

# County of Hawai'i PLANNING COMMISSION

101 Pauahi Street, Suite 3 • Hilo, Hawai'i 96720-3043 (808) 961-8288 • Fax (808) 961-8742

November 15, 2004

Mr. Sidney Fuke 100 Pauahi Street, Suite 212 Hilo, HI 96720

Dear Mr. Fuke:

Special Permit (SPP 827)

Request: Time Extension to Condition No. 2

Use Permit (USE 106)

Request: Amendments to Conditions 3, 6, 7 and 9 Applicant: Ainaloa Development Corporation

Tax Map Key: 1-6-4:21 & 57

The Planning Commission at its duly held public hearing on October 22, 2004, voted to accept the attached Planning Department's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law & Recommendation.

Specifically, the Planning Commission voted to approve Ainaloa Development Corporation's request for a 5-year time extension to Condition No. 2 (time to secure final plan approval) of Special Permit No. 827, which allowed an expanded golf clubhouse, recreational facilities, and related improvements on 7+ acres of land situated within the State Land Use Agricultural District.

The Planning Commission also took the following action to Ainaloa Development Corporation's request to amend or delete certain conditions of Use Permit No. 106, which allowed the development of an 18-hole golf course and related improvements on 200 acres of land zoned Agricultural 1-acre (A-1a):

Condition No. 3: Approved a 5-year time extension to secure final plan approval for

the proposed golf course and related improvements.

Condition No. 6: Approved request to delete condition, which required construction

of the Keaau-Pahoa Road/Ainaloa Boulevard intersection.

Condition No. 7: Retained current language of condition to improve Ainaloa

Boulevard.

Mr. Sidney Fuke Page 2

Condition No. 9:

Retained current language of condition, with the exception of Condition No. 9(D). The requirement to donate funds for/or a water tanker and an asphalt paver to the Ainaloa Community

Association was deleted.

The property is located along Ainaloa Boulevard at the extreme northwestern (mauka) end of Ainaloa Subdivision, approximately 3.7 miles from Highway 130, Keaau, Puna, Hawaii.

This approval does not, however, sanction the specific plans submitted with the request as they may be subject to change given specific code and regulatory requirements of the affected agencies.

Should you have any questions, please contact Norman Hayashi of the Planning Department at 961-8288.

Sincerel

Fred Galdones, Chairman Planning Commission

LainaloafinalPC Attachment

cc/att: Department of Public Works

Department of Water Supply County Real Property Tax Division

State Land Use Commission

Rodney Haraga, Director/DOT-Highways, Honolulu

Ainaloa Development Corporation

Sandra Pechter Song, Esq.

Colin Love, Esq. Mr. Ole Fulks Ivan Torigoe, Esq.

Bobby Jean Leithead-Todd, Esq.

# SANDRA PECHTER SONG

ATTORNEY AT LAW

101 Aupuni Street, Suite 1.24
Hilo, Hawaii 96720 | DEC 17 PM 4 12
Telephone: (808) 933-9212
Fax: (808) 935-3945 | AMM AND THE ATMENT

### LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

| To:                             | Planning Commission<br>County of Hawaii<br>101 Pauahi Street, Suite 3<br>Hilo, Hawaii 96720   | Ole Fulks<br>HC-1, Box 5<br>Keaau, Hawa          |   |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
|                                 | Christopher Yuen Planning Director. County of Hawaii 101 Pauahi Street, Suite 3 Hilo, Hawaii 96720  | Office of the                                    | , Esq.<br>Leithead-Todd<br>Corporation Counsel<br>Street, Suite 325 |
| Date:                           | December 13, 2004   | From:  | Sandra P. Song  |
| Re:                             | Ainaloa Development Corporation v. Co<br>04-1-0421  | ounty of Hawaii Plann.                           | ing Commission, et al., Civil No.                                   |
| We are                          | e sending you (X) attached () under   | separate cover the fo                            | llowing items:  |
| •                               | File stamped copy of Notice of Appe<br>"A"; Designation of Record on Appe<br>Record; Certificate of Service   | al to Circuit Court; S<br>al; Order for Certific | tatement of the Case; Exhibit ation and Transmission of             |
| [ ] For [ ] For for [ ] For [ ] | r your information/file r review and comment r your reference r signature in black ink and brwarding as noted below r filing or recording E REMARKS BELOW | [ ] Per your                                     | ture in black ink and return<br>request<br>onversation<br>approval  |
| REMA                            | RKS.  |  |   |

00292

463421

FILED

SANDRA PECHTER SONG 1552 101 Aupuni Street, Suite 124 Hilo, Hawaii 96720 Tel. No. (808) 933-9212 Fax No. (808) 935-3945

2004 DEC 13 PM 3: 27

Attorney for Appellant Ainaloa Development Corporation C. OKAWA. CLERK THIRD CIRCUIT COURT STATE OF HAWAII

### IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE THIRD CIRCUIT

#### STATE OF HAWAII

| AINALOA DEVELOPMENT                      | ) |                                   |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| CORPORATION,                             | ) | CIVIL NO. 04-1 -0421              |
|  | ) | (Agency Appeal)                   |
| Appellant,                               | ) |                                   |
| <del>-</del>                             | ) | NOTICE OF APPEAL TO CIRCUIT       |
| VS.                                      | ) | COURT; STATEMENT OF THE CASE;     |
|  | ) | EXHIBIT "A"; DESIGNATION OF       |
| COUNTY OF HAWAII PLANNING                | ) | RECORD ON APPEAL; ORDER FOR       |
| COMMISSION; CHRISTOPHER YUEN,            | ) | CERTIFICATION AND TRANSMISSION    |
| Planning Director, County of Hawaii; and | ) | OF RECORD; CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE |
| OLE FULKS,                               | ) |                                   |
|  | ) |                                   |
| Appellees.                               | ) |                                   |
|  | ) |                                   |
|  |   |                                   |

### NOTICE OF APPEAL TO CIRCUIT COURT

Notice is hereby given that Appellant Ainaloa Development Corporation, hereby appeals to the Circuit Court of the Third Circuit from the decision rendered by the Hawaii County Planning Commission on November 15, 2004 regarding Use Permit No. USE 106. A copy of the decision is attached hereto as Exhibit "A".

This appeal is brought pursuant to Hawaii Revised Statutes Section 91-14 and Rule 72 of the Hawaii Rules of Civil Procedure.

DATED: Hilo, Hawaii, December

SANDRA PECHTER SONG

Attorney for Appellant

Ainaloa Development Corporation

00293

I hereby certify that this is a full, true and correct copy of the original on file in this office.

Ciers, third Circuit Court, State of Hawall

#### STATE OF HAWAII

| AINALOA DEVELOPMENT  | )            |                       |
|--|--------------|-----------------------|
| CORPORATION,   | )            | CIVIL NO              |
| Appellant,   | )            | (Agency Appeal)       |
| vs.  | )            | STATEMENT OF THE CASE |
| COUNTY OF HAWAII PLANNING<br>COMMISSION; CHRISTOPHER YUEN,<br>Planning Director, County of Hawaii; and<br>OLE FULKS, | ) ) )        |                       |
| Appellees.   | )<br>)<br>_) |                       |

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant Ainaloa Development Corporation (hereinafter "Ainaloa"), by and through its above-named attorney, for a Statement of the Case, alleges and avers as follows:

- 1. Ainaloa is a Hawaii corporation, with its principal place of business in Honolulu, Hawaii, and is the owner of a 200 acre parcel of land situated at Keaau, District of Puna, County and State of Hawaii, and designated by State of Hawaii Tax Map Key Nos: (3) 1-6-004-021 and 057, (hereinafter "Ainaloa's Land").
- 2. Appellee County of Hawaii Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission"), is an agency of the County of Hawaii, that is responsible for issuing certain land use permits, including special permits and use permits, and is the agency that issued the decision involved in the subject appeal.
- 3. Appellee Christopher Yuen (hereinafter "Yuen") is the Planning Director of the County of Hawaii, and is joined as party herein in that he was a party to the Commission proceeding being appealed.
- 4. Appellee Ole Fulks (hereinafter "Fulks") is a resident of Puna, County and State of Hawaii, and is joined as a party herein in that he was a party to the Commission proceeding being appealed.

15

- 5. This appeal involves a decision rendered by the Commission on November 15, 2004, regarding amendments requested by Ainaloa to Use Permit No. USE 106 (hereinafter, "Use Permit No. 106") previously issued on November 4, 1992 for the development of an 18-hole golf course, golf clubhouse and related improvements on Ainaloa's Land. A copy of the decision is attached hereto as Exhibit "A."
- 6. Ainaloa's Land is zoned Agriculture, with a minimum lot size of one-acre. A golf course is a permitted land use on Ainaloa's Land; however, under Section 25-2-60 of the Hawaii County Zoning Code (hereinafter "Zoning Code"), the Commission must issue a use permit prior to this type of use being established.
- 7. Section 25-2-60 provides that a use permit is a permit for certain types of permitted uses which require special attention to insure that the uses will not unduly burden public agencies to provide public services or cause substantial adverse impacts upon the surrounding community.
- 8. Section 25-2-64(b) of the Zoning Code authorizes the Commission to impose conditions when it issues a use permit only if the conditions bear a reasonable relationship to the use permit granted.
- 9. In September, 2003, Ainaloa filed an application with the Commission to amend four conditions in Use Permit No. 106:
- (a) Amendment to Condition No. 3 to allow a five-year time extension to obtain final plan approval from the County Planning Department for the golf course improvements;
- (b) Deletion of Condition No. 6, which required Ainaloa to channelize the Keaau-Pahoa Road/Ainaloa Boulevard intersection;
- (c) Amendment of Condition No. 7 which would permit Ainaloa to contribute \$1,000,000 to the County of Hawaii for improvements to Ainaloa Boulevard, in lieu of improving the entire 3.1 mile length of Ainaloa Boulevard, at a cost of approximately \$6,000,000; and
- (d) Amendment to Condition No. 9, to delete the requirement of purchasing an asphalt paver and water tanker, and constructing bus shelters for the Ainaloa Community Association.
  - 10. Although the Commission granted Ainaloa's time extension request, amending

. .

Condition No. 3, and deleted the road channelization requirement of Condition No. 6 because the State of Hawaii had already made such improvement, the Commission failed to amend Condition Nos. 7 and 9.

- 11. None of the other 3,500 lots in the Ainaloa Subdivision, which have access onto Ainaloa Boulevard, are being required by the County of Hawaii to pay for any roadway improvements to Ainaloa Boulevard, as a condition of land use development.
- 12. The establishment of a golf course on Ainaloa's land would result in a substantially lower impact upon the use of Ainaloa Boulevard than would the subdivision of the same land into individual lots, and the improvement of the entire length of Ainaloa Boulevard would not be required as a condition of the subdivision of Ainaloa's land into individual lots.
- 13. The use of Ainaloa Land for a golf course does not unduly burden public agencies to provide services, including roadways for the golf course; nor does cause a substantial adverse impact to either Ainaloa Boulevard or the adjoining Ainaloa Subdivision.
- 14. The Commission's action in maintaining the roadway improvements and equipment purchase requirements of Condition Nos. 7 and 9 imposes unconscionable exactions upon Ainaloa for the development of its golf course.

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

#### (Due Process)

- 15. Paragraphs 1 through 14 are incorporated by reference herein as if fully set forth.
- 16. There is not a reasonable connection between the golf course proposed and the exactions required of Ainaloa under Condition Nos. 7 and 9 of Use Permit No. 106; nor, is there a rational nexus between the conditions imposed and the impacts of the golf course development.
- 17. As such, the Commission's action deprives Ainaloa of its Property without due process of law guaranteed by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 5 of the Hawaii State Constitution.

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

### (Statutory Violation)

- 18. Paragraphs 1 through 17 are incorporated by reference herein as if fully set forth.
- 19. The exactions imposed by the Commission under Condition Nos. 7 and 9 of Use

.

Permit No. 106 do not bear a reasonable relationship to the golf course development, as required by the County Code.

20. The Commission violated the County Code by maintaining Condition Nos. 7 and 9 of Use Permit No. 106.

### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

### (Exceeding Statutory Authority)

- 21. Paragraphs 1 through 20 are incorporated by reference herein as if fully set forth.
- 22. The Commission exceeded its statutory authority by maintaining conditions in Use Permit No. 106 which did not have a reasonable relationship to the golf course development authorized under this permit.

#### FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

### (Erroneous Decision)

- 23. Paragraphs 1 through 22 are incorporated by reference herein as if fully set forth.
- 24. The Commission's decision in maintaining Condition Nos. 7 and 9 of Use Permit No. 106 was clearly erroneous in view of the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence on the whole record.

#### FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

### (Arbitrary Action)

- 25. Paragraphs 1 through 24 are incorporated by reference herein as if fully set forth.
- 26. The action of the Commission in denying Ainaloa's request to amend Condition Nos. 7 and 9 of Use Permit No. 106 was arbitrary and capricious, and characterized by an abuse of discretion or clearly unwarranted exercise of discretion.

### WHEREFORE, Ainaloa prays as follows:

- 1. That this Court reverse those certain portions of the Commission's decision of November 15, 2004 in Use Permit No. 106, relating to Condition Nos. 7 and 9;
- 2. That this Court declare those portions of Condition Nos. 7 and 9 requiring the improvement of Ainaloa Boulevard, the purchase of an asphalt paver and water tanker, and the construction of bus shelters along Ainaloa Boulevard to be invalid and unenforceable;
  - 3. That Ainaloa be permitted to proceed with its golf course development without the

1

roadway improvement and equipment purchase exactions required under Condition Nos. 7 and 9 of Use Permit No. 106; and

4. That Ainaloa be awarded its costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, and such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DATED: Hilo, Hawaii, December 13

SANDRA PECHTER SONG

Attorney for Appellant

Ainaloa Development Corporation



# County of Hawai'i

#### PLANNING COMMISSION

101 Pauahi Street, Suite 3 • Hilo, Hawai'i 96720-3043 (808) 961-8288 • Fax (808) 961-8742

November 15, 2004

Mr. Sidney Fuke 100 Pauahi Street, Suite 212 Hilo, HI 96720

Dear Mr. Fuke:

Special Permit (SPP 827)

Request: Time Extension to Condition No. 2

Use Permit (USE 106)

Request: Amendments to Conditions 3, 6, 7 and 9 Applicant: Ainaloa Development Corporation

Tax Map Kev: 1-6-4:21 & 57

The Planning Commission at its duly held public hearing on October 22, 2004, voted to accept the attached Planning Department's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law & Recommendation

Specifically, the Planning Commission voted to approve Ainaloa Development Corporation's request for a 5-year time extension to Condition No. 2 (time to secure final plan approval) of Special Permit No. 827, which allowed an expanded golf clubhouse, recreational facilities, and related improvements on 7+ acres of land situated within the State Land Use Agricultural District.

The Planning Commission also took the following action to Ainaloa Development Corporation's request to amend or delete certain conditions of Use Permit No. 106, which allowed the development of an 18-hole golf course and related improvements on 200 acres of land zoned Agricultural 1-acre (A-1a):

Condition No. 3:

Approved a 5-year time extension to secure final plan approval for

the proposed golf course and related improvements.

Condition No. 6:

Approved request to delete condition, which required construction

of the Keaau-Pahoa Road/Ainaloa Boulevard intersection.

Condition No. 7:

Retained current language of condition to improve Ainaloa

Boulevard.

Hawai'i County is an Equal Opportunity Provider and Employer

Mr. Sidney Fuke Page 2

Condition No. 9:

Retained current language of condition, with the exception of Condition No. 9(D). The requirement to donate funds for/or a water tanker and an asphalt paver to the Ainaloa Community Association was deleted.

The property is located along Ainaloa Boulevard at the extreme northwestern (mauka) end of Ainaloa Subdivision, approximately 3.7 miles from Highway 130, Keaau, Puna, Hawaii.

This approval does not, however, sanction the specific plans submitted with the request as they may be subject to change given specific code and regulatory requirements of the affected agencies.

Should you have any questions, please contact Norman Hayashi of the Planning Department at 961-8288.

Sincerely

Fred Galdones, Chairman Planning Commission

LainaloafinalPC Attachment

cc/att: Department of Public Works
Department of Water Supply

County Real Property Tax Division

State Land Use Commission

Rodney Haraga, Director/DOT-Highways, Honolulu

Ainaloa Development Corporation

Sandra Pechter Song, Esq. /

Colin Love, Esq. Mr. Ole Fulks Ivan Torigoe, Esq.

Bobby Jean Leithead-Todd, Esq.

#### BEFORE THE COUNTY OF HAWAI'I

#### PLANNING COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Application of

USE PERMIT NO. 106 SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 827

AINALOA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

To Amend Conditions of Use Permit No. 106 and Special Permit No. 827, which allowed the Development of a Golf Course Golf clubhouse, and Related Improvements On Lands within the State Land Use Agricultural District and County's Agricultural 1-acre Zoned District at Keaau, Puna, Hawai'i, TMK: 1-6-04:21 and 57.

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, DECISION AND ORDER

Hearing Date: October 22, 2004

s:dept\plan\Ainaloa Contested Case BLT/ Final FOF COL 11-8-04 BLTpc.wpd

### FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW <u>DECISION AND ORDER</u>

This matter came on for contested case hearing on October 22, 2004 before the County of Hawaii Planning Commission. Applicant, Ainaloa Development Corporation (hereinafter "Applicant") was represented its counsel, by Sandra P. Song. Applicant's representative Sydney Fuke was also present. The County of Hawaii Planning Department (hereinafter "Department") was represented by Deputy Corporation Counsel, Bobby Jean Leithead-Todd. Norman Hayashi was also present on behalf of the Department. Intervener Ole' Fulks (hereinafter "Fulks") represented himself. Hearings Officer, Colin L. Love was also present.

After hearing all the evidence presented at the hearing and having reviewed the file, exhibits, and the Hearing's Officer's recommendations from the July 29, 2004 contested case hearing, the Planning Commission makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

### Findings of Fact

- 1. Ainaloa Development Corporation submitted a request for:
  - a. 5-year extension to Condition No. 2 (secure plan approval) of Special Permit No.
     827, which allowed an expanded golf clubhouse, recreational facilities, and
     related improvements on approximately 7 acres of land situated within the State
     Land Use Agricultural District.
  - b. 5-year extension to Condition No. 3 (secure plan approval), deletion of Condition No. 6 (intersection improvements), amend Condition No. 7 (roadway improvements) and Condition No. 9 (community benefit program) of Use Permit No. 106, which allowed the development of an 18-hole golf course and related improvements on 200 acres of land zoned Agricultural (A-1a).
- 2. The properties are located along Ainaloa Boulevard at the extreme northwestern (mauka) end of Ainaloa Subdivision, approximately 3.7 miles from Highway 130, Keaau, Puna, Hawaii, TMK: 1-6-4:21 and 57.
- 3. On November 9, 1992 the Planning Commission approved Special Permit No. 827 and Use Permit No. 106.
- 4. On March 14, 1994 Applicant requested a time extension to Condition No. 2 of Special Permit No. 827 and Condition No. 3 of Use Permit No. 106.
- 5. On April 25, 1994, the Planning Director granted a time extension until November 12, 1995 to comply with Condition No. 2 of Special Permit No., 827 and Condition No. 3 of Use Permit No., 106.

- 6. On September 18, 1996 the Applicant requested an additional time extension to Condition No. 2 of Special Permit No. 827 and Condition No. 3 of Use Permit No. 106.
- On November 20, 1998 the Planning Commission granted a five-year extension until December 7, 2003 to comply with Condition No. 3 of Use Permit No. 106. The Planning Commission agreed with the Applicant that the delay could not have been foreseen and was beyond the control of the Applicant. The approval was in part because the initial approvals had been appealed to the Board of Appeals in December 1992. Then it was appealed to the Third Circuit Court in November 1993 and then to the State Supreme court in August 1994. In October 1997, the Supreme Court sustained the decisions of the Planning Commission and the Board of Appeals. The Planning Commission agreed that due to the appeals and global financial and economic conditions, the Applicant was unable to comply with the conditions of approval.
- 8. Applicant's request for a third time extension is based upon their assertion that their inability to comply with the conditions was a result of circumstances that could not have been foreseen or were beyond the control of the Applicant, and not attributable to any negligence. Applicant asserts that since being granted the five year extension of November 1998, legal challenges, global economic malaise, the residual effects of the SARS epidemic, and the worldwide threat of terrorism affected the applicant's ability to pursue the development.
- 9. Applicant's request to delete Condition No. 6 of the Use Permit was based upon the fact that the State completed the intersection improvements and the condition is no longer applicable.
- 10. Applicant is proposing that Condition No. 7 of the Use Permit be amended to allow a \$1,000,000.00 contribution in lieu of providing the extensive off-site roadway and related improvements. The Applicant proposes to make a contribution to the County for roadway and related improvements to Ainaloa Boulevard. Applicant proposes that a minimum of \$500,000.00

will be contributed prior to issuance of any construction permit for the golf course and the remaining \$500,000.00 be paid prior to the opening of the golf course.

- 11. Applicant is proposing that Condition No. 9 of the Use Permit be amended to delete the requirement to purchase an asphalt paver and water tanker for the Ainaloa Community

  Association as well as the construction of a bus shelter. Applicant alleges that it has insufficient funds to provide the existing community benefits it agreed to provide.
- 12. The existing Condition No. 2 of Special permit No. 827 states:
  - "2. Plans for the proposed expanded clubhouse and recreational facilities shall be submitted concurrently with plans submitted for Final Plan Approval review for the proposed golf curse and related improvements. To assure adequate time for Plan Approval review, and n accordance with Chapter 25-244 (Zoning Code), plans shall be submitted a minimum of forty-five days prior to the date by which plan approval must be secured. In the design and review of any improvements, due consideration shall be entail the minimization of noise and visual impacts through appropriate siting, height, bulk, color schemes, and landscaping. Plans shall identify all structures, landscaping, and paved parking stalls associated with the proposed development."
- 13. Condition Nos. 3. 6, 7 and 9 of Use Permit No. 106 states:
  - "3. Final Plan Approval for the proposed golf curse and related improvements shall be secured from the Planning Department within five (5) years from the effective date of this second amendment. To assure adequate time for Plan Approval review and in accordance with Chapter 25-244 (Zoning Code), plans shall be submitted a minimum of forty0five (45) days prior to he date by which plan approval must be secured. Plans shall identify all structures, landscaping, which shall include a 40-foot perimeter landscaping buffer, and paved parking stalls associated with the proposed development."
  - "6. The Keaau-Pahoa Road/Ainaloa Boulevard intersection shall be fully channelized meeting with the approval of the State Department of Transportation-Highways Division and/or the County Department of Public Works, prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy or the opening of the golf course, whichever occurs first."
  - "7. Ainaloa Boulevard from Keaau-Pahoa Road to the entrance of the project site shall be upgraded to County dedicable standards meeting with the approval of the Department of Public Works. Stop signs and street lights shall also be installed at all lateral roads fronting Ainaloa Boulevard with an existing power pole. In addition, for pedestrian safety, the applicant shall extend the pavement width

- within the existing right-of-way of Ainaloa Boulevard, including the striping or installing of a rolled curb. All roadway improvements to Ainaloa Boulevard shall be completed prior to he issuance of the certificate of occupancy or opening of the golf course, whichever occurs first."
- "9. To ensure that he goals and policies of the General Plan are implemented, the Planning Director shall formulate a community benefit assessment program which shall include the following: (A) a program for public play at reasonable costs, (B) a program for reasonable access to the proposed recreational facilities by Ainaloa Subdivision residents, (C) a standpipe, providing water for potable and firefighting purposes, to be located on a park site owned by the Ainaloa Community Association, (D) funds for/or a water tanker and an asphalt paver to be donated to the Ainaloa Community Association, (E) bus shelters to be constructed at different locations along Ainaloa Boulevard within the existing right-of-way, and shall not preclude other community benefit assessments as may be approved by the Planning Director. The community benefit assessments, as outlined in the developer's letter of October 2, 1992 to the Planning director, shall also be provided. Such community benefits shall be implemented prior to the official opening of the golf course."
- 14. At the time both permits were initially approved in 1992, the permits were granted based upon representations made by the Applicant and the understandings of the community that a number of much-needed improvements would be made by the Applicant. These agreements or understandings were included as conditions in the permits. Thirteen years have passed since the original granting of the permit. None of the community benefits in the conditions have been satisfied, with the exception of Condition No. 6 of the Use Permit. This was not completed by the Applicant but was completed by the State.
- 15. The Planning Director recommended approval of the request for an additional time extension and recommended approval of the amendments to Condition No. 2 of Special Permit No. 827 and Conditions Nos. 3 and 6 of Use Permit No. 106.
- 16. The Planning Department recommended that Condition No. 7 of the Use Permit No. 106 be retained with its present wording and that the request to amend it be denied. This was based upon the request being contrary to the original reasons for granting the Special Permit. The

original granting of the permit was based in part on the support of the community. Community support was based upon the representations of the developer.

17. The Planning Department's recommendations states that the:

"Although this request would not be contrary to the General Plan or the Zoning" Code as there are no changes to either designation, it would be contrary to the original reasons for granting the Special Permit. In supporting this project, the community had relied in large part to the representations made by the applicant in 1992. The applicant's request to amend Condition No. 9 of the Use Permit, to delete a portion of the requirement to purchase an asphalt paver and water tanker for the Ainaloa Community Association because 'there are insufficient funds to provide a community benefit program that exceeded standard permitting requirements' is unreasonable. The community had supported the project based upon representations made by the applicant at the time the permits were approved. and not to provide the required benefits to the community would negate the good faith efforts of both the applicant and the community. The community had relied on the applicant to provide benefits. The agreements or understandings were included as conditions in the permits to offset the impact of the proposed project on the surrounding community. Therefore, the Planning Director does not support the applicant's request to amend Condition No. 9 of Use Permit No. 106.

18. Mr. Ed Smythe, a member of the Ainaloa Community Association's board of directors testified. He stated a survey had been conducted regarding the donation of one million dollars for improvements to Ainaloa boulevard. The survey was mailed to all 3,600 property owners who are members of the community association. Seven hundred ninety-seven (797) voted in favor. About 100 voted no and 88 did not take a position. The results were printed in the association newsletter. The survey letter sent out to the members of the association asking if they were in favor of the \$1,000,000 contribution towards improvements, the water standpipe and access to the golf course did not mention what was being deleted from the conditions. No communication was sent to all the property owners/members of the association that the donation of the asphalt paver and the water tanker was being deleted from the conditions, nor was any

information sent out regarding the original condition requiring improvement of the entire roadway to County dedicable standards or the construction of bus shelters. (Transcript at 94)

- 19. Mr. Gary Safarik, a resident of Ainaloa subdivision and Council representative of District 5 (which includes Ainaloa) testified. Mr. Safarik stated that the County Council adopted a resolution to acquire the "Puna Emergency Access Road" either through eminent domain or through negotiation. Ainaloa Boulevard is part of the Puna Emergency Access Road. The Ainaloa Community Association has agreed to turn over Ainaloa Boulevard to the County. Upon donation of the roadway, the County would assume ownership, maintenance and liability for the roadway. The Puna Emergency Access Road connects Ainaloa Boulevard to a roadway (8 Road) in Hawaiian Acres. The County is looking into acquiring an easement over the Hawaiian Acres portion of the emergency road. The Council has earmarked \$3.5 million dollars to address site distance and safety issues on Ainaloa Boulevard and flooding issues in Hawaiian Acres. The County has already spent two million in federal monies to improve the Puna Emergency Access Road. Even with two million dollars, the County was only able to do a minimal amount of work, basically resurfacing the roadway that is substandard and dangerous in some areas. (Transcript pp. 18-24).
- 20. At the time the original permit was granted, Ainaloa and Hawaiian Acres were not connected. With the connection of Ainaloa to Hawaiian Acres, the roadway will become an alternate route for people in the Puna region, thus increasing the traffic on Ainaloa Boulevard.
- 21. If the Applicant is required to improve Ainaloa Boulevard to dedicable standards as required by the original conditions, the County will have the ability to use the \$3.5 million earmarked for the Puna Emergency Access Road on the Hawaiian Acres portion of the road.

  According to Mr. Bruce McClure, Director of Public Works for the County of Hawaii, just the

Hawaiian Acres portion of the emergency roadway would cost between \$8 and \$10.6 million dollars to improve.

- 22. Ainaloa Boulevard is 3.7 miles long. Based upon Mr. McClure's estimates of a cost of \$1.5 to \$2 million dollars per mile of roadway, the cost to improve Ainaloa Boulevard to a county dedicable standard far exceeds the \$1 million offered by the Applicant.
- 23. The original conditions imposed upon the project were estimated in 1992 to cost about \$6.8 million dollars. In an October 2, 1992 letter (Planning Dept. Exhibit 9) from Ainaloa Development Corporation to Planning Director, Norman Hayashi, the Applicant stated that:

"For your information, our consultants have estimated our community benefits proposal (off-site infrastructural improvements costs only) at \$6.8 million. The specific breakdown follows:

|    |                           | (in millions) |
|----|---------------------------|---------------|
| d. | Upgrade Ainaloa Boulevard | - \$6.100     |
| e. | Channelized intersection  | -\$ .300      |
| f. | Street lights             | -\$ .150      |
| g. | Potable water line and    |               |
|    | Standpipe                 | -\$ .050      |
| e. | Water truck               | -\$.075       |
| f. | Road paver                | - \$ .125     |
|    | TOTAL                     | \$ 6.800      |
|    |                           |               |

The community benefits program also includes recreational benefits that are not specifically measurable in terms of dollars and cents. This program includes public access to the golf course at reasonable rates and some structure use of the other components of the recreational facility.

Then, too, potable water would be provided to the community at no cost. We have not included this as part of the aforementioned cost. Nonetheless, the availability of a reliable source of potable water should be of benefit to this area.

We trust that the foregoing package of benefits meets the requirements of the County's Community Benefits Assessment program; and if so, we would have no objection to your making this a part of the Commission's condition of approval."

- 24. Based on 1992 dollars, Applicant is proposing to reduce its community benefit package from \$6.8 million to \$1.050 million, less than 1/6th of what they offered in 1992. If adjusted for current inflation and current construction prices, the reduction in benefits is much greater.
- 25. The vast majority of the members of the Ainaloa Community Association were not informed of the difference between what was originally agreed to by the Applicant valued at \$6.8 million and the current proposal to only contribute \$1 million and build the water standpipe, so they did not have a true opportunity to respond to the proposed changes.

#### Conclusions of Law

- 1. The request for amendment of Condition No. 3 of Use Permit No. 106 to authorize a five-year time extension for obtaining plan approval for Ainaloa's golf course would not be contrary to the General Plan or the Zoning Code and is consistent with the requirements for time extension.
- 2. The request for an amendment to Condition No. 2 of Special Permit No. 827 to authorize a five-year time extension for obtaining plan approval for Ainaloa's expanded golf course clubhouse, recreational facilities and related improvements would not be contrary to the General Plan or the Zoning Code and is consistent with the requirements for time extension.
- 3. Since the requirements of Condition No. 6 of Use Permit No. 106 have been completed by the State of Hawaii, deletion of Condition No. 6 is appropriate.
- 4. Reducing Applicant's community benefits assessments from \$6.8 million dollars (1992 values) to \$1,050,000 (one million roadway and fifty thousand for water standpipe) solely on the basis that the Applicant can no longer afford the benefits is not a reasonable basis for changing the benefits package which was agreed to by the Applicant at the time the permits were originally approved.

- 5. Reducing the community benefits package on the basis that the condition does not bear a reasonable relationship to the use permit granted should not be the basis for an amendment to conditions agreed to by the Applicant when the permits were granted. The time to raise those objections to the assessments should have been at the time of the original grant of the permits, or by appealing those assessments in 1992.
- 6. Since there was no objection from the Ainaloa Community Association to elimination of the water truck and road paver from the Community Benefits Assessment, items "d" can be deleted from Condition No. 9 of the Use Permit.

### Decision and Order

Based upon the preceding findings of fact and conclusions of law, Ainaloa Development Corporation's request to amend Condition No. 3 of the Use Permit to approve a five-year time extension is granted. Applicant's request to amend Condition No. 2 of Special Use Permit No. 827 to allow a five-year time extension is granted. Applicant's request to delete Condition No. 6 of Use Permit No. 106 is granted. Applicant's request to amend Condition No. 7 is denied. Applicant's request to amend Condition No. 9 of Use Permit No. 106 is denied in part and granted in part. Condition No. 9 is amended by deleting item "9.d", the asphalt paver and water tank.

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_, Hawai'i, November 15, 2004

fed Galdones, Chairman

Hawaii County Planning Commission

### STATE OF HAWAII

| AINALOA DEVELOPMENT  | )                                 |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| CORPORATION,   | ) CIVIL NO                        |
| Appellant,   | ) (Agency Appeal)                 |
|  | ) DESIGNATION OF RECORD ON APPEAL |
| vs.  | )                                 |
| COUNTY OF HAWAII PLANNING<br>COMMISSION; CHRISTOPHER YUEN,<br>Planning Director, County of Hawaii; and<br>OLE FULKS, | )<br>)<br>)<br>)                  |
| Appellees.   | )                                 |
|  | _)                                |

# **DESIGNATION OF RECORD ON APPEAL**

Appellant Ainaloa Development Corporation, hereby designates the entire record and file pertaining to this matter, including all transcripts, minutes, notes, correspondence and exhibits.

DATED: Hilo, Hawaii, December 13

SANDRA PECHTER SONG

Attorney for Appellant

Ainaloa Development Corporation

### STATE OF HAWAII

| AINALOA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION,   | )<br>) CIVIL NO  |
|--|--|
| Appellant, vs.   | <ul><li>(Agency Appeal)</li><li>ORDER FOR CERTIFICATION AND</li><li>TRANSMISSION OF RECORD</li></ul> |
| COUNTY OF HAWAII PLANNING<br>COMMISSION; CHRISTOPHER YUEN,<br>Planning Director, County of Hawaii; and<br>OLE FULKS, | )<br>)<br>)<br>)   |
| Appellees.   | )<br>_)  |
| ORDER FOR CERTIFICATIO   | N AND TRANSMISSION OF RECORD   |
| TO: CHAIRMAN COUNTY OF HAWAII PLA 101 Pauahi Street, Suite 3 Hilo, Hawaii 96720                                      | NNING COMMISSION   |
| YOU ARE HEREBY ORDERED to  | certify and transmit to this Court within twenty (20)  |
|  | further time as may be allowed by this Court, the the above-captioned matter pursuant to Hawaii      |
| Revised Statutes, Section 91-9(e).  DATED: Hilo, Hawaii,   | EC 1 3 2004  |
|  | C. OKAWA (SEAL)  |
|  | Clerk of the above-entitled Court  |

### STATE OF HAWAII

| AINALOA DEVELOPMENT  | )                          |
|--|----------------------------|
| CORPORATION,   | ) CIVIL NO                 |
| Appellant,   | ) (Agency Appeal)          |
| vs.  | ) CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE ) |
| COUNTY OF HAWAII PLANNING<br>COMMISSION; CHRISTOPHER YUEN, | )                          |
| Planning Director, County of Hawaii; and OLE FULKS,        | )                          |
| Appellees.   | )<br>)                     |
| -  | _)                         |

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing was duly served upon each of the following by mailing the same, postage prepaid on Deamby 13, 2004.

HAWAII COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION 101 Pauahi Street, Suite 3 Hilo, Hawaii 96720 Appellee

CHRISTOPHER YUEN
Planning Director
County of Hawaii
101 Pauahi Street, Suite 3
Hilo, Hawaii 96720
Appellee

OLE FULKS HC-1, Box 5664 Keaau, Hawaii 96749 Appellee LINCOLN ASHIDA, ESQ.
IVAN TORIGOE, ESQ.
BOBBY JEAN LEITHEAD-TODD
Office of the Corporation Counsel
County of Hawaii
101 Aupuni Street, Suite 325
Hilo, Hawaii 96720
Attorney for Appellees
Hawaii County Planning Commission
and Christopher Yuen

DATED: Hilo, Hawaii, Deambu 13, 2004

SANDRA PECHTER SONG

Attorney for Appellant

Ainaloa Development Corporation

FLAAnye COCK MARKETTE

CERTIFIED MAIL

November 9, 1992

Mr. Sidney Fuke Sidney Fuke & Associates 100 Pauahi Street, Suite 212 Hilo, HI 96720

Dear Mr. Fuke:

Use Permit Application (UP 92-8)
Special Permit Application (SP 92-18)
Applicant: Ainaloa Development Corporation
Request: Golf Course, Expanded Clubhouse,
Recreational Facilities & Related Improvements
Tax Map Key: 1-6-4:21 & 57

The Planning Commission at its duly held public hearing on November 4, 1992, voted to approve the above applications, Use Permit No. 106 to allow an 18-hole golf course, golf clubhouse and related improvements on 200 acres of land zoned Agricultural-1 acre (A-la) by the County and Special Permit No. 827 to allow for an expanded golf clubhouse, recreational facilities, and related improvements. The proposed clubhouse would contain locker and changing rooms, a restaurant, and a recreation center which would include a swimming pool, exercise room, ping-pong area, meeting area, and tennis courts. The proposed 200-acre project site is zoned Agricultural-1 acre (A-la) and is located adjacent to the Ainaloa Subdivision, approximately seven miles southeast of Keaau and four miles northwest of Pahoa. The proposed site is located on Ainaloa Boulevard, at the extreme northwestern end (mauka) of the Ainaloa Subdivision, approximately 3.7 miles from Highway 130, Keaau, Puna, Hawaii.

EXHIBIT A

00134

NOV 1 2 1992

7

Approval of Use Permit request is based on the following:

The establishment of an 18-hole golf course and related facilities within the County's Agricultural-1 acre (A-la) zoned district will not be inconsistent with the general purpose of that zoned district, the intent and purpose of the Zoning Code, and the General Plan, provided adequate mitigating conditions are met.

The subject request will also provide a form of perpetual open space, thus, maintaining the current open character of the adjacent surrounding area with its natural and scenic qualities. The proposed development would, therefore, be consistent with the policies of the Recreation and Open Space elements of the General Plan which state that recreational facilities in the County shall reflect the natural, historic, and cultural character of the area, and that the recreational use should be compatible with the adjacent areas. The Department of Land and Natural Resources concurred with the findings of the applicant's archaeological inventory survey that all sites in the project area were recorded and only two archaeological sites were identified. Both sites were determined to be "no longer significant", and the proposed development will have "no effect" on historic sites.

The granting of this proposal would complement the goals of the General Plan's Recreation element which states to "Provide a diversity of environments for active and passive pursuits" and to "Provide a wide variety of recreational opportunities. . . ."

As a condition of this approval would be the formulation of a community benefit assessment program by the Planning Director prior to Final Plan Approval of the golf course. It is felt that this provision would be consonant with the policy of the Land Use Element that states "The county shall encourage the development and maintenance of communities meeting the needs of its residents in balance with the physical and social environment." A community benefit assessment program would also encompass a wide range of community needs rather than the limited recreational needs determination previously required.

Golf courses are permitted uses within the State Land Use Agricultural District provided that the affected lands are not classified either "A" and "B" soils by the Land Study Bureau. The Land Study Bureau's Overall Master Productivity rating for

agricultural use of the subject property is Class "E" or very poor; therefore, consideration of a golf course within these State land use parameters is permissible.

The granting of the proposed use will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare nor cause substantial adverse impact to the community's character or to surrounding The character of land use in the immediate area is properties. open space with clustered residential homesites. Adjacent to the project site are the agricultural subdivisions of Ainaloa to the southeast, Hawaiian Acres to the west, Tiki Gardens to the east, and Orchidland Estates to the north. As previously mentioned, the open nature of the proposed golf course will complement the rural character of the community. The proposed clubhouse and wastewater treatment plant will be centrally located on the property and screened with berms and landscaping to minimize adverse visual impacts to surrounding properties. Existing vegetation would be retained as much as possible between fairways. In addition, the Planning Department's Guidelines for Golf Course Development will be utilized during plan approval to assure that adjacent properties will not be adversely affected by direct play on the golf course.

The proposed project is located approximately three miles from the Keaau-Pahoa Road/Ainaloa Blvd. intersection. Keaau-Pahoa Road (Highway 130) is a two-lane highway under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Transportation. Primary access to the golf course will be from Ainaloa Boulevard, a private road with a 60-foot right-of-way consisting to a 20-foot wide asphaltic-concrete pavement.

The project is identified to be outside the 500-year flood plain or Zone "X". The applicant has prepared a Stormwater Runoff Assessment to analyze storm runoff conditions for the subject property. The study determined that runoff is considered to be insignificant. To mitigate any possible storm water runoff and to ensure that all runoff is retained on-site, the applicant shall prepare a detailed drainage plan meeting with the approval of the Department of Public Works for submittal at the time of plan approval review.

The granting of the proposed use will not adversely affect similar or related existing uses within the surrounding area, community, or region. The City of Hilo has one 18-hole municipal golf course and one 9-hole private golf course (open

to the public). In addition, the Planning Commission has approved two additional 18-hole golf courses, one to be located mauka of the Komohana-Ponahawai Street intersection, and the other to be located mauka of the Wilder Road-Kaumana Drive intersection. Another golf course is under construction at Pohoiki. It is not anticipated that this approval would not affect these existing or proposed courses.

All essential utilities and services required for the development of a golf course and related facilities are or will be made available. Conditions of approval relative to the provision of such services are being proposed. These include off-site roadway improvements and other community benefit assessments meeting with the approval with the Department of Planning and affected agencies. In the area of roads, the intersection of Keaau-Pahoa Road/Ainaloa Boulevard shall be fully channelized meeting with the approval of the State Department of Transportation and the County Department of Public Ainaloa Boulevard shall be upgraded to County-dedicable standards from the Keaau-Pahoa Road intersection to the proposed entrance of the project. Also required shall be installation of stop signs and street lights at road intersections that front Ainaloa Boulevard with an existing power pole. All roadway improvements shall be installed prior to occupancy.

Approval of the Use Permit request is subject to the following conditions:

- The applicant, successors or assigns shall comply with all of the stated conditions of approval.
- 2. The applicant shall prepare an Erosion Control Plan addressing a detailed drainage system meeting with the approval of the Department of Public Works which shall be submitted at the time of Plan Approval Review for the proposed development. As required by the Department of Public Works, all runoff generated from the proposed development shall be disposed on-site.
- 3. Final Plan Approval for the proposed golf course and related improvements shall be secured from the Planning Department within 18 months from the effective date of the permit. To assure adequate time for Plan Approval review and in accordance with Chapter 25-244 (Zoning Code), plans shall be submitted a minimum of forty-five (45) days prior

to the date by which plan approval must be secured. Plans shall identify all structures, landscaping, which shall include a 40-foot perimeter landscaping buffer, and paved parking stalls associated with the proposed development.

- 4. Construction of the golf course and related improvements shall commence within one year from the date of receipt of final plan approval and be completed within three (3) years thereafter.
- 5. The project's access roadway and its connection to Ainaloa Boulevard shall meet with the approval of the Department of Public Works. The applicant shall provide all off-site roadway improvements as may be required by and meeting with the approval of the Department of Public Works.
- 6. The Keaau-Pahoa Road/Ainaloa Boulevard intersection shall be fully channelized meeting with the approval of the State Department of Transportation-Highways Division and/or the County Department of Public Works, prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy or the opening of the golf course, whichever occurs first.
- 7. Ainaloa Boulevard from Keaau-Pahoa Road to the entrance of the project site shall be upgraded to County dedicable standards meeting with approval of the Department of Public Works. Stop signs and street lights shall also be installed at all lateral roads fronting Ainaloa Boulevard with an existing power pole. In addition, for pedestrian safety, the applicant shall extend the pavement width within the existing right-of-way of Ainaloa Boulevard, including the striping or installing of a rolled curb. All roadway improvements to Ainaloa Boulevard shall be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy or opening of the golf course, whichever occurs first.
- 8. In the design of the golf course, the County of Hawaii Planning Department's Guidelines for Golf Course Design (November 1989, as amended) shall be utilized. The Planning Department shall determine appropriate setback requirements (i.e. building and property line) at the time of plan approval review. Easements for golf course purposes over and across abutting lots, either existing or proposed, shall not be permissible.

- To ensure that the goals and policies of the General Plan are implemented, the Planning Director shall formulate a community benefit assessment program which shall include the following: (A) a program for public play at reasonable costs, (B) a program for reasonable access to the proposed recreational facilities by Ainaloa Subdivision residents, (C) a standpipe, providing water for potable and firefighting purposes, to be located on a park site owned by the Ainaloa Community Association, (D) funds for/or a water tanker and an ashpalt paver to be donated to the Ainaloa Community Association, (E) bus shelters to be constructed at different locations along Ainaloa Boulevard within the existing right-of-way, and shall not preclude other community benefit assessments as may be approved by the Planning Director. The community benefit assessments, as outlined in the developer's letter of October 2, 1992 to the Planning Director, shall also be provided. community benefits shall be implemented prior to the official opening of the golf course.
- 10. Should any unidentified sites or remains such as artifacts, shell, bone, or charcoal deposits, human burials, rock or coral alignments, paving or walks, or caves be encountered during land preparation activities, work in the immediate area shall cease and the Planning Department shall be immediately notified. Subsequent work shall proceed upon an archaeological clearance from the Planning Department when it finds that sufficient mitigative measures have been taken.
- 11. Prior to construction, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Department that all proposed off-site construction material such as topsoil or sand are being supplied from an approved quarry or resource site.
- 12. During construction, best effort measures shall be taken to minimize the potential of both fugitive dust and runoff sedimentation. Such best effort measures shall be in compliance with construction industry standards and practices utilized during construction projects of the State of Hawaii. Further, top-soil material-hauling

traffic shall be restricted to the calculated non-peak hours, as may be defined by the State Department of Transportation.

- 13. The use of pesticides and herbicides in conjunction with all phases of operation shall conform with the applicable regulations of appropriate governmental agencies. Also the applicant shall establish and maintain the golf course in an environmentally responsible manner based upon principles of an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) system.
- 14. The applicant shall provide adequate potable water service and back-up facilities to meet demands for fire protection for all golf course-related facilities prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit.
- 15. A potable and irrigation water system shall be constructed in accordance with the Department of Water Supply's Water System Standards and Rules and Regulations.
- 16. Should the location of the private potable well on the subject property cause additional wastewater requirements for adjoining properties, the applicant shall provide:

  a) a private wastewater system for a single-family residence on the affected lots meeting with the requirements of the appropriate State and/or County rules applicable at the time of issuance of a building permit for a single-family residence on the affected lots; or b) allow the affected property owners to hook-up into the project's wastewater system. Under that basis, the developer shall provide a wastewater transmission line along the property line of the affected adjoining lots.
- 17. Comply with all other applicable laws, rules, regulations and requirements, including those of the Departments of Transportation-Highways Division, Fire, Health, Water Supply and Public Works.
- 18. An annual progress report shall be submitted to the Planning Director prior to the anniversary date of the permit. The report shall include, but not be limited to, the status of the development and to what extent the conditions of approval are being complied with. This condition shall remain in effect until all of the

\_

conditions of approval have been complied with and the Planning Director acknowledges that further reports are not required.

An initial extension of time for the performance of 19. conditions within the permit may be granted by the Planning Director upon the following circumstances: a) the non-performance is the result of conditions that could not have been foreseen or are beyond the control of the applicant, successors or assigns, and that are not the result of their fault or negligence; b) the granting of the time extension would not be contrary to the general plan or zoning code; c) granting of the time extension would not be contrary to the original reasons for the granting of the permit; and d) the time extension granted shall be for a period not to exceed the period originally granted for performance (i.e., a condition to be performed within one year may be extended for up to one additional year). Further, should any of the conditions not be met or substantially complied with in a timely fashion, the Director shall initiate procedures to revoke the permit.

Approval of the Special Permit request is based on the following:

The granting of this request to allow for an expanded golf clubhouse, recreational facilities and related improvements would not be contrary to the objectives of Chapter 205, Hawaii Revised Statutes, as amended. The proposed clubhouse will be a two-story structure with a floor area of approximately 30,000 In addition, a recreation center would include a square feet. 6,500 square foot recreation building, two tennis courts and a swimming pool. All facilities would be appurtenant to the main use of the subject property as a golf course. The recreational facilities would be made available to Ainaloa Community Association members upon conditions agreed upon by the Association and owner. The State Land Use Law and Regulations are intended to preserve, protect, and encourage the development of lands in the State for those uses in which they are best suited in the interest of the public health and welfare of the people of the State of Hawaii. In the case of the Agricultural District, the intent of the State Land Use Laws Rules and Regulations is to preserve or keep lands of high agricultural potential in agricultural use. The lands on which the proposed expanded golf clubhouse and recreational facilities would be located is classified "E" or very poor by the Land Study

> Bureau's Overall Master Productivity Rating and not classified by the Department of Agriculture's ALISH map. Therefore, it can determined that the proposed use would not affect important agricultural lands within the district or region and would not be contrary to the objectives of the State Land Use Law.

> The desired use will not adversely affect the surrounding properties. Surrounding uses include scattered residential and agricultural uses. The expanded clubhouse and recreational facilities would be located toward the interior of the property and adequately screened with berms and landscaping. It is anticipated that the impacts will be minimal due to the size of the property. The surrounding golf course will also serve as a buffer between the activities associated with the clubhouse and recreational facilities. Hours of operation would be from approximately 7:00 to sunset, with limited use of recreational facilities during evening hours, thereby minimizing any traffic or noise impacts to the surrounding properties during evening hours.

The desired use will not unreasonably burden public agencies to provide roads and streets, sewers, water, drainage, school improvements, police and fire protection. All necessary infrastructure to support the proposed development will be funded by the applicant. A private wastewater treatment plant will be constructed on site by the owner. Both potable and irrigation water will be provided via the construction of two wells. All potable water system improvements shall meet with the approval of the Department of Water Supply. Access and installation of fire protection standards shall meet with the approval of the Fire Department and will be required as a condition of approval.

Unusual conditions, trends, and needs have arisen since the district boundaries and regulations were established. The establishment of an agricultural subdivision unrelated to an established community core has created a need for facilities to accommodate recreational and social requirements of the community.

The land upon which the proposed use is sought is not unsuitable for the uses permitted within the district, however, the proposed use will not interfere with permitted uses.

\_

The proposed facilities will not substantially alter or change the essential character of the land but will complement the open and rural character of the land. All recreational facilities will be incorporated within the proposed clubhouse site and the surrounding golf course which are permitted within the State Land Use Agricultural District. Landscaping will be incorporated around the structures as to minimize visual impacts.

The request is not contrary to the goals, standards and policies of the General Plan. The proposed use is consistent with the goal of the Land Use Element of the General Plan which is to "Designate and allocate land uses in appropriate proportions and mix and in keeping with the social, cultural, and physical environments of the County." The proposed is consistent with the policy that, "The county shall encourage the development and maintenance of communities meeting the needs of its residents in balance with the physical and social environment."

Approval of the Special Permit request is subject to the following conditions:

- The applicant, its successors or assigns shall be responsible for complying with all stated conditions of approval.
- 2. Plans for the proposed expanded clubhouse and recreational facilities shall be submitted concurrently with plans submitted for Final Plan Approval review for the proposed golf course and related improvements. To assure adequate time for Plan Approval review, and in accordance with Chapter 25-244 (Zoning Code), plans shall be submitted a minimum of forty-five days prior to the date by which plan approval must be secured. In the design and review of any improvements, due consideration shall entail the minimization of noise and visual impacts through appropriate siting, height, bulk, color schemes, and landscaping. Plans shall identify all structures, landscaping, and paved parking stalls associated with the proposed development.
- Construction of the proposed facilities shall commence within one year from the date of receipt of Final Plan Approval and be completed within three (3) years thereafter.

- 4. Comply with all applicable conditions of the accompanying Use Permit for the golf course and clubhouse.
- Comply with all other laws, rules, regulations and requirements.
- 6. An annual progress report shall be submitted to the Planning Director prior to the anniversary date of the approval of the permit. The report shall include, but not be limited to, the status of the development and to what extent the conditions of approval are being complied with. This condition shall remain in effect until all of the conditions of approval have been complied with and the Planning Director acknowledges that further reports are not required.
- An extension of time for the performance of conditions within the permit may be granted by the Planning Director upon the following circumstances: a) the non-performance is the result of conditions that could not have been foreseen or are beyond the control of the applicant, successors or assigns, and that are not the result of their fault or negligence; b) granting of the time extension would not be contrary to the General Plan or Zoning Code; c) granting of the time extension would not be contrary to the original reasons for the granting of the permit; and d) the time extension granted shall be for a period not to exceed the period originally granted for performance (i.e., a condition to be performed within one year may be extended for up to one additional year). Further, should any of the conditions not be met or substantially complied with in a timely fashion, the Director shall initiate procedures to revoke the permit.

These approvals do not, however, sanction the specific plans submitted with the applications as they may be subject to change given specific code and regulatory requirements of the affected agencies.

If you should have any questions please feel free to contact Connie Kiriu or Susan Gagorik of the Planning Department at 961-8288.

Sincerely,

Mike Luce, Chairman Planning Commission

7842d jdk

Attached 10/2/92 ltr.

xc: Ainaloa Development Corp. w/ltr.
 Department of Public Works w.ltr.
 Department of Water Supply w/ltr.
 County Real Property Tax Division w.ltr.
 State Land Use Commission w/ltr.
 Department of Transportation-Highways w/ltr.
 Department of Health w/ltr.
 Fire Department w/ltr.
 DLNR w/ltr.
 Mayor w/ltr.
 Planning Director w/ltr.
 Plan Approval Section w/ltr.
 Connie w/ltr.