


Stephen K. Yamashiro  
Mayor



Virginia Goldstein  
Director

Norman Olesen  
Deputy Director

## County of Hawaii

### PLANNING DEPARTMENT

25 Aupuni Street, Room 109 • Hilo, Hawaii 96720-4252  
(808) 961-8288 • Fax (808) 961-9615

**CERTIFIED MAIL**  
P 008 113 051

May 23, 1996

Robert D. Triantos, Esq.  
P.O. Box 1720  
Kailua-Kona, Hawaii 96745-1720

Dear Mr. Triantos:

Variance Application WH(VAR 96-23)  
Variance No. 743  
Applicant: AMERICAN SAVINGS BANK  
Variance from Minimum Front Yard and Open Space Requirements  
of the Zoning Code, Chapter 25, Article 4, Section 25-124(a)(1)  
and Article 1, Division 10, Section 25-66(a)(1)  
Tax Map Key: 7-7-004:044

After reviewing your application and the information submitted, the Planning Director certifies the approval of your variance request to allow an existing two story single family dwelling with a 14.4 and 14.8 foot front yard and a 8.6 and 8.7 foot open space in lieu of the minimum 15 foot front yard and 10 foot open space as required by Chapter 25, Article 4, Section 25-124(a)(1) and Article 1, Division 10, Section 25-66(a)(1).

The subject property is located on the makai side of Alii Drive, in Kaunalumalu, North Kona, Hawaii, TMK: 7-7-004:004.

The Planning Director has concluded that the variance request from the minimum front and open space requirements should be approved based on the following findings:

#### SPECIAL AND UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES

1. The homeowners at that time, received all of the necessary Department of Public

05545

MAY 29 1996

Robert D. Triantos, Esq.  
Page 2  
May 23, 1996

Works, Building Division approvals for dwelling.

2. When the plans were approved by the Planning Department, the plans would have had to show that all minimum required setbacks were going to be adhered to for the proposed dwelling in 1984.
3. There appears to have been a construction staking error occurred in 1984 when the dwelling was constructed in the siting of the structure on the property. There also appears that a very minor siting error was done at the time of construction with the encroachments. No other evidence has been found to show otherwise.
4. It has been over 12 years since the construction of the existing dwelling which was approved by the County and the applicant is trying to resolve a situation which they had no control over and have honestly conducted a certified survey to ensure to disclosure of all facts concerning the dwelling.
5. The variance application was acknowledged as received by the Planning Department on April 10, 1996.
6. A survey map prepared by Wes Thomas Associates on August 25, 1995, shows the existing two story single family dwelling with 14.4 and 14.80 feet front yard. The subject dwelling encroaches into the front yard by 2 and 3/8 inch to 7 and 1/4 inch.
7. In addition the survey map indicates the existing two story single family dwelling with 8.60 and 8.70 feet open space. The subject dwelling encroaches into the open space by 1 foot 3 and 5/8 inch to 1 foot 4 and 7/8 inch.

Therefore, considering the foregoing facts, the Planning Director has determined that there are special or unusual circumstances applying to the subject property which exist either to a degree which deprives the owner or applicant of substantial property rights that would otherwise be available or to a degree which obviously interferes with the best use or manner of development of the subject property.

#### ALTERNATIVES

1. The applicant on their own volition are honestly trying to resolve this long standing problem which was not created by them. The investigation of this particular matter has

Robert D. Triantos, Esq.  
Page 3  
May 23, 1996

not shown any deliberate or intentional grounds in allowing the encroachments to occur.

2. Any architectural alterations or design changes to the dwelling to conform with the minimum setbacks would create undue and excessive hardships of the applicant when other more reasonable options are available.
3. While there are other alternatives available the more practical solution is the granting of the variance.

Based on the above cited considerations, there are no reasonable available solutions without excessive demands placed on the applicant when a more reasonable alternative is available by the granting of this variance application.

#### INTENT AND PURPOSE

The intent and purpose of requiring buildings setbacks within a subdivision is to assure that adequate air and light circulation is available between structures and property lines.

The existing two story single family dwelling with 14.4 and 14.80 feet front yard encroaches by 2 and 3/8 inch to 7 and 1/4 inch. In addition the existing two story single family dwelling encroaches into the open space by 1 foot 3 and 5/8 inch to 1 foot 4 and 7/8 inch.

These encroachments into the front yard and open space are minor and not visually perceptible that it will diminish the ability for adequate light, air and open space. Therefore, while the Zoning Code requires a minimum 15 feet front yard and 10 feet open space, in this particular case, the encroachments are minor that will not visually or physically impact or be adverse to any adjacent properties or development with the granting of this variance. The rest of the existing dwelling complies with the minimum yard requirements of the Zoning Code.

There were no objections from any of the participating government agencies or any surrounding property owners. There was one letter from the property to the south of the subject property who requested the applicant comply with the minimum 5 foot setback for the side yard roof overhang. However, the Zoning Code require an 8 foot side yard and 4 foot open space for roof overhangs for the subject dwelling. As such, the existing dwelling complies with the minimum side yard and open space requirements of the Zoning Code.

Robert D. Triantos, Esq.  
Page 4  
May 23, 1996

Based on the foregoing findings, this variance request would be consistent with the general purpose of the zoning district, the intent and purpose of the Zoning Code and Subdivision Codes and the County General Plan; will not be materially detrimental to the public's welfare; and will not cause substantial adverse impact to the areas character and to adjoining properties.

This variance request is approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant, its assigns or successors, shall be responsible for complying with all stated conditions of approval.
2. The approval of this variance shall be included in the conveyance document for the subject property and a copy of the recorded conveyance document shall be submitted to the Planning Department within a year from the effective date of approval of this variance.
3. Obtain approval from the Board of Appeals for all Housing and Building Code Violations, if applicable.
4. All other applicable State and County rules and regulations shall be complied with.

Should any of the foregoing conditions not be complied with, the Planning Director may proceed to declare this Variance Permit null and void.

Sincerely,

  
VIRGINIA GOLDSTEIN  
Planning Director

EMM:rld  
a:\77004044\american.app

xc: West Hawaii Office