STATE OF HAWAII
LAND USE COMMISSION

August 5, 1966
Hilo, Hawaii

MEMORANDUM

TO: Land Use Commission

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: A66-109 - MAUNA KEA SUGAR CO., INC.; A66-110 - ESTATE OF SOPHIE JUDD COOKE (DEC'D); A66-112 - FRANK & BESSIE MONIZ; A66-113 - MAUI COUNTY (IAO); A66-115 - HAWAII COUNTY (LALAMILO); A66-117 - HAWAII COUNTY (HILO); A66-120 - EDWIN & ELSIE IGE

A66-109 - MAUNA KEA SUGAR CO., INC.

A public hearing was held on May 6, 1966, on the matter of this petition, which requested the change in district designation for three separate parcels of land from an Agricultural District to an Urban District. The three parcels involve two acres of cane land, 5.4 acres of cane land and grazing lands, and a 36-acre parcel of wooded lands in the upper Hilo area.

On July 8, 1966, the Land Use Commission voted to approve the requested change from Agricultural to Urban for the two-acre parcel and the 5.4-acre parcel and to defer final action on the requested change for the 36-acre parcel of wooded lands. Deferral on the matter of the 36-acre parcel was based on a proposed field trip to inspect the site during the August 5 meeting of the Commission in Hilo. The petitioners have formally indicated that they would not have any objection on the deferral.

During the meeting of July 8, 1966, the staff maintained its original recommendation for denial of the reclassification involving the 36-acre parcel since:

1. The parcel contains the last vestige of handsome wooded lands in the mauka Hilo area.

2. Denuding these lands of the dense growth of trees can and will probably contribute to flood problems in the area which is presently developed for residential purposes.

3. Additional data submitted by the petitioners during the public hearing were not of such significance to warrant a change in the staff's original recommendation for denial.

Having made the field trip to inspect the 36-acre parcel under consideration, the matter of a final decision is now before this Commission.

denied

A66-110 - ESTATE OF SOPHIE JUDD COOKE (DEC'D)

The public hearing on the matter of this petition involving the reclassification of approximately 4.9 acres from an Agricultural District to an Urban District was heard by the Commission on June 17, 1966. At that time, the staff recommended that the petition be disapproved.

Since that time, attorneys for the petitioners have submitted a new petition requesting a reclassification of the same lands from an Agricultural classification to a Rural classification. They also propose to withdraw the original petition. Accordingly, the Commission is now faced with the following alternatives:

1. Process the original petition on the basis of the public hearing held on June 17, 1966.

2. Accept the petitioners' request to withdraw the original petition and process the new petition by scheduling another public hearing for the reclassification from Agricultural to Rural.

Should it be the Commission's decision to process the original petition, it would then be the staff's recommendation that the petition be denied on the basis of the analysis of the staff report of June 17, 1966.

A66-112 - FRANK & BESSIE MONIZ

Reclassification of approximately 6.9 acres of land located at Kaonoulu, Kula, Maui, from Agricultural to Rural was the subject of a hearing held on June 17, 1966. It was recommended by the staff at that time that the petition submitted by Frank & Bessie Moniz be denied since:

1. Data submitted by the petitioners consisted primarily of statements indicating the potential uses other than agricultural for the subject lands which do not substantiate the need for additional rural lands.

2. A change of the configuration of lands due to the construction of a new highway is not a change in trends of development.

3. The U. S. Census reports a 20 per cent decline in the population of the Waiakoa area during the period from 1950 to 1960 and this decreasing trend is also predicted for the period from 1960 to the present.

4. Examination of development trends within the existing Rural Districts in the area does not support the petitioners' suggestion of need for additional rural lands.

5. The petitioners have not considered the condition that only approximately 100 acres of the total 400-acre Rural District in the Kealahou to Kaonoulu area have actually developed to date as rural lands.

6. The 915-acre Rural District situated at Pulehu contains extensive acreage of approximately 645 acres that have not been developed to date as rural lands.

During the public hearing, a representative of the petitioners submitted that the U. S. Census report, which indicated a decline in population for the Waiakoa area, was a fallacy as evidenced by the tremendous upsurge of construction taking place in the Kula area. The petitioners' representative also stated that:

1. There were many reasons why approximately 400 acres presently classified in the Rural District were not fully developed. These were land ownership, cost of developing these properties, and topography and inadequate water supply.

2. Lands approved for development under special permit involving 14 acres for residential purposes had not been carried out since the owner had gone into a financial bind.

3. It would be unjust to allow lands to lie idle merely on the premise that there were other ample lands provided for expansion.

4. The rate of sales at Pukalani Terrace, a Rural District, has been very high.

Statements made by the petitioners at the public hearing rationalizing on matters of extensive vacant rural lands and the apparent lack of success of several developments in the rural lands, do not contribute to justification of the need for the proposed boundary change from Agricultural to Rural. Moreover, there would be questions on the validity of these rationalizations.

Statements by the petitioners purporting that the U. S. Census figures of declining population are incorrect needs no further comment. However, statements relating to a tremendous upsurge of construction in the Kula area have been merely statements without substantiation. Field investigations throughout the area have not turned up any evidence of an upsurge in construction. Also, contrary to the petitioners' statements, a count of building permits issued for construction in the Kula area does not indicate a significant upsurge in construction. During the period from 1960 to 1965, only an average of less than 16 building permits per year have been issued for construction in this area. This can hardly be construed to reflect an upsurge in construction in an area containing more than 1,000 acres of Rural District lands that are undeveloped.

It is recommended that this Commission take action to disapprove the petition based on the staff's presentation at the public hearing and the discussion submitted above.

denied

A66-113 - MAUI COUNTY (IAO)

A petition submitted by the County of Maui via the County Attorney and the County Engineer for the reclassification of approximately 15,300 square feet of lands from the Conservation District to the Rural District was heard by this Commission on June 17, 1966. The subject lands are located at the northeastern boundary of the Kepaniwai Park located in Iao Valley, Maui.

It was the staff's recommendation that the petition be denied since the need for additional rural lands in the area had not been substantiated. This recommendation was based upon evaluation of the petitioner's submittal that the reclassification is sought to effectuate a land exchange between the County and an adjoining property owner, Mrs. Adelaide Duarte. Moreover, Mr. John Duarte (the owner's spouse) had submitted that in the event that the reclassification is approved and the land exchange is effectuated, he would merely append the subject lands to his parcel. A mere appendage of the subject lands to Mr. Duarte's property, in essence, does not require a change in district classification since this can be done even with its present Conservation classification.

It is also noted that the County's proposal to relocate the existing caretaker's home to another site can be accomplished instead by using the subject lands although an expression to the contrary was made by the County. Mr. Duarte also indicated that he owned the present right-of-way to the County lot area and, therefore, his approval to move the caretaker's quarters to the County lands must be sought. However, the County Engineer's map clearly indicates that quite the opposite is the situation with Mr. Duarte presently gaining access to his lands through the County park lands and, therefore, should obtain County permission to use the access road.

In addition to the lack of substantiation for the need of additional rural lands, it is the opinion of the staff that the several inconsistencies involving the proposed land use of the subject lands, which have not been satisfactorily clarified, behoove the staff to maintain its original recommendation for denial.

A66-115 - HAWAII COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION (LALAMILO LANDS, S. KOHALA)

This petition to change the district classification for approximately 12.1 acres of agricultural lands into urban lands at Lalamilo, South Kohala, Hawaii, was heard on June 17, 1966. It was the staff's recommendation that the petition be approved since the subject parcels were actually subdivided and sold over a period of five years from 1954 to 1958 before adoption of the State Land Use District Regulations. It was also noted that this established urban use is immediately adjacent to lands classified urban.

During the public hearing, no additional significant presentations were received and, therefore, the staff recommends approval of the petition.

approved

A66-117 - HAWAII COUNTY (HILO)

A Hawaii County petition for the reclassification of approximately 3.25 acres of land from Agricultural to Urban was heard on June 17, 1966. It was the staff's recommendation that the petition be approved since these lands were first subdivided in 1951 and again in 1953 into lot sizes primarily suited and developed for urban purposes. Since that time, the County Planning Commission has obtained signatures of four of the five land owners involved indicating their concurrence with the proposed boundary change.

No other significant data were received at the public hearing and to date and, therefore, it is recommended that the petition be approved.

Approved

A66-120 - EDWIN & ELSIE IGE

Mr. and Mrs. Edwin T. Ige's petition requesting reclassification of approximately 58 acres of agricultural lands to a Rural classification was heard by the Land Use Commission on June 17, 1966. These lands are located approximately 1/2 mile mauka of the Waiakoa Urban District along the Lower Kula Highway.

A recommendation of disapproval of the petition was made by the staff since the petitioners had not provided any evidence to support their statement that there is a definite demand for rural lots in the Waiakoa area. No further evidence was submitted by the petitioners during the public hearing.

The staff recommendation for denial was also based upon its findings indicating that population growth in the Waiakoa area showed a 20 per cent decline during the decade from 1950 to 1960. Data was also presented relating to extensive vacancies and use of rural lands for agricultural purposes within a mile of the subject lands and, also, throughout the entire Kula area.

Further investigation into the matter of development trends in the Kula area has been made by the staff and it has been found that the Keokea area has declined in population over the past years from 1940 to 1960 as with the Waiakoa area. Another item of considerable significance is the building permit count for the Kula area which indicated that less than 16 building permits per year on an average were issued. This data evaluated in light of the more than 1,000 acres of undeveloped Rural District lands in the Kula area establishes, without any doubt, that there has been no construction boom in the Kula area.

It is recommended that the Commission take action on the basis of the staff's original recommendation for denial.

Approved