


Stephen K. Yamashiro
Mayor



Virginia Goldstein
Director

Russell Kokubun
Deputy Director

County of Hawaii

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

25 Aupuni Street, Room 109 • Hilo, Hawaii 96720-4252
(808) 961-8288 • Fax (808) 961-8742

CERTIFIED MAIL

P 417 370 143

September 25, 1998

Mr. Klaus D. Conventz
P.O. Box 2308
Kailua-Kona, HI 96745-2308

Dear Mr. Conventz:

Variance Application WH(VAR 98-048)
Variance No. 954
Applicant: KLAUS D. CONVENTZ
Owner: BARBARA KAY TRUST
Request: Variance From Minimum Side Yard Requirements
Tax Map Key: 7-3-047: 087

After reviewing your application and the additional information submitted, the Planning Director certifies the approval of your variance request to allow an existing accessory structure with a 18.1 feet side yard in lieu of the minimum 20 feet side yard, as required by Ordinance 96-160, Chapter 25, Article 5, Division 7, Section 25-5-76(a) and Ordinance 97-88.

The subject property is located at Lot 5, Kona Heavens, Unit III, Being a Portion of R.P. 8214, L.C. Aw. 7715, Ap. 11 to Lota Kamehameha, at Kaloko, North Kona, Hawaii, Tax Map Key: 7-3-047: 087.

SPECIAL AND UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES

1. The subject property consists of 44,933 square feet of land area.
2. The subject single family dwelling was issued the following building permits:
 - a. Building Permit No. 885816 opened on September 2, 1988 and closed on March 15, 1989 for the construction of a dwelling.

C9411

OCT 05 1998

- b. Building Permit No. 885826 opened on September 7, 1988 and closed on January 19, 1989 for swimming pool.
3. A survey map prepared by Wes Thomas Associates on July 6, 1998, shows the existing accessory structure with a 18.1 feet side yard in lieu of the minimum 20 feet side yard. As such the existing accessory structure encroaches 1 foot 10-7/8 inches into the required 20 feet side yard.
4. When the building permit was approved, the owner received all of the necessary Department of Public Works, Building Division approvals for the existing accessory structure.
5. When approved by the Planning Department, the plans would have had to have shown that all minimum required setbacks were going to be adhered to for the existing accessory in 1988.
6. There appears to have been a construction staking error in the siting of the structure on the property. This occurred in 1988 when the existing accessory structure was constructed. There also appears to have been a very minor siting error made at the time of construction with the encroachment. No other evidence has been found to show otherwise.
7. It has been over 10 years since the construction of the existing accessory structure 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 the disclosure of all facts concerning the existing accessory structure.
8. The variance application was filed with the Planning Department on July 29, 1998.

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 owners 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

Mr. Conventz
Page 3
September 21, 1998

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

2. Any architectural alterations or design changes to the dwelling and detached carport to conform with the minimum setbacks would create undue and excessive hardships for the applicant when other more reasonable options are available.

Based on the above cited considerations, there are no reasonable solutions available without excessive demands being placed on the owners 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 accessory structure encroaches 1 foot 10-7/8 inches into the required 20 feet side yard.

This encroachment into the side yard will not diminish the ability for adequate light and air to circulate and will still provide adequate open space. Therefore, while the Zoning Code requires a minimum 20 feet side yard, in this particular case, the encroachment 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 was one objection from a surrounding property owner who was concerned about reduced distances to his southerly boundary line, future grading, slopes, and drainage.

Based on the foregoing findings, this variance request would be consistent with the general purpose of the zoning district and the intents and purposes of the Zoning Code, Subdivision Code and the County General Plan. Furthermore, this variance 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 owner, 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

Mr. Conventz
Page 4
September 21, 1998


submitted to the Planning Department within a year from the effective date of approval of this variance.

3. If applicable, approval from the Board of Appeals for all Building Code Violations will be obtained.
4. All encroachments within the County right-of-way shall be removed.
5. 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.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact Royden Yamasato of this department.

Sincerely,


VIRGINIA GOLDSTEIN
Planning Director

EMM: rld
a:\73047087\vkay.app

xc: West Hawaii Office