

File

RECEIVED:
COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Date: JUN 24 1966

File No: *- 246-108*

June 21, 1966

Mr. A. C. Gouveia
P. O. Box 365
Beluslos, Hawaii 96725

Dear Mr. Gouveia:

The petition by A. C. and Emily F. Gouveia (A65-108), for an amendment to the Land Use District Boundaries from an Agricultural District to an Urban District for 3.8 acres of land at Leslos, North Kona, Hawaii, TMK 7-7-07: 18, was denied by the Land Use Commission at its meeting on June 17, 1966.

Prior to taking action on your petition, the enclosed memorandum was presented to the Commission.

Should you desire any further information, or have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE S. MORIGUCHI
Executive Officer

Encl.
cc: Chairman Thompson
Planning Commission, Hawaii

STATE OF HAWAII
LAND USE COMMISSION

June 17, 1966
Hilo, Hawaii

MEMORANDUM

TO: Land Use Commission

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: Bernice P. Bishop Estate (A65-103), Keeki-Napoopoo Area; Takeshi and Chizuko Kudo (A65-104), Kealakekua, Hawaii; Mauna Loa Development Corporation (A65-105); and A. C. and Emily F. Gouveia (A65-108)

1. Bernice P. Bishop Estate (A65-103)

During the public hearing held on March 25, 1966 on the matter of this petition, it was the recommendation of the Staff that the petition be denied since:

1. The need of the lands presently within the Conservation District for Urban classification has not been demonstrated by the petitioner.
2. The requested change will tend to create undue demands upon the general public for the benefit of a relatively few who would use the area for weekend and vacation houselots.
3. Water services are unavailable in the area at present.
4. The subject lands are not contiguous to an urban district.

The petitioner reported during the public hearing that:

1. Without increased taxes from such a project as proposed, there will be no income to the Government.
2. If this project is approved, the petitioners plan to request additional urban lands in the area.
3. The Island of Hawaii is so large that there is no need to restrict development.

In response to these additional comments made by the petitioner, the Staff would point out that although increased taxes from the subject project is cited, no mention is made of the increased expenditures that would be required to service the project by the County and State. The suggestion that the Island of Hawaii is so large that there is no need to restrict development cannot be accepted by the Staff as a valid argument. The fact that a State Land Use Law has been deemed necessary

for application to the Island of Hawaii and the rest of the State, is a firm indication in itself that developments must be properly planned and phased even on the Island of Hawaii where extensive lands are available.

It is of interest to note that the petitioner has suggested that "urban classified Napoopoo area, at present, has no noticeable activity toward use and development for urban purposes." Therefore, the petitioner has contended that there is no need for urban lands in the Napoopoo area.

Upon evaluation of the data presented to date on the matter of this petition, the Staff recommends disapproval of the petition.

2. Takeshi & Chizuko Kudo (A65-104)

A petition for amendment to the Land Use District boundaries involving approximately 2 1/2 acres of land at Kealakekua, Hawaii, from an agricultural classification to an urban classification, was heard on March 25, 1966, by this Commission. At that time, the Staff recommended that the petition for amendment be approved since:

1. Lands available for urban expansion in the area of the subject lands appears to be limited.
2. All community and utility services required to service urban lands are available in the area with the subject lands immediately adjacent and contiguous to the present Urban District boundary.
3. Agricultural operations in the adjoining areas would not be adversely affected by permitting the boundary change.

Any additional significant data relative to the petition have not been received to date and, therefore, the Staff recommends approval of the petition.

3. Mauna Loa Development Corporation (A65-105)

A change in district classification from Agricultural to Urban for approximately 252 acres of land at Keauhou, Hawaii was the subject of a petition heard on March 25, 1966. The Mauna Loa Development Corporation proposes a mountain resort type development to complement the golf course, dude ranch, and country club development. During the public hearing, the Staff reported that:

1. Justification for the change from Agricultural to Urban appears to be lacking.
2. Justification for a mountain resort type development appears to have been substantiated.

3. The petitioners be asked to consider a rural classification in lieu of the urban classification for their development with their plans to be revised accordingly.

Since that time, a revised development plan which reduces the number of lots from 420 to 356 has been submitted by the petitioners to comply with conditions for a rural district. However, they have indicated a preference for a change to Urban although they would accept a Rural classification.

On the basis of the data submitted to date, the Staff recommends that the 252 acre parcel be allowed for change from an Agricultural District to a Rural District.

4. A. C. & Emily F. Gouveia (A65-108)

A petition by Anthony and Emily Gouveia for boundary amendment from an Agricultural District to an Urban District involving 3.8 acres at Laaloa, North Kona, Hawaii was heard by this Commission on March 25, 1966. The primary reason advanced by the petitioner and the Hawaii County Planning Commission in support of the petition was that the use of the lands for agricultural purposes has not been economically successful since the lands are not suitable for extensive agricultural use. The Staff recommended denial of the petition due to (1) an apparent lack of any justification for the need of additional urban lands and (2) the proposed use would contribute toward scattered urban developments.

No additional data pertaining to the petition has been received since the public hearing and, therefore, the Staff again recommends denial of the petition.