

RECEIVED:  
COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
Date: NOV 25 1966  
File No. *100-100000*

*100-100000*

November 22, 1966

W. H. Shipman, Ltd.  
230 Kekuaona Street  
Hilo, Hawaii

Gentlemen:

A petition (A66-133) to amend the land use district boundaries at Keau, Puna, Hawaii, affecting your property, was approved by the Land Use Commission at its meeting on October 29, 1966, as follows:

Reclassified to an Urban District (from an Agricultural District)

Tax Map Keys - 1-6-42: 24 through 55 inclusive  
1-6-42: Portion of 56  
1-6-03: 59, 62, 69, portion of 11

Reclassified to an Agricultural District (from an Urban District)

Tax Map Keys - 1-6-03: Portions of 3, 12, 73  
1-6-03: 21  
1-7-17: Portion of 1

(See map attached)

Very truly yours,

GEORGE S. MORIGUCHI  
Executive Officer

Encl.  
cc: Chairman Thompson  
Hawaii Planning Commission  
Department of Taxation  
Dept. of Land & Natural Resources

Same letter sent to: American Factors, Ltd.  
Agent for Puna Sugar Co., Ltd.  
P. O. Box 3230  
Honolulu, Hawaii



STATE OF HAWAII  
LAND USE COMMISSION

State Highways Division, District Engineers  
Office, 50 Makaala Street, Hilo, Hawaii

9:45 A.M.  
August 5, 1966

STAFF REPORT

A66-133 - LAND USE COMMISSION (KEAAU)

Background

Upon its own motion, the State Land Use Commission has initiated boundary amendment processing for several areas in the Keaau District. Accordingly, property owners have been notified and a public hearing has been called to consider these changes.

Changes in district boundaries from Urban to Agricultural and from Agricultural to Urban are involved. The following tabulation indicates pertinent data relating to these areas: (Area numbers correspond with those shown on map.)

<u>Urban to Agricultural (Green)</u>	<u>Agricultural to Urban (Red)</u>
Area #1 - 11.5 acres	Area #6 - 11 acres
Area #2 - 16 acres	Area #7 - 20 acres
Area #3 - 8.2 acres	Area #8 - 12.5 acres
Area #4 - 28 acres	Area #9 - <u>11</u> acres
Area #5 - <u>5</u> acres	Total 54.5 acres
Total 68.7 acres	

Area #1 is a small isolated Urban District with approximately slightly more than half in use as a plantation camp and the remainder in cane. This area should more logically be classified Agricultural and the existing facilities permitted to remain as non-conforming uses to be phased out eventually. The homes in this area are substandard and have a relatively short span of future usability.

Area #2 is an isolated Urban District located in the middle of a cane field and is quite apparently erroneously districted.

Area #3 is located at the western fringe of the developed area of Keaau Town and planted in cane. The area is served by the Old Volcano Road and is proposed for light industrial facilities on the General Plan.

Area #4 is a strip of urban lands presently used for cane cultivation, generally, with a small portion in marginal unused land. It fronts on the Volcano Road opposite the Puna Dispensary in the outskirts of Kurtistown.

Area #5, presently planted in cane, is a small portion of an existing Urban District developed for urban purposes.

It is recommended that Areas 1, 2, 4, and 5, be reclassified from Urban to Agricultural on the basis that they tend to contribute to scattered urban developments. However, it is recommended that Area #3, which is at the outskirts of Keaau Town, be maintained as an Urban District in spite of its present use for agricultural purposes. This is based on the General Plan which provides for light industrial uses in the area eventually.

Area #6 is a parcel owned by the County and slated for use as an expansion area to the Keaau School. This area is unused at present.

Area #7 is a strip urban area created by the construction of the new highway and the Old Volcano Road. The area is presently intensively used for urban purposes.

Area #8 has been developed recently as a residential subdivision and most of it has been built upon. It borders on an existing Urban District.

Area #9 is known as the 9 1/2-mile Camp and consists of substandard homes.

It is recommended that Areas 6, 7, and 8 be reclassified from an Agricultural District to an Urban District based on their proposed and present use

for urban purposes. Area #9 is not recommended for change to Urban in that it is an isolated urban area intended for eventual discontinuance for urban purposes.

These recommendations, in summary, would change 60.5 acres from Urban to Agricultural and 43.5 acres from Agricultural to Urban.