

40 8 19 11 12 13

FILED
COUNTY OF HAWAII
JAN 20 1961

TO TASKS
1. TASK 1
2. TASK 2
3. TASK 3
4. TASK 4
5. TASK 5
6. TASK 6
7. TASK 7
8. TASK 8
9. TASK 9
10. TASK 10
11. TASK 11
12. TASK 12
13. TASK 13
14. TASK 14
15. TASK 15
16. TASK 16
17. TASK 17
18. TASK 18
19. TASK 19
20. TASK 20
21. TASK 21
22. TASK 22
23. TASK 23
24. TASK 24
25. TASK 25
26. TASK 26
27. TASK 27
28. TASK 28
29. TASK 29
30. TASK 30
31. TASK 31
32. TASK 32
33. TASK 33
34. TASK 34
35. TASK 35
36. TASK 36
37. TASK 37
38. TASK 38
39. TASK 39
40. TASK 40
41. TASK 41
42. TASK 42
43. TASK 43
44. TASK 44
45. TASK 45
46. TASK 46
47. TASK 47
48. TASK 48
49. TASK 49
50. TASK 50
51. TASK 51
52. TASK 52
53. TASK 53
54. TASK 54
55. TASK 55
56. TASK 56
57. TASK 57
58. TASK 58
59. TASK 59
60. TASK 60
61. TASK 61
62. TASK 62
63. TASK 63
64. TASK 64
65. TASK 65
66. TASK 66
67. TASK 67
68. TASK 68
69. TASK 69
70. TASK 70
71. TASK 71
72. TASK 72
73. TASK 73
74. TASK 74
75. TASK 75
76. TASK 76
77. TASK 77
78. TASK 78
79. TASK 79
80. TASK 80
81. TASK 81
82. TASK 82
83. TASK 83
84. TASK 84
85. TASK 85
86. TASK 86
87. TASK 87
88. TASK 88
89. TASK 89
90. TASK 90
91. TASK 91
92. TASK 92
93. TASK 93
94. TASK 94
95. TASK 95
96. TASK 96
97. TASK 97
98. TASK 98
99. TASK 99
100. TASK 100

1. ☐ REVIEW & COMMENT
 2. ☐ APPROPRIATE ACTION
 3. ☐ INVESTIGATE A REGION
 4. ☐ RECOMMENDATION
 5. ☐ YOURS
 6. ☐ REPLY
 7. ☐ STATE
 8. ☐ REPLY
 9. ☐ STATE
 10. ☐ REPLY
 11. ☐ STATE
 12. ☐ REPLY
 13. ☐ STATE
 14. ☐ REPLY
 15. ☐ STATE
 16. ☐ REPLY
 17. ☐ STATE
 18. ☐ REPLY
 19. ☐ STATE
 20. ☐ REPLY
 21. ☐ STATE
 22. ☐ REPLY
 23. ☐ STATE
 24. ☐ REPLY
 25. ☐ STATE
 26. ☐ REPLY
 27. ☐ STATE
 28. ☐ REPLY
 29. ☐ STATE
 30. ☐ REPLY
 31. ☐ STATE
 32. ☐ REPLY
 33. ☐ STATE
 34. ☐ REPLY
 35. ☐ STATE
 36. ☐ REPLY
 37. ☐ STATE
 38. ☐ REPLY
 39. ☐ STATE
 40. ☐ REPLY
 41. ☐ STATE
 42. ☐ REPLY
 43. ☐ STATE
 44. ☐ REPLY
 45. ☐ STATE
 46. ☐ REPLY
 47. ☐ STATE
 48. ☐ REPLY
 49. ☐ STATE
 50. ☐ REPLY
 51. ☐ STATE
 52. ☐ REPLY
 53. ☐ STATE
 54. ☐ REPLY
 55. ☐ STATE
 56. ☐ REPLY
 57. ☐ STATE
 58. ☐ REPLY
 59. ☐ STATE
 60. ☐ REPLY
 61. ☐ STATE
 62. ☐ REPLY
 63. ☐ STATE
 64. ☐ REPLY
 65. ☐ STATE
 66. ☐ REPLY
 67. ☐ STATE
 68. ☐ REPLY
 69. ☐ STATE
 70. ☐ REPLY
 71. ☐ STATE
 72. ☐ REPLY
 73. ☐ STATE
 74. ☐ REPLY
 75. ☐ STATE
 76. ☐ REPLY
 77. ☐ STATE
 78. ☐ REPLY
 79. ☐ STATE
 80. ☐ REPLY
 81. ☐ STATE
 82. ☐ REPLY
 83. ☐ STATE
 84. ☐ REPLY
 85. ☐ STATE
 86. ☐ REPLY
 87. ☐ STATE
 88. ☐ REPLY
 89. ☐ STATE
 90. ☐ REPLY
 91. ☐ STATE
 92. ☐ REPLY
 93. ☐ STATE
 94. ☐ REPLY
 95. ☐ STATE
 96. ☐ REPLY
 97. ☐ STATE
 98. ☐ REPLY
 99. ☐ STATE
 100. ☐ REPLY

REVIEW & COMMENT

10-11-68

[illegible]

TATSUO FUJIMOTO
Executive Officer

STATE OF HAWAII
LAND USE COMMISSION

MEMORANDUM

January 19, 1973
1:30 p.m.

TO: Land Use Commission

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: A72-343 - B. P. BISHOP ESTATE

A public hearing was held on November 30, 1972 on a request by the Bishop Estate and the Kamehameha Development Corporation, to amend the district boundaries for approximately 15.4 acres of land at Puaa, North Kona, Hawaii, from an Agricultural to an Urban designation. The Urban designation would permit the petitioner to utilize the subject property for the development of rental apartment units aimed at the moderate income rental needs generated by resort-hotel developments. The proposal includes 309 one, two and three bedroom apartment units, consisting of 20 buildings, each 3 stories high, parking for 419 cars, and a recreation center. The subject property is zoned for agricultural (Ag-1a) uses and is designated for "medium density urban development" by the County General Plan land use pattern allocation guide map.

The Hawaii County Planning Commission recommended approval of this petition based on the findings that the subject area is contiguous to existing urban areas, meets urban district standards, and would minimize the consumption of other agricultural lands having high capacity for cultivation.

Additional data dated December 11, 1972 was received from the petitioner which is summarized below:

1. Existing hotels as well as anticipated resort projects will generate a need for moderate cost rental accommodations on the part of hotel employees as follows:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Start Date</u>	<u>No. of Employees</u>
Kona Lagoon	Early 1974	250
Keauhou Bay Club and Shops	1975	60
Kona Colony Club (Heeia)	1975	<u>40</u>
		350

Increasing occupancy at existing hotels will require an

additional 175-200 new employees. These needs will be increased by 50% if 1 out of 2 have dependents.

2. Letters from W. D. Child, Jr. of Interisland Resorts and Kanae Kobayashi of Hawaiian Pacific Resorts indicate that additional hotel employees will be hired to staff the new hotels and existing ones as noted above.
3. Development of the Bishop Estate lands at Kahaluu and Keauhou has been constrained because of pending litigation; thus, planning for housing on these areas are precluded. The subject site is the most ideal for the proposed use.

ANALYSIS

An evaluation of the petitioner's submittal of December 11, 1972 finds that the "need" for the proposed facilities is not as urgent as he indicates. For example, the petitioner has indicated that 250 new employees will be hired to staff the new Kona Lagoon Hotel which is expected to begin operations in early 1974. However, Mr. Kobayashi's letter of December 6, 1972 reveals that initially, only 150 full and part-time employees will be hired. Only after occupancy rates have been stabilized will employment at Kona Lagoon Hotel be at the 250-person level. Further, it is noted that the other projects listed by the petitioner will initiate operations in 1975 if proposed development schedules are met. Within the 2 year intervening period, it is expected that on-going and imminent developments on lands now districted Urban will adequately accommodate the needs referred to by the petitioner. Further, the court litigation referred to by the petitioner as deterring employee housing on his considerable holdings at Keauhou and Kahaluu which are already in the Urban District may well be resolved within the 2-year period, thus allowing the siting of employee housing at a more appropriate location from the standpoint of convenience and travel time on the part of the employees, since the employment centers referred to by petitioner are located over 5 miles away. With regard to this point, there has been no evidence submitted to show whether all or just part of the Bishop Estate lands at Keauhou are affected by the litigation and in what manner the litigation would prevent planning or even construction of the proposed use at the Keauhou site.

In a summary of vacant land acreage by County zoning classification and land ownership as of December, 1971, by districts and tax key sections, prepared by the County of Hawaii Planning

Department, in their Land Use Report, Volume II, 1971, it was estimated that there were 570 vacant acres of single-family residential land and 249 vacant acres of multi-family residential land in the North Kona District, as of December 31, 1971. Specifically, there were 86 vacant acres of single-family residential land and 90 vacant acres of multi-family residential land in Tax Key Section 5, within which the subject property is located.

As stated previously in the staff report, in December of 1970, the Land Use Commission reclassified 7 acres of land, immediately makai of the subject property, from an Agricultural to an Urban designation for the development of approximately 128 apartment units. This property is presently vacant.

Based on the above, it is staff's findings that:

1. Adequate Urban lands exist in the area to accommodate foreseeable urban needs.
2. The petitioner has not substantiated the need for re-classifying the subject property for the proposed use, particularly since the principal employment generating centers identified by the petitioner are located 5 miles away.

Therefore, based upon the above analysis and findings, it is recommended that the request be disapproved at this time. It is also suggested that the entire Kona area, including the parcel now under consideration and the undeveloped lands now in the Urban District, be reassessed during the forthcoming boundary review for redistricting to more appropriate classifications.