entrance are the requirement of the State Highway Department.

Mrs. Sullam felt that the present layout of the shopping center was not very usable for the residents in the back and inquired whether the residents or the community association in the area were contacted for comments.

The Chairman recalled that at the public hearing several residents of Hauula testified in favor of the proposal.

The Director indicated that the Laie Community Association was notified but no comment has been received.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Ingleson, seconded by Mr. Bright, the Commission recommended approval of the change in zoning from R-6 Residential to B-2 Community Business District for the strip of land totaling 0.85 acre off Kamehameha Highway at Laie with the recommendation to the applicant that he contact the State Highway Department for reconsideration of the access plan to the shopping center by having one main driveway for ingress and egress purposes rather than two separate driveways and to provide for a mandatory pedestrian entryway to the shopping center.

GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
WAIAWA TO HALAWA
KAONOHI RIDGE
SUBDIVISION
RESIDENTIAL USE

On October 2, 1969, the Commission held a public hearing to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Waiawa to Halawa District to (1) incorporate the approved subdivision plans of Units 2A and 3, identified as Tax Map Key 9-8-11: portion of Parcel 10, and Unit 2B, identified as Tax Map Keys 9-8-41: Parcels 1 to 82, 9-8-42: Parcels 1 to 101, and 9-8-43: Parcels 1 to 54 of the Kaonohi Ridge Subdivision; and (2) change the land use classification of Lots 220-225, Unit 2B thereof, identified as Tax Map Key 9-8-41: Parcels 10 to 14, and 21 from Residential to Park use.

After closing the public hearing, the Commission took action to recommend approval of the change in land use classification from Residential to Park use of Lots 220 to 225 in Unit 2B but took no action on the first proposal.

Mr. Leonard Moffitt, staff planner, explained the proposal and displayed the approved subdivision plan for the area. He stated that the adopted DLUM for the area shows a scheme of interior parks surrounded by residential uses in each block. This plan was not considered workable and the Parks Department did not accept it; therefore, the DLUM amendment is to change the land use designation from Park use to Residential use for the approved Kaonohi Ridge Subdivision area. Within this same subdivision, the Commission took action last week to designate approximately 4.4 acres of land for park use. This size neighborhood park is more than adequate to service the projected population for the area.

The Commission recalled that they did discuss this proposal last week.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mrs. Sullam, seconded by Mr. Brennan, the Commission recommended approval of the proposed amendment to the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Waiawa to Halawa District by changing the land use designation from Park use to Residential use for the subdivision area known as Kaonohi Ridge Subdivision, Units 2A, 2B and 3 at Kaonohi Ridge.

STREET NAMES
LUALUALEI,
WAIANAE
MOHIHI COURT
SUBDIVISION

Upon the motion by Mr. Bright, seconded by Mr. Brennan, the Commission recommended approval of the following street names:

(1) Roadway within the Mohihi Court Subdivision at Lualualei, Waianae:

MOHIHI PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Mohihi Street
Meaning	: A variety of sweet potato

STREET NAMES WAIALAE-IKI WAIALAE RIDGE-LINE ESTATES, UNITS II & III

(2) Roadways within the Waialae Ridgeline Estates, Units II and III Subdivision at Waialae Iki:

HALEKOA DRIVE	- Extension of an existing roadway going in a mauka direction and looping to terminate at its intersection.
HALEHAKA STREET	- Roadway running between the loop of Halekoa Drive.
Meaning	: Hollyhock (althaea rosea)
AHA AINA PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Halekoa Drive running in a mauka direction.
Meaning	: Feast
AHAANA WAY	- Deadend roadway off Aha Aina Place running in an Ewa direction, mauka of Aha Maka Way.
Meaning	: Design resembling duck tracks, carved on tapa beaters.
AHA MAKA WAY	- Deadend roadway off Aha Aina Place running in an Ewa direction and being between Halekoa Drive and Ahaana Way.
Meaning	: Assembly for relaxation.
AHAMELE PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Halekoa Drive running in a makai direction.
Meaning	: A yellow-spotted needle-fish.
AHA-NIU PLACE	- Deadend roadway off Halekoa Drive running a makai direction.
Meaning:	: A native sedge with pointed leathery leaves with light-brown flower clusters.

ZONING A-3 APARTMENT DISTRICT KALAUAO, KAONOHI RIDGE MAUKA OF MOANALUA ROAD AMFAC-TROUSDALE

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, authorized the calling of a public hearing to consider the following zoning change initiated by the Planning Director:

> Change in zoning from existing A-2 Apartment District to A-3 Apartment District for land identified by Tax Map Key 9-8-11, 12, 13, 16 and 17, situated on the mauka side of the Moanalua Road realignment and makai of the Francis H. I. Brown Golf Course at Kalauao, Kaonohi Ridge, and containing an area of approximately 32.12 acres; and

authorized the Planning Director to set the date of the public hearing.

MISC. PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF ALOHA WEEK PARTY

Commissioners Ingleson and Sullam were appointed by the Chairman as the Judging Committee to select the best decorated section in the Planning Department at the Aloha Week luncheon to be held at the office on Wednesday, October 22, 1969. The Commission will donate the prize to the winning section.

Mr. Brennan volunteered himself as the committee of one on the Prize Committee.

The Commissioners were invited to lunch which will cost $2 per person.

MISC. MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION MEETINGS

The Commission stated that the minutes of the Commission meetings should not be a verbatim transcript but should be, in theory and practice, minutes of the meeting; that is, the minutes should be summaries, actions and recommendations of the Commission only.

The Commission also requested that the minutes be made available to them by the next meeting. A map or a tax map should also be included with the staff report sent to the Commission.

The Director was requested to comply with the preceding requests of the Commission.

MISC. MEETING WITH THE D.I.A.

The Commission was invited to lunch with the Downtown Improvement Association on Thursday, October 23, 1969, at 11:45 a.m., at the Bank of Hawaii, 6th Floor, regarding the Gruen plan for Downtown Honolulu.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima

Carole A. Kamishima
Office Services Supervisor

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
October 23, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, October 23, 1969, at 1:45 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT: Philip T. Chun, Chairman
Edward Brennan
Roy R. Bright
Lewis Ingleson
Arthur A. Rutledge
Fredda Sullam
Thomas N. Yamabe II (present at 2:00 p.m.)
James K. Sakai, ex-officio
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio (excused at 3:50 p.m.)

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ABSENT: None

MINUTES: The minutes of the special meeting of June 5, 1969, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mrs. Sullam and seconded by Mr. Rutledge.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING A-3
APARTMENT DIST.
KALAUAO
KAONOHI RIDGE
AMFAC-TROUSDALE

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to change the zoning from A-2 Apartment District to A-3 Apartment District for three separate parcels of land situated on the mauka side of Moanalua Road realignment and makai of the Francis I. Brown Golf Course at Kaonohi Ridge, Kalauao, identified by Tax Map Key 9-8-11: portion of Parcel 3 and containing a total area of approximately 32.12 acres.

The notice of public hearing was advertised in the Sunday Star Bulletin and Advertiser of October 12, 1969, and copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community and civic associations in the area and to interested parties.

The Director oriented the Commission to the location of the subject parcel by pointing out the existing zoning and uses in the surrounding area and the access roads to the parcels. The adopted Detailed Land Use Map for this planning area designates the area between the H-1 Freeway and Moanalua Road realignment as medium and high density apartment uses. The three

parcels under consideration, Parcel A containing 2.15 acres, Parcel B containing 6.33 acres, and Parcel C containing 23.64 acres are designated as high density apartment use. The developer will provide adequate water and sewer facilities within the development areas.

The proposal is to develop the area under the A-3 Apartment zoning regulations. The density under the A-2 and A-3 zoning is the same, which is about 50 units per acre, the difference is in the building height restriction. The maximum height allowable in an A-2 district is 40 feet, whereas, in an A-3, the maximum height is 350 feet.

A copy of a letter from Mr. Morio Omori, attorney for the applicant, was submitted to the Commission. Mr. Omori indicated that there are additional information and data deemed necessary to complete the presentation of the application and requested that the public hearing be continued for two weeks.

The Director explained that the developer did submit a development plan but withdrew it because it was not representative of the current thinking for the area. The design concept applicable to the area involved either the townhouse concept or the high-rise type of development and the impact of such development upon the area. The principal issues are the design concept and deciding some type of policy decision for the area. The staff and the developer agree that additional information would be helpful in evaluating the issues; therefore, further consultations will be held with the developer.

The Chairman called for testimony from the public. Mr. Omori requested that the public hearing be kept open and continued since they are presently in consultation with the staff on the design concept issue. He stated that there was a legal argument as to whether or not in the transitional section of the Comprehensive Zoning Code, the zoning of this area was changed to A-2 Apartment as contended by the staff or A-3 Apartment as contended by them, but for purposes of this hearing, they are proceeding on the assumption that the transitional zoning is interpreted to mean that the area is presently zoned A-2.

They will meet with the staff to discuss the design concept. They feel that high-rise development would not be incompatible with the area because of the

areas uniqueness in having a freeway as its mauka boundary, a shopping center as its makai boundary, a golf course and park in the immediate area and a good road system.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Bright, seconded by Mr. Brennan, kept the public hearing open and continued it to the next meeting of the Commission.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
MAKIKI
MAKIKI AND NEHOA STREETS
THE CHINESE CENTER (CONVALESCENT HOME)

Prior to consideration of this application, Commissioner Ingleson who had declared a conflict of interest previously, left the room.

The Commission again considered an application for a conditional use permit to construct and operate a convalescent home on two parcels of land containing a total area of 44,875 sq. ft. located at the mauka-Diamond Head corner of Makiki and Nehoa Streets in Makiki within an R-6 Residential District. The applicant proposes to construct a three story structure containing 64 rooms for a total of 120 beds and the necessary service facilities areas. Off-street parking will be provided at the rear of the property and on an adjoining parcel.

A public hearing was held and closed on August 14, 1969. The Commission had deferred action until a sufficient number of members were present to give this application full consideration.

The Director first read a communication just received from Miss Gertrude Humphries, owner of the property adjoining the entire rear boundary of the property where the convalescent home is to be built. She stressed that the proposed development will not be entirely screened from her property thus invading her privacy and injuring the aesthetic aspects of her property. She also mentioned a discrepancy of about 168 sq. ft. in reporting the total area of the land under discussion. She contended that the area of the drainage channel should not have been included in the calculation so that the land area should correctly be 44,707 sq. ft. and not 44,875 sq. ft. as mentioned in the staff report. She reminded the Commission of the objections submitted by Hanahauoli School and others in the area and felt that the Commission should give every consideration to these objections before recommending approval of the application.

The Chairman reminded the members that the deadline for submitting a recommendation to the City Council

has passed and if a decision is not reached today, the matter would have to be submitted by the Director to the Council without a recommendation from the Commission.

At the request of Commissioner Brennan, the Chairman permitted the questioning of the applicant but with the ruling that any answers must be limited directly to the questions asked; otherwise, the proceeding might be considered a public hearing.

Dr. Theodore T. Y. Yeh, applicant, and his attorney, Mr. Hiroshi Sakai, were recognized by the Chair.

In reply to Mr. Brennan's first question, Dr. Yeh stated that he did operate a convalescent hospital in Haywood, California, but he leased out the operation in order to concentrate his work in Honolulu. However, he still owns the land upon which the hospital is built. To the second question, Dr. Yeh stated that the hospital in Haywood was in a residentially zoned area but after the hospital was built, the zoning on the land was changed.

Mrs. Sullam expressed her concern about the impact of the community upon the convalescent home by the following factors:

1. The home will be located on a corner parcel where a great deal of traffic passes by. Despite the fact that the rooms are going to be air conditioned, the traffic noise might be disturbing to the inmates of the home.

2. There is a school across the street and almost always there is noise when school lets out at about 2:30 p.m. At that time, it is most likely that the older people will be napping and they would be disturbed by the noise.

Mrs. Sullam did not believe that convalescent homes are incompatible with residential areas but she felt it wise to find a quiet place in a residential area for such homes. She wondered whether this factor was taken into consideration.

<u>MOTION</u>: Mr. Yamabe's motion to recommend approval of this application was seconded by Mr. Bright.

Mr. Brennan also believed that this property is not the proper site for a convalescent home because of the

school across the street and of the area being vulnerable to heavy traffic. He felt that a site more conducive to recuperation should be selected.

Mr. Rutledge felt it unfair to have the Commission members who are not experts and who do not have the staff to make a thorough study on convalescent homes to make a decision on this application especially since the Planning Department staff had recommended approval. The residents in the area objected and their reasons for objection relating to noise, the school across the street, traffic, and so forth should be given every consideration but up to this point, the Commission has not been able to do a good job. For that reason, rather than aligning with Commissioners Sullam and Brennan and becoming a majority to vote against the application, he felt that the application should be transmitted to the City Council without a recommendation from the Commission and to let the Council exercise some responsibility in deciding whether or not to grant the application.

The Chairman stated that the duty of the Commission is to make an attempt to reach a decision. If a decision cannot be reached then the application can be forwarded to the Council without a recommendation from the Commission but with a statement that the Commission did attempt to reach a decision but failed in this attempt.

The Chairman called for a vote on the motion for approval and announced the failure of the motion to carry due to the lack of sufficient affirmative votes. Commissioners Yamabe and Bright voted for the motion. No negative vote was taken.

The Chair directed the Director to submit this application to the City Council and indicate the fact that the Commission could not reach an affirmative vote in recommending approval.

MISC.
RESOLUTION BY COUNCILMAN CHARLES CAMPBELL
WAIKIKI-DIAMOND HEAD
RE: PROPOSED ACQUISITION AND REZONING OF DIAMOND HEAD AREA

The Commission again discussed the Resolution introduced by Councilman Charles Campbell proposing the following:

1. Acquisition of all Diamond Head Tract properties within the area bounded by Poni Moi Road, Diamond Head Road, Coconut Avenue and Kalakaua Avenue plus the fourteen Diamond Head Terrace Open Tract lots described as follows: Tax Map Key 3-1-33, Parcels 2 to 8, 12, 13, 14, 50, 51, 53, and 56; and

2. Changing the zoning designation for the entire area bounded in red as described in Resolution No. 239 and adopted as Bill No. 102 to R-1 Residential from R-3, R-6, and A-4.

The City Council had referred the proposed Resolution to the Planning Commission for its review and recommendation. The Commission had deferred further consideration pending receipt of additional information from the staff.

The staff's response to questions asked by the Commission was submitted to the Commission as a supplemental memorandum dated October 20, 1969. Significant questions brought out related to the following:

1. The possibility of establishing a Historic, Cultural and Scenic District for the Diamond Head area under discussion.

The staff had reviewed the procedures necessary for creating a Historic, Cultural and Scenic District and in view of a number of studies and analyses that would be required, reported that a period of six months to one year would be required to complete such studies.

2. Determine the cost of the proposed acquisition area--Diamond Head Tract area.

A report giving two cost figures based on appraised value and market value determined from the State Tax assessments were submitted to the Commission.

3. Determine whether Councilman Campbell had considered a Historic, Cultural and Scenic District for the area.

In this respect, the Director reported that this past Tuesday, the City Council adopted a resolution, introduced by Councilman Campbell, referring back to the Planning Department and the Planning Commission for consideration and report, a review and examination of the possibility of establishing a Historic, Cultural and Scenic District for the Diamond Head area. This resolution has not been received by the Department as yet.

4. A request had been made to have a representative from the Department of Land and Natural Resources present to explain the Van Dorpe study for the preservation of Diamond Head.

Unfortunately, the staff member most familiar with this study could not be present today but might be available at a subsequent meeting of the Commission.

The Director informed the Commission of the Council's request for the Commission's recommendation on Councilman Campbell's resolution prior to the Council meeting of November 4.

In view of the forthcoming resolution regarding the Historic, Cultural and Scenic District, the Commission inquired what effect this had on the present proposal under discussion.

The Director did not know but assumed that the Council was aware that it had made the present request and that the second resolution is a supplemental report on the Historic, Cultural and Scenic District aspect. The Commission favored invoking the Historic, Cultural and Scenic District for the area under discussion because it could act as a stopgap measure to prevent further construction in the area until the City is ready to purchase the properties for park purposes in conformity with the adopted General Plan for the area. However, one problem brought out related to the time factor. While the study is being conducted, the City would be placed in a vulnerable position should an application be made for a building permit for construction or reconstruction in the area. The City might find itself in a similar situation as before where acquisition of properties must be made at the option of the owner-developer rather than at its own option based on an established program. With no standards developed, the City cannot determine the extent of construction, reconstruction or renovation that would be permitted. It would also have no basis for denying the permit should the proposed construction comply with existing regulations.

Mrs. Sullam inquired whether a moratorium on construction could be placed in the area while the study was being undertaken. She also inquired whether a provision could be placed within the ordinance establishing the Historic, Cultural and Scenic District to divide the subject area into portions, for instance, establish one portion as 50 years undisturbed until such time as the City is ready to purchase the properties, another portion 60 years, and so forth so that as these parcels reach the established period of purchase, the City would be prepared to purchase them.

For certain area, such as the Diamond Head Tract area where the houses are getting old and the people are uncertain about development, acquisition could be much sooner. Since the ultimate goal is to extend Kapiolani Park all the way to the lighthouse, this would be a start and at the same time some pressure would be taken off the people.

The Director replied that such restrictions could be applied to the Historic, Cultural and Scenic District. For instance, if a building has some historic or cultural significance, special controls could be applied to that building or if the area has some historic or scenic qualities, other restrictions could be applied.

Mr. Brennan felt that the Historic, Cultural and Scenic District was the most appropriate vehicle by which to preserve Diamond Head through the control of height and type of structures in that area. Because of the time involved to make a detailed study before this District can be established, he inquired whether there were some other means of invoking this District sooner.

The Director indicated that whatever available staff resources could be devoted to this one problem to complete the study in a fairly short time but this would then leave a shortage in other areas of urgency.

In view of the lack of sufficient staff to make a thorough study to offer facts and pertinent information by which the Commission can base its recommendation, Mr. Rutledge felt it difficult for the Commission to make an appropriate recommendation to the Council. Knowing the limitation of the Commission's position, he felt that the Council was "playing games" with the Commission in asking for a quick answer to such an involved problem.

Regarding the proposal to establish the Historic District for the area, Mr. Rutledge commented that this was calculated to be a stopgap measure to prevent further construction in the area while the City decides when to dispossess the people and determine the price of the properties. In the meantime, the people are helpless and cannot do anything with their properties. It seemed to him that some legal problems were involved here and he indicated that this problem should have been cleared first

before sending the Resolution to the Commission for a recommendation. He felt that due consideration should be given to the people who has certain property rights and these rights should be respected by not playing games with them.

If it is the Council's intent to eventually acquire the properties in the area for park purposes under the guise of the Historic District, Mr. Rutledge felt that the Council can initiate such action without a recommendation from the Commission so that he could not understand why the Commission's recommendation was being sought by the Council. He felt that this entire issue should be sent back to the Council which should make its own decision.

The Director indicated that the Council is requesting for some kind of expression from the Commission. The fact that through a recently adopted amendment to the General Plan the subject area was designated for park purposes, the intent of the Council is clear that it ultimately proposes to purchase all properties for park purposes. He stated that no undue hardship is being placed on the property owners who may wish to build, rebuild or remodel their homes and he mentioned the process involving the application for a building permit. After a referral to the Council because the area is designated for park purposes, the City must either purchase the property or issue the permit. Any purchase price would involve an accepted appraisal value and presumably any new improvements made to the property would be taken into consideration when determining the fair market value at the time of acquisition.

Mr. Ingleson inquired whether the City can establish a policy for incremental purchase of properties in the area, for instance, identify those properties which are to be purchased in 1971, 1972, 1973 and so forth to give an indication to the residents as to their length of tenancy there.

The Director's reply was that one of the assignments of the Waikiki-Diamond Head study committee is to prepare a recommended stage program for acquisition of properties in the area. Funds are available in the current Capital Improvement Program to conduct an appraisal, the use of the reported appraisal values and the examination of possible funding sources from private, Federal, State, City, and others. The

recommended program is in conjunction with a park plan, reevaluation of the road system and whatever work that is necessary to prepare a plan for the area. This study will also be time consuming and possibly the outcome of that study might be a recommendation for a Historic, Cultural and Scenic District.

At the suggestion of Mr. Ingleson, the Commission limited its discussion to Councilman Campbell's first resolution until receipt of the second resolution relating to the Historic District.

Referring to the second portion of the Resolution relating to R-1 zoning of certain areas, Mrs. Sullam questioned whether the Commission can recommend the R-1 zoning when the General Plan designates the area for park. She referred to the City Charter which states that any change in zoning shall be in conformity with the General Plan.

The Commission agreed that a legal question was involved on the zoning proposal and felt that the existing zoning on the land should be retained under the General Plan park designation.

It was Mr. Yamabe's belief that the question on acquisition should not be limited to the area proposed under Councilman Campbell's resolution but should include the entire area designated for park purposes on the General Plan. Since the timetable of acquisition and the funding for such acquisition are the responsibility of the City Council, he felt that the Commission should confine its recommendation to the acquisition portion only in accordance with the General Plan designation of park and let the City Council determine the timetable of acquisition.

MOTION: Mrs. Sullam's motion to recommend to the Council that acquisition be made in this entire area in accordance with the adopted General Plan land use designation of park and that the timetable for such acquisition be made by determination of the City Council was seconded by Mr. Brennan.

The Director then distributed to the Commission members, a letter just received from the Department of Land and Natural Resources responding to certain questions asked by the Commission. Two exhibits were displayed.

One was titled "Legend for Monument District Boundaries" and the other "Legend for State Monument District". The Land Department's staff's recommendation and the consultant's recommendation of the two district boundaries were outlined in dotted and dash lines. A representative from the Land Department was not present to explain the exhibits. (The letter and exhibits were placed on file.)

ACTION: A vote taken on the motion made by Mrs. Sullam carried unanimously.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT REVOLVING FUND LAND ACQUISITION WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER SITE

The Commission reviewed a referral from the City Council for comment on Council Resolution No. 358, transferring the sum of $69,180 from the Improvement Revolving Fund to the Building Department to settle a court case concerning the acquisition of Parcel 6 in the makai block of the Civic Center site. The settlement price for Parcel 6 comprising 10,798 sq. ft. is $288,680. Since $219,500 was previously deposited with the court, the requested sum of $69,180 is to cover the difference.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission recommended approval of Council Resolution No. 358.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM CIP FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969-70 (SUPPLEMENTARY NO. 2)

The Commission reviewed Bill No. 147, as amended, entitled: "Capital Improvement Supplementary No. 2. An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 3425, as amended, Relating to Capital Improvements of the City and County of Honolulu for the Fiscal Year July 1, 1969 to June 30, 1970", as referred by the City Council to the Commission for its comments and recommendation.

The proposed amendment involves the appropriation of $90,000 from the General Fund to the Building Department, Health project, for the renovation of the Kalihi-Uka Police Station building for use as an emergency health service headquarters for the City.

The staff's report explaining the project was circulated to the Commissioners.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Yamabe, the Commission recommended approval of Bill No. 147, as amended.

AREAWIDE REVIEW AGENCY FEDERAL GRANT ASSISTANCE WAIANAE DISTRICT WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (BOARD OF WATER SUPPLY)

As the Areawide Review Agency under Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Act of 1966, the Planning Commission reviewed an application for Federal Grant assistance to the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development under Public Law 89-117, by the Board of Water Supply, City and County of Honolulu, for the construction of Increment I, Phase I, Part A, of the proposed Waianae District Water Development Project. The project application is for the construction and renovation of a booster pumping station with two pumps, capacity of 2.5 million gallons/day (MGD) each at Lualualei; a 2.0 MG distribution reservoir with 20-inch influent and effluent water mains at Waianae (Paheehee); and 12,000 lineal feet of 20-inch transmission main connecting to the existing 20-inch transmission main from the Kunia and Hoaeae water sources.

The Director reported that the improvements will cost an estimate of $1.3 million and are included in the current Six-Year Capital Improvement Program of the City and County of Honolulu. Since the proposed projects conform to the overall water master plan for Oahu and of the Waianae District Water Plan adopted by the Board of Water Supply, and further that they are in conformance with the Oahu General Plan in achieving an adequate water system to support the comprehensive and coordinated physical development of the City and County of Honolulu and to advance the general welfare and prosperity of its people, the Director recommended that the Commission certify this application for Federal funds as being consistent and in consonance with existing planning programs and studies currently in effect for the City and County of Honolulu.

By referring to the adopted Waianae District Water Plan map displayed, Mr. Bung Yuen Quon from the Board of Water Supply elaborated on the improvement projects. He stated that the adopted Water Plan is for a 15-year program and Phase I is their top priority project in the CIP.

Replying to questions from the Commission, Mr. Quon reported on the present water consumption rate in Waianae and the source of that water supply coming from the Waianae District itself and from the Pearl Harbor region. Since the known source of water within the Waianae District is inadequate to satisfy the present water requirement of the area, especially

during peak demand hours, they anticipate a continuing need to bring water into the area from outside sources. The proposal, therefore, is to replace the existing 8-inch pipeline along Mailiili and Lualualei Roads from Paakea Street to Farrington Highway with a 20-inch transmission main, the installation of a 2.0 million gallon distribution reservoir, and the renovation of the Lualualei Booster Station. This should correct the bottlenecks in the existing system and make the system more efficient. The Waianae District has always been one of their priority areas and the fact that it is within the Model Cities Program area helped in making a decision.

At the request of the Commission, Mr. Quon also explained water development plans for the Kunia, Wahiawa, and North Shore areas.

Mr. Rutledge's motion to recommend approval of this application for Federal Grant assistance was seconded by Mr. Bright and carried. Mr. Yamabe voted in the negative based on his belief that this action was not being consistent with the intent of the General Plan.

A motion to reconsider the previous action taken was seconded by Mr. Brennan and carried.

In the discussion that followed, the Director reported that the project is not in conflict with the General Plan.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Bright, the Commission certified that this project application for Federal funds by the Board of Water Supply is consistent and in consonance with existing planning programs and studies currently in effect for the City and County of Honolulu. Mr. Yamabe voted for the motion based on information received that this project is not in conflict with the General Plan.

STREET NAMES
WAIMALU, EWA
WAIMALU SUB-
DIVISION UNIT I

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Bright, seconded by Mr. Brennan, recommended approval of the following street names:

(1) Street names for roadways within the Waimalu Subdivision, Unit 1, at Waimalu, Ewa, Oahu:

PUAKIKA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Puaalii Street running in a mauka direction and being between Puahau Place and Puakukui Place.

Meaning: Cigar flower (Cuphea ignea), from Mexico, a small, smooth shrub with narrow, red, tubular, odorless flowers nearly an inch long. The flowers are used for leis.

PUAKUKUI PLACE - Deadend roadway off Puaalii Street running in an Ewa direction and being between Puakika Place and Puaanuhe Street.

Meaning: Blossoms of Kukui.

STREET NAMES
CENTRAL HONOLULU

(2) Street name for a roadway within the Central Honolulu area, identified by Tax Map Key 2-4-12:

PAPAKU PLACE - Deadend roadway off Piikoi Street running in an Ewa direction and being between Lunalilo Street and Kinau Street.

Meaning: Foundation or surface.

STREET NAMES
MOANALUA
SHAFTER FLATS
INDUSTRIAL DEV.
UNIT III

(3) Street name for a roadway in the Shafter Flats Industrial Development, Unit III, at Honolulu:

KILIHAU STREET - Extension of an existing roadway running in a Waikiki direction to terminate in a cul-de-sac.

STREET NAMES
KANEOHE
HEEIA

(4) Street name for a roadway in the Heeia area, Tax Map Key 4-6-17: 21, in Kaneohe;

HOLOUKA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Haiku Road running in a Kahuku direction and being mauka of Haiku Plantation Drive.

Meaning: Draft, air current, as in the mountains.

The Chairman will send a letter of appreciation to the staff upon his return from a trip.

ZONING ORDINANCE PROPOSED AMENDMENT RELATING TO PARK DEDICATION

The working draft of a proposed ordinance relating to dedication of land for parks and playgrounds was distributed to each member of the Commission.

The sub-committee of the Commission composed of Mrs. Sullam, Mr. Ingleson and Mr. Rutledge will meet with Legal Counsel Andrew Sato to review the draft on Thursday, October 30, 1969, at 9:00 a.m., at the same place.

The Commission requested that this item be placed on the agenda of the next Commission meeting for discussion.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima

Carole A. Kamishima
Office Services Supervisor

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
November 6, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, November 6, 1969, at 1:40 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Vice Chairman Arthur A. Rutledge presiding:

PRESENT:

Arthur A. Rutledge, Vice Chairman
Roy R. Bright
Lewis Ingleson
Fredda Sullam
Thomas N. Yamabe II
James K. Sakai, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Ian McDougall, Staff Planner
Jack Gilliam, Staff Planner

ABSENT:

Philip T. Chun
Edward Brennan
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

MINUTES:

The minutes of October 2 and 9, 1969, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe and seconded by Mr. Bright.

PUBLIC HEARING
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
(AMENDMENT)
CENTRAL BUSINESS
DISTRICT
HOTEL STREET &
KAPIOLANI BLVD.
(PUBLIC FACILITIES
USE)

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the Development Plan for the Central Business District by deleting a public off-street parking lot from the proposed Municipal Office Building site at the corner of Hotel Street and Kapiolani Boulevard and identified by Tax Map Key 2-1-33: Parcel 11 and portion of 23.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 26, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, and to interested citizens and organizations.

For orientation purposes, the Director pointed out the proposed Municipal Office Building site bounded by King Street, Kapiolani Boulevard, Hotel Street and Alapai Street. As a result of the proposed widening and extension of South Street to meet Alapai Street, he reported that this triangular block will be reduced in size. If a portion of the area were to remain in off-street parking use, it would greatly limit the

PUAALII STREET	-	Looped roadway running off Kaonohi Street.
Meaning:		Descendant of a chief, Lit., chief flower.
PUAAPIKI STREET	-	Roadway running between Puaalii Street.
Meaning:		A name for the Ilima flower.
PUAALII PLACE	-	Deadend roadway off Puaalii Street running in a mauka direction and being between Kaonohi Street and Puahoku Place.
PUAALII WAY	-	Deadend roadway off Puaalii Place running in an Ewa direction.
PUAANUHE STREET	-	Roadway running between Puaalii Street.
Meaning:		Same as Lau-lele, butterfly weed (Asclepias). Lit., caterpillar flower.
PUAHAU PLACE	-	Deadend roadway off Puaalii Street running in a Kokohead direction and being between Puaanuhe Street and Puakika Place.
Meaning:		Blossoms of Hau, a tree.
PUAHOKU PLACE		Deadend roadway off Puaalii Street running in a makai direction.
Meaning:		A tropical American herb (Isotoma (/Hippobroma/) longiflora/, one to two feet high, with few, or no branches, with long, narrow, lobed leaves, and starlike flowers with three inch long tube. The plant is related to the lobelias. It is poisonous, especially to stock.

PUAKIKA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Puaalii Street running in a mauka direction and being between Puahau Place and Puakukui Place.

Meaning: Cigar flower (Cuphea ignea), from Mexico, a small, smooth shrub with narrow, red, tubular, odorless flowers nearly an inch long. The flowers are used for leis.

PUAKUKUI PLACE - Deadend roadway off Puaalii Street running in an Ewa direction and being between Puakika Place and Puaanuhe Street.

Meaning: Blossoms of Kukui.

STREET NAMES
CENTRAL HONOLULU

(2) Street name for a roadway within the Central Honolulu area, identified by Tax Map Key 2-4-12:

PAPAKU PLACE - Deadend roadway off Piikoi Street running in an Ewa direction and being between Lunalilo Street and Kinau Street.

Meaning: Foundation or surface.

STREET NAMES
MOANALUA
SHAFTER FLATS
INDUSTRIAL DEV.
UNIT III

(3) Street name for a roadway in the Shafter Flats Industrial Development, Unit III, at Honolulu:

KILIHAU STREET - Extension of an existing roadway running in a Waikiki direction to terminate in a cul-de-sac.

STREET NAMES
KANEOHE
HEEIA

(4) Street name for a roadway in the Heeia area, Tax Map Key 4-6-17: 21, in Kaneohe;

HOLOUKA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Haiku Road running in a Kahuku direction and being mauka of Haiku Plantation Drive.

Meaning: Draft, air current, as in the mountains.

The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director and authorized the Director to establish the dates of the public hearing:

GENERAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN (AMENDMENT) CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT	(1)	A proposal to amend a portion of the Development Plan for the Central Business District by deleting a public off-street parking lot from the proposed municipal office building site bounded by Kapiolani Boulevard, Hotel Street, Alapai Street and King Street.
GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (AMEND) WAIANAE MAKAHA, MAKAI OF FARRINGTON HIGHWAY (RES. USE)	(2)	A proposal to amend a portion of the Detailed Land Use Map for the Waianae District (PA #29) by changing the land use designation from Resort to Residential use for land situated on the makai side of Farrington Highway at Makaha.
ZONING R-6 RESIDENTIAL HAWAII-KAI HAHAIONE VALLEY KAISER HAWAII-KAI DEV. CO.	(3)	A proposal to change the zoning from AG-1 Restricted Agriculture District to R-6 Residential District for land situated in Hahaione Valley, at the end of Hahaione Street and Ainapo Street, within the Hawaii-Kai Development area in Maunalua and containing an area of 114.233 acres.
ZONING B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS KANEOHE MAKAI OF KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY BETWEEN LILIPUNA AND WILLIAM HENRY ROADS	(4)	A proposal to change the zoning from R-4 Residential to B-2 Community Business for land situated on the makai side of Kamehameha Highway between Lilipuna Road and William Henry Road in Kaneohe.

MISC.
PLANNING STAFF
ALOHA WEEK
PROGRAM

The Chairman read a letter received from the Planning Department staff thanking the members of the Commission for making their Aloha Week Program a success. Special thanks were given to Commissioners Sullam and Ingleson for judging the "Most Beautifully Decorated Section" contest and to Commissioner Brennan for arranging the prize.

The Commission in turn thanked the staff for the invitation to participate in the luncheon and program with a special commendation for their endeavors in presenting such a program and decorating the office so beautifully.

The Chairman will send a letter of appreciation to the staff upon his return from a trip.

ZONING ORDINANCE PROPOSED AMENDMENT RELATING TO PARK DEDICATION

The working draft of a proposed ordinance relating to dedication of land for parks and playgrounds was distributed to each member of the Commission.

The sub-committee of the Commission composed of Mrs. Sullam, Mr. Ingleson and Mr. Rutledge will meet with Legal Counsel Andrew Sato to review the draft on Thursday, October 30, 1969, at 9:00 a.m., at the same place.

The Commission requested that this item be placed on the agenda of the next Commission meeting for discussion.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima

Carole A. Kamishima
Office Services Supervisor

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
November 6, 1969

The Planning Commission met in regular session on Thursday, November 6, 1969, at 1:40 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Vice Chairman Arthur A. Rutledge presiding:

PRESENT:

Arthur A. Rutledge, Vice Chairman
Roy R. Bright
Lewis Ingleson
Fredda Sullam
Thomas N. Yamabe II
James K. Sakai, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Ian McDougall, Staff Planner
Jack Gilliam, Staff Planner

ABSENT:

Philip T. Chun
Edward Brennan
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio

MINUTES:

The minutes of October 2 and 9, 1969, as circulated, were approved upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe and seconded by Mr. Bright.

PUBLIC HEARING
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
(AMENDMENT)
CENTRAL BUSINESS
DISTRICT
HOTEL STREET &
KAPIOLANI BLVD.
(PUBLIC FACILITIES
USE)

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to amend a portion of the Development Plan for the Central Business District by deleting a public off-street parking lot from the proposed Municipal Office Building site at the corner of Hotel Street and Kapiolani Boulevard and identified by Tax Map Key 2-1-33: Parcel 11 and portion of 23.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 26, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, and to interested citizens and organizations.

For orientation purposes, the Director pointed out the proposed Municipal Office Building site bounded by King Street, Kapiolani Boulevard, Hotel Street and Alapai Street. As a result of the proposed widening and extension of South Street to meet Alapai Street, he reported that this triangular block will be reduced in size. If a portion of the area were to remain in off-street parking use, it would greatly limit the

planning and design concept for the office building. In the course of its studies, the Mayor's Municipal Office Building Task Force felt that the design of the office building would be enhanced if the off-street parking designation were to be eliminated from the Development Plan and whatever required parking for the building be placed in the City-owned property mauka of Hotel Street.

Rather than designating specific areas for off-street parking use, the Director felt it more appropriate to permit flexibility in locating the parking areas especially for public facilities, such as the State Capitol and the Municipal Office Building. The exception would be the designation of public off-street parking garages, such as "Block G" and the Bethel Street parking structure.

Questioned by the Commission, additional facts brought out were as follows:

1. Private parking facilities or structures are not shown on the Development Plan.

2. The non-designation of a portion of the area for parking does not mean that no parking would be provided on the office building site. The Comprehensive Zoning Code requirement on parking must be met.

3. Architectural competition for the design of the office building will begin soon. In this respect, the Task Force will be establishing a precise perimeter boundary for the office building and possibly a parking structure, and it is anticipated that the adjacent mauka City property as well as street widening proposals and other factors will be taken into consideration and included in the report to the contestants.

There was no one to speak either in favor of or in opposition to the proposed amendment to the Development Plan.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Bright, closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the Director's proposal to amend a portion of the Development Plan for the Central Business District.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING R-6 RES.
MAUNALUA
HAWAII-KAI
HAHAIONE VALLEY
KAISER HAWAII-
KAI DEV. CO.

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to change the zoning from AG-1 Agriculture District to R-6 Residential District for approximately 114.233 acres of land situated at the terminus of Hahaione Street and Ainapo Street and extending approximately

3,500 feet north in Hahaione Valley within the Hawaii Kai development at Maunalua and identified by Tax Map Key 3-9-8: portion of Parcel 1.

The public hearing notice published in the Sunday Star Bulletin and Advertiser of October 26, 1969, was read by the Director. Copies of the hearing notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various civic and community associations in the general area, and to nearby property owners.

The Director gave his report on the proposed rezoning as follows:

1. The proposed zoning is in conformity with the adopted Detailed Land Use Map of the area which is designated for residential use.

2. Ainapo and Hahaione Streets are the two primary roadways leading to the zoning area. Both are 56-foot rights-of-way improved with curbs, gutters and sidewalks.

3. The Traffic Department anticipated no adverse congestion in the foreseeable future at the intersection of Hawaii-Kai Drive and Kalanianaole Highway if Kalanianaole Highway is widened from May Way to Hawaii Kai Drive.

4. Water and sewer facilities are available for the proposed development.

5. In view of the limited capacity of the existing sanitary sewage facilities, development of the area will be limited to a maximum of 400 units.

Since the proposed zoning is in conformity with the Detailed Land Use Map and the proposed development would be harmonious and consistent with the planning for the area, the Director recommended approval of the change in zoning to R-6 Residential.

Interrogated by the Commission, the Director gave additional information as follows:

1. Ainapo and Hahaione Streets will be extended through the development area.

2. The Detailed Land Use Map for the Hawaii-Kai area was adopted in June, 1966.

3. Upon its ultimate development, the population of Hawaii-Kai is anticipated to be about 50 to 60 thousand people.

4. Within the development area, a park site is designated on the adopted Detailed Land Use Map and this park site is reflected on the tentative subdivision layout plan submitted by the developer.

A letter submitted by Mr. Barry R. Okuda, Vice President and Assistant to the General Manager, Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company was read. Mr. Okuda stated that at the time that the DLUM was being considered for adoption in 1966, a commitment was made by Kaiser Hawaii-Kai to the City Council on the dedication of a park site in Hahaione Valley 2B. Therefore, depending on the action taken by the City and the Bishop Estate, there will be a dedication of land for a 6-acre public park site or the development of a 4-acre private park by Hawaii-Kai or, as a third alternative, the development of a park area within a planned unit or cluster development.

Testimony was heard from the public.

Mr. Tim Yee, Vice President and General Manager for the Kaiser Hawaii-Kai Development Company, requested favorable consideration of the rezoning which is in conformity with the Detailed Land Use Map. He mentioned the agreement made to develop the area with a maximum of 400 units regardless of whether the area is developed as a planned unit development or as a conventional subdivision.

Regarding the park site, he stated their intent, through approval of the Bishop Estate, to dedicate 6 acres to the City for a public park site. They will construct at their expense all improvements and utilities to and past the park site and grade the area so as not to exceed a 10 percent slope. He explained that the possibility of a private park was mentioned because at the time the commitment for a park site was made, some of the Councilmen questioned whether the City would accept the park site. Therefore, they made an option to the City that in the event the City did not accept the park site, the developer would make it a private park and maintain it through a homeowners' association. There will also be a park site should they develop the area as a planned unit development.

Mr. Yee then withdrew an earlier request made by letter for continuance of this hearing. He stated that they were able to resolve certain problems which were the reasons for asking for the continuance.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. Yee confirmed the figure given by the Director that upon the ultimate development of the Hawaii-Kai area, the

anticipated population would be between 50 and 60 thousand people. This, however, depends on how the lots are developed because some will go into planned unit development, and the marketability of certain properties.

Regarding access, he stated that engineering plans are almost completed for the extension of Hahaione Street. This road construction will be one of the first projects because it will provide access to the apartment development area as well as this residential section. He did not know the timetable for construction of the H-1 freeway through Hawaii-Kai but he mentioned their intent to construct, at their expense, the frontage road along the H-1 alignment and to dedicate it to the City or the State. They have agreed not to build within the alignment area.

Regarding the requirement for schools, Mr. Yee stated that the Department of Education has been provided their construction schedules and the anticipated density of all zoned and unzoned areas. They are in constant consultation with the DOE on school construction schedule and when necessary have accelerated the construction of certain projects ahead of others. To date, the number of school sites shown on the General Plan seems adequate but they are prepared to meet additional needs if informed by the DOE.

Mr. Yee stated that the various community associations and other organizations in the Hawaii-Kai area have been informed of this project as well as of other projects involving the area. This will be done on a continuing basis. Their most recent meeting was with the Hahaione people who were concerned with the number of units to be built in the valley area. When informed that the number was not to exceed 400 units, they seemed satisfied.

Commissioner Rutledge felt it wise for the developer to put such notifications to the people in writing and send a copy to the Commission so that years later should there be a question, the records would show that there was notification to the people of this proposal.

The Director then read a letter just received from Mr. Ted Green, Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation. The Parks Department indicated the need for a neighborhood recreation park within the development area and asked what provisions were being made by the developer to satisfy the recreational and open space needs for the area.

Since this question has been answered by Mr. Tim Yee, the Commission asked for comments from Mr. Delos Seeley of the Parks Department.

Mr. Seeley indicated the Department's satisfaction with the developer's plan to dedicate a park site. He stated that they are merely requesting an opportunity to participate in the planning of the park area, its location, configuration, topography, and so forth because it was quite alarming to learn that the area might have a slope of about 10 percent grade.

The Director reported that upon receipt of a formal subdivision plan for the area, the Parks Department will be given an opportunity to comment on the park site and plan.

When asked by the Commission to clarify his comment made on the 10 percent grade, Mr. Seeley stated that a 10 percent grade is not usable for recreational purposes unless the area is terraced. However, a 10 percent slope is not prohibitive from development because they have developed such sites, but in addition to location, topography and configuration, they must take into consideration other aspects, such as street frontages before accepting the park site.

When asked by the Commission for his comment, Mr. Tim Yee stated that the 10 percent grade was mentioned as a maximum but they believe that this particular site can be graded to less than 10 percent slope. He assured the Commission that they will work closely with the Parks Department and the Planning Department in planning the park site.

In reply to Mrs. Sullam's question about bicycle pathways in park areas, Mr. Seeley expressed hope that more attention could be given to bicycle trails, but as yet no such plans have been developed.

Mr. Yee mentioned their interest in developing the area as a planned unit development to give them more flexibility in designing the layout of the units and providing for more recreational and open spaces, pedestrian walkways to the school and park, and such other amenities offered through a planned unit development.

Regarding maintenance of the park area, Mr. Seeley expressed hope that the City will find funds for maintenance because their department's budget in the past on maintenance has been very limited. In some cases, they have developed a park for minimum maintenance because they feel that they can always go back

later and add the improvements. Realizing that the adoption of the currently discussed park dedication ordinance will see the dedication of more park sites to the City, he stated that the Parks Department will give more emphasis to maintenance funds when preparing their capital improvement programs.

The Commission then asked about the extent of the mass transit system and its plan through the Hawaii-Kai area.

The Director did not believe that the mass transit system under the Oahu Transportation Study went as far as the Hawaii-Kai area although such a system would generally follow the alignment of the existing main road through the area. During the public hearing on the apartment zoning consideration, he noted that transportation was discussed at length and a point was made that accessibility from Hawaii-Kai to downtown and vice versa was among the best of any major development area. He felt that the addition of 400 units is a modest increase in traffic and can be handled by the existing freeway system. For meeting future requirements, he expected that additional funds would be appropriated by the State to continue the Oahu Transportation Study for a more definitive plan for a mass transit system and its alignment.

Mr. Yee informed the Commission that they have been working with the State on the problem of transportation for a number of years.

No one spoke against the proposed rezoning.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Bright, the Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the proposal to change the zoning from AG-1 Agriculture District to R-6 Residential District for approximately 114 acres of land at Hahaione Valley within the Hawaii-Kai development at Maunalua.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING B-2
COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT
KANEOHE
KAMEHAMEHA HIGHWAY AND WILLIAM HENRY ROAD
HAWAIIAN TELEPHONE CO., LTD.

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to change the zoning from R-4 Residential District to B-2 Community Business District for approximately 5,838 sq. ft. of land situated approximately 160 feet north of the intersection of Kamehameha Highway and William Henry Road and extending from 100 feet to 194 feet makai of Kamehameha Highway at Kaneohe and identified by Tax Map Key 4-5-15: portion of Parcel 4.

The notice of public hearing was advertised in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of October 26, 1969,

and copies of the notice were sent to the applicable governmental agencies, to the various community and civic organizations in the Kaneohe area, to property owners in the surrounding area, and to interested parties.

The Director oriented the Commission to the location of the subject property and explained the proposal to extend the existing business zone fronting on Kamehameha Highway to the back boundary of the property. He indicated that the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for Kaneohe designates the area for commercial use. Water and sewer facilities are available and adequate to serve the area. Existing land uses in the adjoining areas indicate a variety of commercial uses and an apartment structure in the back. A telephone exchange office structure and maintenance shops presently exist on the subject property and the Telephone Company proposes to construct an addition to the existing structure to house telephone communications equipment to service the Kaneohe area. Site plans submitted indicate a basement and first floor addition for 1970 and an ultimate development to a total of 4 floors by 1997. Evaluation of the development plan submitted for the proposed addition shows that the requirements of the Comprehensive Zoning Code relating to setback, height, parking and so forth can be met.

The Director recommended approval of the proposed rezoning for the following reasons:

1. The proposed zoning conforms to the adopted Detailed Land Use Map for the area.

2. Utilities are adequate to support the proposed use.

3. The proposed development will be harmonious and complimentary to the surrounding area.

4. The extension of the business zone will allow the applicant to expand the existing structure in accordance with proper zoning requirements.

5. The extension will follow a logical, natural boundary of the parcel rather than follow an arbitrary zoning boundary of 100 feet back from Kamehameha Highway as presently zoned.

There was no one to testify either in favor of or in opposition to the proposed rezoning.

Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission closed the public hearing and took the matter under advisement.

In reply to Mr. Yamabe's inquiry, the Director stated that exceptions from the zoning regulations for public utilities and facilities are made in certain instances, but in this instance, the use as an office will require a commercial zoning.

ACTION: The Commission, upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Bright, recommended approval of the change in zoning from R-4 Residential District to B-2 Community Business District for the Hawaiian Telephone Company's property in Kaneohe identified by Tax Map Key 4-5-15: portion of Parcel 4.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING A-3 APARTMENT DISTRICT
KALAUAO
KAONOHI RIDGE
AMFAC-TROUSDALE

The Commission continued until the next meeting, the public hearing to consider a proposal to change the zoning from A-2 Apartment District to A-3 Apartment District for three separate parcels of land situated on the mauka side of Moanalua Road realignment and makai of the Francis I. Brown Golf Course at Kaonohi Ridge, Kalauao, identified by Tax Map Key 9-8-11: portion of Parcel 3 and containing a total area of approximately 32.12 acres.

The Director had reported the recent receipt of some of the conceptual proposals and sketches for development of the parcels in accordance with the A-3 Apartment requirements and requested an opportunity to analyze the proposals and comment on them.

GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
LAIE TO KAAAWA
KAIPAPAU
REAR OF THE HAUULA SHOPPING CENTER
(JONATHAN MANOR)

The Commission again considered a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Laie to Kaaawa District by changing the land use designation from Commercial to Residential use for a parcel of land identified by Tax Map Key 5-4-04: portion of Parcel 22, situated northeast of Kawaewae Way and to the rear of the Hauula Shopping Center fronting on Kamehameha Highway at Kaipapau.

The Commission held a public hearing on September 18, 1969, and after closing the hearing, deferred action pending receipt of data from Jonathan Manor regarding a possible lease agreement with Wigwam Stores for additional space and a review of this proposal with the request of the Kahuku Shopping Center, Limited for a change in land use designation from Residential to Commercial for an adjacent parcel of land containing 2.4 acres.

Mr. Ian McDougall, staff planner, oriented the Commission to the location of the property and reviewed the staff's analyses relating to the subject property as follows:

1. The parcel is vacant and it abuts the Hauula Shopping Center and a service station on the makai side, single family residential homes on the mauka side and vacant parcels on the Kaneohe and Laie Point sides.

2. The existing topography of the subject parcel is about 10 to 15 feet higher in elevation than the Hauula Shopping Center parcel.

3. Physical access to the property is from Kawaipuna Street off Kamehameha Highway and through extended Kawaewae Place which are minor streets running through a residential area. The Traffic Department has reported that the pavement width is insufficient to permit free flow of two-way traffic.

4. The Department of Public Works has reported that there are no public sewerage facilities available to the area.

5. Due to the existing topography of the site, the inadequate access, and the relationship of the parcel to the existing single family development, the staff concluded that the site is more suitable for single family residential use rather than commercial use.

In compliance with the Commission's request, Mr. McDougall reported that Jonathan Manor has submitted a letter from Wigwam Stores, Inc., dated July 15, 1969, stating that Wigwam agrees to sign a lease on an expanded store with a total space of 25,000 sq. ft. for a term of 20 years and with a further condition that there be a minimum of 3 to 1 parking ratio. A site plan showing the proposed extension area was submitted and displayed.

Should the subject parcel be developed as proposed with extensive grading and retaining walls as shown on the proposed site plan, Mr. McDougall reported that the residential suitability of the property would be negated. A retaining wall following the configuration of the expansion area would result in an undesirable irregular shaped remnant parcel. A retaining wall placed at a uniform depth across the full width of the property would also result in a shape that would be difficult to develop. Other problems foreseen are:

1. The need for pedestrian access to individual stores from the mauka parking areas.

2. Pedestrian access from the mauka parking areas will conflict with truck deliveries occurring at the rear of the stores.

3. Vehicular access to the mauka parking areas is questionable due to the 90 degree turns required at the rear of the proposed facilities.

Based on the foregoing factors mentioned, the staff's recommendation is to change the commercial designation of the subject parcel to residential use.

In reply to questions from the Commission, Mr. McDougall pointed out an existing easement for roadway and utility purposes running along the Kaneohe boundary of the Hauula Shopping Center property and ending at the subject property because of the difference in elevation. He felt it possible to extend this easement area to provide for a pedestrian access from the residential development in the back but because of the difference in elevation and plans for a retaining wall at the boundary of the commercial zone, there might be some difficulty in providing that pedestrian access. Presently, access to the shopping center is from Kamehameha Highway. He stated that a management survey made of the existing shops in the shopping center revealed that only the manager of the Wigwam Stores indicated an expansion plan for its future needs.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mrs. Sullam, the Commission concurred with the Director's proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map of the Laie to Kaaawa District by changing the land use designation from Commercial to Residential use for a parcel of land situated to the rear of the Hauula Shopping Center at Kaipapau.

GENERAL PLAN
DLUM (AMENDMENT)
LAIE TO KAAAWA
KAIPAPAU
KANEOHE SIDE OF
THE HAUULA
SHOPPING CENTER
(KAHUKU SHOPPING
CENTER, LTD.)

The Commission again considered a proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Laie to Kaaawa District by changing the land use designation from Residential to Commercial for a 2.4 acre parcel of land situated on the mauka side of Kamehameha Highway at Kaipapau, identified by Tax Map Key 5-4-18: Parcel 59, adjacent to the Hauula Shopping Center.

A public hearing was held on August 14, 1969, and again reviewed by the Commission on September 18, 1969. The Commission had deferred action and referred the matter back to the staff for further study relating to an overall shopping center concept for the area by taking into consideration the proposed amendment to the Detailed Land Use Map affecting the Jonathan Manor property.

Mr. Ian McDougall, staff planner, reviewed the proposal with the Commission. He reported the staff's

recommendation for approval of the proposed amendment based on the following:

1. Approximately 2 acres of an existing commercial area to the rear of the Hauula Shopping Center have been recommended for deletion primarily because of an elevation difference with the shopping center land and physical access through a residential area.

2. The parcel under consideration for commercial use has direct access from Kamehameha Highway as well as from Kawaipuna Street.

3. The proposed 2.4 acres of commercial use would serve the same market area as that being recommended for deletion. The total of 6 acres of commercial use will basically be unchanged from the adopted Detailed Land Use Map.

4. A research done on population projections, income available for retail purchases, and income generated per square foot of retail space concluded that additional commercial facilities could be economically sustained by 1975. In addition, it was reported that a restaurant would not be in conflict with the retail establishments in the trading area.

5. By 1975, it is anticipated that the number of families in Hauula can reach 500 from its present 410. Therefore, it is fairly reasonable to assume that additional commercial facilities in the area can be economically sustained.

ACTION: Upon the motion by Mrs. Sullam, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission recommended approval of the proposal to amend a portion of the General Plan Detailed Land Use Map for Laie to Kaaawa District by changing the land use designation from Residential to Commercial for a 2.4-acre parcel of land situated on the mauka side of Kamehameha Highway at Kaipapau, identified by Tax Map Key 5-4-18: Parcel 59.

STREET NAME
KANEOHE
HEEIA

Upon the motion by Mr. Bright, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, the Commission recommended approval of the following street name for a roadway in the Heeia area at Kaneohe, Tax Map Key 4-6-17: Parcel 21:

HOLOUKA PLACE - Deadend roadway off Haiku Road running in the Kahuku direction and being mauka of Haiku Plantation Drive.

Meaning: Draft; air current, as in the mountains.

C.I.P. IMPROVEMENT REVOLVING FUND ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR KEKAULIKE OFF-STREET PARKING LOT

The Commission reviewed City Council Resolution No. 372 which proposes to transfer the sum of $24,762.60 from the Improvement Revolving Fund to the Department of Traffic to finalize the acquisition of Parcel 4 comprising an area of 3,638 sq. ft. and Parcel 5 comprising an area of 3 sq. ft. as additions to the Kekaulike Off-Street Parking Lot.

The Director reported that the lots were vacant at the time condemnation proceedings were initiated and they have now been occupied and developed by the City for parking. The court settlement price is $79,377.60 of which $65,000 is for land and the remaining for architect's fees, test borings and such other expenses incurred by the owner for a commercial building that had been planned for the area. Since $54,615 was deposited with the court in 1967, the requested transfer sum of $24,762.60 will be used to pay the difference. At present, the Improvement Revolving Fund has a balance in excess of $300,000. The Fund will be reimbursed when funds become available in the Capital Improvement Budget Ordinance. He recommended approval of Resolution No. 372 since the acquisition meets a public need and the price appears reasonable.

ACTION: The Commission recommended approval of Resolution No. 372 upon the motion by Mr. Bright, seconded by Mr. Yamabe.

ZONING ORDINANCE PARK DEDICATION

Mr. Jack Gilliam, staff planner, gave a progress report on the proposed ordinance to amend Chapter 22, R. O., 1961, by adding thereto a new article to be numbered Article 6, relating to Dedication of Land for Parks and Playgrounds or the Payment of Money in lieu thereof, as a condition precedent to final approval of a subdivision.

The subcommittee of the Commission met with the staff and Deputy Corporation Counsel Sato to review the ordinance.

Mr. Gilliam stated that the legal language of the ordinance was changed somewhat, especially where private parks were concerned. One technical problem still to be worked out dealt with residential zoned land designated, for instance, for apartment use. Since there is a difference in the amount of land required by dedication for residential zoned land as against apartment zoned land, the language must be clear as to what requirement would be applicable. There could be a subdivision while the land is zoned residential and subsequently zoned apartment after the park dedication was made. He hoped to have the ordinance in final form and sent to the Commission by November 13 so that the Commission would have a week

to study it and be ready for discussion on the next meeting of November 20.

The Commission received the progress report.

Upon the motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Bright, the Commission authorized the calling of public hearings to consider the following changes initiated by the Planning Director and authorized the Director to establish the dates of the public hearings:

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT-HOUSING HEEIA HAIKU VILLA QUAL-PAC DEV.	(1) A proposal to establish a Planned Development-Housing District for a development known as Haiku Villa on 6.64 acres of land in Heeia within an R-4 Residential District.
ZONING B-2 COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT WAIPAHU MOKUOLA AND WAIPAHU STREETS CROWN LAND CORP.	(2) A proposal to change the zoning from R-6 Residential to B-2 Community Business District for 9,196 sq. ft. of land situated at the corner of Mokuola Street and Waipahu Street in Waipahu, including portions of four other parcels within the same block.
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT KAIMUKI 1041 TENTH AVE. COLUMBARIUM USE CHURCH OF THE EPIPHANY	(3) An application for a Conditional Use Permit to permit columbarium use of a church addition to be made on property at 1041 Tenth Avenue in Kaimuki within an R-6 Residential District.
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT KAPAHULU OFF-STREET PARKING CARE ANIMAL CENTER	(4) An application for a Conditional Use Permit for off-street parking purposes on property identified by Tax Map Key 3-2-01: Parcel 83 at Kapahulu within an R-7 Residential District.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carole A. Kamishima

Carole A. Kamishima
Office Services Supervisor

Meeting of the Planning Commission
Minutes
November 20, 1969

The Planning Commission met in a special session on Thursday, November 20, 1969, at 1:45 p.m., in the Conference Room of the City Hall Annex with Chairman Philip T. Chun presiding:

PRESENT:

Philip T. Chun, Chairman
Arthur A. Rutledge, Vice-Chairman
Edward Brennan
Thomas N. Yamabe II
Fredda Sullam
Lewis Ingleson
Richard K. Sharpless, ex-officio
James K. Sakai, ex-officio

Robert R. Way, Planning Director
Andrew Sato, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Duk Hee Murabayashi, Staff Planner
Jack Gilliam, Staff Planner

ABSENT:

Roy R. Bright

MINUTES:

The minutes of May 15, 1969, as circulated, were approved on motion by Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mrs. Sullam.

PUBLIC HEARING
ZONING R-6 RES.
WAIPAHU
CORNER OF MOKUOLA
ST. & WAIPAHU ST.
CROWN LAND CORP.

A public hearing was held to consider a proposal to change the zoning from R-6 Residential District to B-2 Community Business District for parcels of land beginning at the corner of Mokuola Street and Waipahu Street on the makai side of Waipahu Street and extending northeast approximately 300 feet and identified as Tax Map Key: 9-4-26: portions of Parcels 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, and 105.

The Director reported that the Notice of Public Hearing was published in the November 9, 1969, edition of the Star-Bulletin and Advertiser. Copies of the notice were sent to applicable governmental agencies, to various civic and community organizations in the area and to nearby property owners. No letters of protest were received.

Mr. Jack Gilliam presented the staff's report and oriented the Commission as to the location of the subject property in Waipahu. He elaborated on the following points:

1. The applicant wishes to demolish the existing Kiso Store commercial building, replacing it with a shopping-center complex containing areas for two retail shops and a restaurant.

2. The applicant's rezoning request originally affected only two parcels, Tax Map Key: 9-4-26, portions 98 and 99. However, the Director, upon review of this application, initiated and expanded the request to include four additional parcels in this block, which are partially zoned R-6 Residential, to be consistent and afford a more logical type of zoning boundary.

3. The portions of R-6 Residential Districts, through prior practice, either have variances for off-street parking for adjacent business, or were zoned as off-street parking districts under the old ordinance. During the transition to the Comprehensive Zoning Code, these off-street parking districts were eliminated and converted to R-6 Residential.

4. Previously, only the building area was zoned, and then a variance granted for parking purposes using that as a type of setback.

5. Water facilities are adequate; sewers are not. Any application for a building permit other than replacement of what already exists will be denied by the Sewer Division.

The Director recommends approval of the proposed rezoning for the following reasons:

1. The area is predominately zoned Business already.

2. In order for the applicant to develop, he will be required to put in an adequate sewer system.

3. Zoning of the two parcels will enable the applicant to more fully utilize the land for commercial use and give consideration for better design of the development.

4. In the interest of good overall planning, the following tax map keys be included in the rezoning, as they too are zoned partially Residential and Business: 9-4-26: 100, portions of 101, 102, and 105.

Questioned by Commissioner Ingleson, Mr. Gilliam stated that the applicant must conform to the 5-foot landscaping setback. He would estimate 50% vacant land in non-commercial use or residential use but could not be specific inasmuch as there are no precise boundaries in this area for undeveloped vacant land.

Attorney Morio Omori, representing the applicant, stated that the rezoning, in essence, will effect a land exchange in line with the demolition and relocation of Kiso Store. The applicant, Crown Land Corporation, will not construct the improvements in the area.

No one spoke in opposition to this proposal.

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

ACTION: Based upon the Planning Director's recommendations, Mr. Brennan moved that the Commission recommend approval of the applicant's request for rezoning, seconded by Mrs. Sullam and carried.

CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT
KAIMUKI
1041 TENTH AVE.
CHURCH OF THE
EPIPHANY
BY: JACK ATNIP, SR.

A public hearing was held to consider a request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct and maintain a columbarium on a parcel of land situated at the southeast corner of Harding Avenue and Tenth Avenue in Kaimuki, Honolulu, and identified as Tax Map Key 3-2-13: 12 and 13.

The public hearing notice was published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of November 9, 1969. Copies of the notice were sent to applicable governmental agencies, to various civic and community organizations in the area, and to nearby property owners. No letters of protest were received.

The Director reviewed with the Commission, the staff's report of the applicant's proposal and of the Director's recommendations in this connection. Copies of this report were sent to the Commissioners prior to the meeting. Queried by Commissioner Yamabe on Recommendation #4, land dedication by the applicant

for a 3-foot road widening, the Director explained that the dedication could be conditioned upon the applicant at this time inasmuch as the area involved is already proposed for development.

Mr. Jack Atnip, Sr., Vestryman, represented the applicant and presented justifications for the request:

1. The burial office of our church simultaneously provides not only for the confident commending of the soul unto God's keeping, but also for a reverend farewell to the body which has housed the spirit in its earthly course.

2. Here in Hawaii a preference has been shown for the method of cremation. There is much to recommend this practice and the Episcopal Church looks upon it with favor. The Church of the Epiphany has sought for more than 60 years to serve its membership and its community in every need.

3. We at the Church of the Epiphany feel that the erection of the columbarium at Epiphany will not serve a very vital need, but because of its design, it will enchance the aesthetic beauty of the community. Therefore, we respectfully solicit your approval of our undertaking.

Replying to various questions of the commissioners, Mr. Atnip stated that they would have no objection to the proposed 3-foot widening on Harding Avenue. They have already agreed to a 5-foot widening on 10th Avenue, and he believed that the 3-foot widening would certainly enhance the appearance of the columbarium. A total of 216 bronze-wall niches are proposed for this single structure beginning with 72 and accomodations for 144 later on. The church will accomodate members of their congregation which averaged approximately 200 members over the past 60 years. There are no intentions of expanding the proposed facility in the future. If requested, they will accomodate members in their immediate community. Other than that, Mr. Atnip stated, "We are not in the business." Parking facilities include their own 35-car parking lot plus the municipal parking lot a block away. No excess parking problems are anticipated because burial services normally include only the immediate family (3 or 4), and the Vicar.

No one spoke in opposition to this proposal.

The public hearing was closed and the matter taken under advisement, on motion by Mr. Yamabe, seconded by Mr. Ingleson.

ACTION: The Commission recommended approval of the applicant's request for a Conditional Use Permit based upon the following conditions, on motion by Mrs. Sullam, seconded by Mr. Rutledge:

1. The plan on file dated January 16, 1968, shall be part of the permit, and any major deviation from it must be first approved by the Planning Director;

2. Landscaping and lawn planting plans shall be submitted to the Planning Director for his approval prior to application for a building permit;

3. The existing off-street parking area shall be maintained and shall not be reduced in size or number of stalls.

4. The 3-foot widening of Harding Avenue and the area affected by the rounding of the corner should be dedicated to the City.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT KAPAHULU CARE ANIMAL CENTER

A public hearing was held to consider a request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct and operate an off-street parking facility located between Kapahulu Avenue and First Avenue approximately 240 feet mauka of Harding Avenue in Kapahulu and containing 15,718 square feet, identified as Tax Map Key: 3-2-01: 82.

The public hearing notice was published in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of November 9, 1969. Copies of the notice were sent to applicable governmental agencies, to various civic and community organizations in the area, and to nearby property owners.

The Director reported receiving six form letters endorsing the proposal from the following people:

1. Nicholas E. Palumbo, Leaseholder, 1134 Kapahulu Avenue;

2. Raymond Serai, Owner, 3011 Waialae Avenue;

3. William T. Nakamura, President, Kapahulu Businessmen's Association, 819 Kapahulu Avenue;

4. Reginald Hong, Resident, 1122 1st Avenue;

5. Mrs. Richard Fusuta, Owner, 1112 1st Avenue; and

6. Mr. and Mrs. Robert H. Sato, Owners, 1136 1st Avenue.

He also reported that one letter of protest was received from two brothers, Mr. James Kam, Owner, 1133 1st Avenue; and Mr. Paul K. Kam, 1141 1st Avenue.

Mr. Gilliam oriented the Commission to the location of the subject property in Kapahulu, and presented the staff's report explaining the applicant's proposal including the Director's recommendations. Replying to various questions of the Commission concerning the report, Mr. Gilliam stated:

1. Athough the development plan for the area, adopted two years ago, shows a road realignment, whether CIP funds are available to develop at this time is another question.

2. A 4-foot wall setback 5 feet from the property line is conditioned upon the applicant. Maintenance of the landscaping area between the wall and the property line is set forth in the Comprehensive Zoning Code, automatically conditioned upon the applicant.

Representing the applicant and speaking for the proposal were Mr. Paul Jones, Architect, Dr. Howard Furumoto, and Mrs. Lucille Libby.

Mr. Jones informed the Commission that the lease for the property acquired in 1957 includes the entire property. No additional land was acquired for parking facilities. To meet the new Comprehensive Zoning Code off-street parking requirements, it was necessary to remove a two-story structure, an asset for Dr. Furumoto, which served as a caretaker's quarters. Questioned by Mr. Ingleson, Mr. Jones agreed, from an architect's viewpoint, that it would be more feasible to locate the wall on the property line rather than having it setback 5 feet from the property line for easier maintenance of the landscaped area.

Dr. Howard Furumoto asserted that he wishes to employ six veterinarians, each to render services in their own specialization. Replying to various questions of the Commission, he pointed out the following:

1. Their proposed off-street parking facilities will alleviate some of the traffic congestion on 1st Avenue.

2. His neighbors have sanctioned this proposal inasmuch as the proposed building will be enclosed, air-conditioned, and soundproofed, eliminating a noise factor presently exposed to the neighborhood.

3. Vehicular access to the parking lot will be off 1st Avenue. The only access to the reception room on Kapahulu Avenue is via an open walkway from the parking lot. The layout of the existing building and present hospital facilities already in operation, would make it too costly to relocate the reception room.

4. There will be two emergency entrances fronting 1st Avenue, directly from the parking lot into the clinic.

5. Present boarding services will eventually be discontinued with the new proposal.

6. They now accommodate 99 animals. Under the new set up, they will service 108.

In later discussion, Mr. Brennan suggested removing the reception room on Kapahulu Avenue, and providing direct access from the parking lot into the clinic on 1st Avenue. Inasmuch as the hospital will be visited during the night hours, walking a dog around the building on an exposed walkway might cause some disturbance to the neighbors. From a practical standpoint, direct access from the parking lot will also afford better service to patrons.

<u>ACTION</u>: Mr. Yamabe moved that the matter be referred back to the Director for consultation with the applicant concerning the elimination of the proposed entranceway on Kapahulu Avenue and the possibility of providing another access fronting 1st Avenue.

ZONING A-3
APARTMENT DISTRICT
KALAUAO-KAONOHI
RIDGE
AMFAC-TROUSDALE

At the Director's request for a continued deferment, Mr. Yamabe moved, seconded by Mr. Ingleson, that the Commission continue until its next meeting on December 4, 1969, the public hearing to consider a proposal to change the zoning from A-2 Apartment District to A-3 Apartment District for three separate parcels of land situated on the mauka side of Moanalua Road realignment and makai of the Francis I. Brown Golf Course at Kaonohi Ridge, Kalauao, identified by Tax Map Key 9-8-11: portion of Parcel 3 and containing a total area of approximately 32.12 acres. The Director stated that he will make a recommendation on the issue at that time.

Attorney Morio Omori, appearing on the applicant's behalf, stated that he does not object to the deferment although he is prepared to proceed with his presentation today. He requested that every effort be made to have the matter considered, definitely, at the next meeting.

ZONING ORDINANCE
PARK DEDICATION

The Director stated that this Ordinance was reviewed by a Subcommittee of the Planning Commission. Mr. Rutledge who chaired the committee reported that the Ordinance in its present form is ambiguous with no flexibility to alter it in any way. It was difficult in certain issues to determine the intent legislators had in mind. Under the circumstances, there was very little they could do with the ordinance.

Various issues recognized and questioned by the Commission were:

1. <u>Horizontal Condominiums</u>

   Mr. Ingleson pointed out that there is no requirement for land dedication concerning horizontal condominiums.

2. <u>Dedication of Land is Based on Existing Zoning Rather than DLUM</u>

   Mr. Ingleson asserted that dedication of land is based on the existing zoning, and not necessarily as the Detailed Land Use Map indicates as a City policy. For that reason, the Detailed Land Use Map was not included in determining the percentage of land to be dedicated.

Deputy Corporation Counsel Sato affirmed this by illustrating that in a recent Supreme Court case involving Ala Moana property, the Supreme Court ruled that the "Detailed Land Use Map is just an expression of the City Council and, therefore, might not become an actuality." Mr. Ingleson, relatively, felt the amount of land to be dedicated should relate to the Detailed Land Use Map.

3. Possible Multiple Economic Jeopardy

Mr. Brennan questioned whether a fee would be applied each time to the development of a new subdivision thereby imposing a double or even multiple fee upon the developer. Further, if a financial fee is paid rather than land dedication, could that fee be used as such to construct any additional park area. Both questions were not answered.

4. Location of Land Dedication, who determines?

Mr. Sato, in reply to a question of who determines the geographic location as to what area will be park, referred to Section 22-6.5(a) which states "The site and/or sites conform to the locations and the standards set forth in the General Plan or Detailed Land Use Map." In this connection, the decision reverts procedurally to the Planning Director who then makes the necessary recommendations.

5. Providing Land "in perpetuity"

Mr. Sato explained that this term refers to land provided "forever and ever." There are two distinctions:

a. In real property law, land provided in perpetuity under certain conditions might revert to the fee owner; and

b. In the dedication of land, the fee passes on to the grantee.

In the case of leased land, the lessor is the fee owner. Land provided in perpetuity is conditional in that if conditions change, land use changes and the land reverts to the owner.

6. Fees

Mr. Sato stated that fees collected will be used for maintenance based upon the assumption that park land is available. The question, "What happens to funds if no lands are available" remained unanswered.

Mr. Sakai questioned whether maintenance is to be included as a principle use of funds. He cautioned if funds are so used, none may be available to purchase the land. Mr. Yamabe, in this relation, suggested that the word "maintenance" be deleted from the Ordinance.

7. Agricultural Lands

Mr. Yamabe felt the agricultural portion of the Ordinance should be deleted because the availability of agricultural lands for dedication purposes, such as park use, decreases land value thus defeating the primary purpose of this Ordinance which is to give the City the advantage land owners might have in land appreciation. He stated that farm areas are spacious enough to accommodate today's minimal population prevalent in these areas. Plantations comprise approximately five or ten acres of land so that the availability of "park lots" for families is their own backyard. Mrs. Sullam suggested that perhaps regional parks, adjacent to schools, might be more appropriate.

8. Fair Share of Costs, Regional Developments

Mr. Brennan questioned whether regional developments such as shopping centers will be included in their fair share of the costs. His question remained unanswered.

Mr. Rutledge emphasized that while the Ordinance is ambiguous and has numerous shortcomings, it is a start in the right direction. The Commission could request the Legislature for enabling legislation to the point of rezoning. Under the circumstances, the Ordinance should be submitted as is to the City Council in its broad stage to allow for flexibility.

ACTION: Mr. Rutledge moved that the Ordinance, as recommended to the Commission, be forwarded to the City Council with the deletion of the word "maintenance" on page 3, the 2nd line from the bottom. Mr. Ingleson seconded the motion.

STREET NAMES
PEARL CITY
MOMILANI
SUBDIVISION
UNIT XI

The Commission, on motion of Mrs. Sullam, seconded by Mr. Rutledge, recommended approval of the following street names:

1. Roadways within the Momilani Subdivision, Unit XI, Pearl City

HOOHAI STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a makai direction.

HOOLAULEA STREET - Extension of an existing roadway in a makai direction.

HOOLAA STREET - Roadway extending from Hoolaulea Street in a makai direction being between Hoohai Street and Hoolaulea Street.

Meaning: To consecrate.

HOOMALOLO STREET - Roadway extending from Hoomoana Street in a makai direction being between Hoolaulea Street and Hoohai Street.

Meaning: To rest.

HOOLELE STREET - Roadway extending from Hoolaulea Street to Hoomalolo Street being between Hoomoana Street and Hoowae Street.

Meaning: To fly.

HOOWAE STREET - Roadway extending from Hoolele Street to Hoomalolo Street in a makai direction being northwest of Hoolele Street.

Meaning: To choose.

STREET NAMES
DELETING KAKAAKO
ST. & SUBSTITUTING
PUNCHBOWL ST.

2. Delete KAKAAKO STREET and substitute thereto:

PUNCHBOWL STREET - Roadway running in a makai direction being between Halekauwila Street and Ala Moana Boulevard.

3. Delete that portion of PUNCHBOWL STREET running between Halekauwila and Kakaako Streets.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT REVOLVING FUND RESOLUTION NO. 391

The Commission reviewed City Council Resolution No. 391 which would transfer the sum of $185,000 from the Improvement Revolving Fund to the Department of Parks and Recreation to finalize the acquisition of Parcel 3, second revision, as an addition to Haleiwa Beach Park.

The Director reviewed the staff report for the benefit of the Commission. No discussion followed.

ACTION: The Commission recommended approval of Resolution No. 391 upon the motion by Mr. Rutledge, seconded by Mr. Ingleson.

Mr. Rutledge moved, seconded by Mr. Brennan, that the following matters initiated by the Planning Director be set for public hearings, the date to be determined by the Planning Director.

ZONING B-5 RESORT-COMMERCIAL DISTRICT WAIKIKI MAUKA-EWA CORNER OF KALAKAUA & LILIUOKALANI AVE. NOBORU IHA

1. A proposal to change the zoning from H-2 Hotel District to B-5 Resort Commercial for 9,868 square feet of land situated on the mauka-ewa corner of Kalakaua and Liliuokalani Avenues in Waikiki.

GENERAL PLAN DETAILED LAND USE MAP (VARIOUS AMENDMENTS) MCCULLY ALEXANDER ST. BET. BINGHAM & SO. BERETANIA ST. KUNIYUKI BROS., INC.

2. A proposal to amend the University Community Plan, General Plan DLUM to redesignate a portion of a parcel of land from Medium-Density Apartment use to High-Density Apartment use situated at Alexander Street between Bingham and So. Beretania Streets in McCully and identified by Tax Map Key: 2-8-10: portion of 24.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT KAHUKU KUILIMA POINT GOLF COURSE USE INSCON DEV. CO.

3. An application for a Conditional Use Permit to permit the construction and operation of an 18-hole championship golf course and accessory uses such as a Pro-shop, snack bar and maintenance yard.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT KAHUKU KUILIMA POINT INTERIM SEWERAGE SYSTEM INSCON DEV. CO.

4. An application for a Conditional Use Permit to construct and operate a sewerage pumping station and waste stabilization pond.

MISCELLANEOUS
CITY COUNCIL REQUEST
REPRESENTATIVE OF
COMMISSION RE
CAMPBELL RESOLUTION

The Director reported at the City Council meeting on Tuesday, November 18, 1969, the Council requested that a representative of the Planning Commission appear at their next meeting on Tuesday, November 25, 1969, prepared to discuss issues relating to Councilman Campbell's Resolution.

The Chairman stated that he would attend and convey to the Council the feelings of the Commission on the subject resolution.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henrietta B. Lyman

Henrietta B. Lyman
Secretary-Reporter II

CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MICROFILM CERTIFICATION

REEL NUMBER: 31

Number of Images: 1,010

FLASH	TITLE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
START	
1	Book #124 May 30, 1968 to November 14, 1968
2	Book #125 November 27, 1968 to June 5, 1969
3	Book #126 June 12, 1969 to November 20, 1969
4	
5	
6	
END	

CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE MICROPHOTOGRAPHS APPEARING IN THIS REEL OF FILM ARE TRUE COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

Dec. 6, 1973
Date

Charlen R. Wahinehookai
Signature of Operator

END