The regular meeting of the Planning Commission Subdivision Committee of the County of Kaua‘i was called to order at 8:30 a.m., at the Līhu'e Civic Center, Mo‘ikeha Building, in meeting room 2A-2B. The following Commissioners were present:

Mr. Roy Ho
Ms. Donna Apisa
Ms. Kanoe Ahuna - Absent

The following staff members were present: Planning Department – Chance Bukoski, Dale Cua, Kaaina Hull, and Leslie Takasaki; Office of the County Attorney – Deputy County Attorney Nicholas Courson; Office of Boards and Commissions – Commission Support Clerk Arleen Kuwamura, Administrative Specialist 1 Anela Segreti.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Subdivision Committee Chair Ho called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Chair Ho: Mr. Bukoski, would you start us off?

Staff Planner Chance Bukoski: Good Morning Chair. Chair Ho

Chair Ho: Here.

Mr. Bukoski: Commissioner Apisa.

Mr. Apisa: Here.

Mr. Bukoski: Commissioner Ahuna.

Mr. Bukoski: We have two present and one absent.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item C, Approval of the Agenda.

Ms. Apisa: Make a motion to approve the agenda as submitted.

Chair Ho: Seconded.

Chair Ho: The motion on the floor is to approve the agenda for today. Moved and seconded. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 2:0.
Mr. Bukoski: Thank you, Chair.

**MINUTES of the meeting(s) of the Subdivision Committee**

**Meeting of January 8, 2019**

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item D, Minutes of the Meeting of the Subdivision Committee, Meeting of January 8, 2019.

Ms. Apisa: Move to approve.

Chair Ho: Seconded. The motion on the floor is to approve the meeting of January 8, 2019. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 2:0.

Mr. Bukoski: Thank you, Chair.

**RECEIPT OF ITEMS FOR THE RECORD (None)**

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item E, Receipt of Items for the Record. Seeing none.

**HEARINGS AND PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item F, Hearings and Public Comment. Is there anyone in the audience that wants to testify on any items on the agenda? Seeing none.

**GENERAL BUSINESS MATTERS (None)**

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item G, General Business Matters. Seeing none.

Chair Ho: One moment please.

Mr. Bukoski: Sorry.

Chair Ho: Did the gentleman have something? OK, Sorry.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)**

**NEW BUSINESS (For Action)**

  Tentative Subdivision Map Approval

Subdivision Application No. S-2019-9; *Kukui’ula Development Co., LLC & Lodge Hale Development, LLC*; Proposed 10-lot Subdivision; TMK: (4) 2-6-019:017 & 026; Koloa, Kaua’i
Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item I, New Business For Action. Tentative subdivision map approval; Subdivision Application No. S-2019-9; Kukui’ula Development Co., LLC & Lodge Hale Development, LLC; proposed 10-lot subdivision; TMK: (4) 2-6-019, Parcel 017 & 026; Koloa, Kaua’i.

Mr. Bukoski read the Subdivision Report for the record (on file with the Planning Department).

Mr. Bukoski: Commission Chair and Commissioners, we have received all various government agencies’ comments and we are recommending tentative approval.

Chair Ho: Is there anyone in the audience representing Kukui’ula Development Company, please? Lodge & Hale?

Ms. Apisa: Pull it forward.

Mr. Linsay Crawford: Good morning Commissioners. For the record, Lindsay Crawford, Kukui’ula Development company.

Ms. Apisa: Good Morning.

Chair Ho: Good Morning Lindsay. Would you like to give us a little bit of background on this or a little bit of history?

Mr. Crawford: Sure a very simple summary of the project is that it’s an area was a previously thought to be a multifamily lot. We decided to turn it into eight single family residential lots and so we basically chopped this particular parcel up into single family rather than continue multifamily. There was a little adjustment to a golf course lot that’s why it involved a couple of other zonings in there. We just adjusted a boundary line between the golf course and these proposed eight single family residential lots.

Chair Ho: Do you know off hand what it’s zoned at?

Mr. Crawford: I’m sorry?

Chair Ho: Do you know off hand what the zoning on that is?

Mr. Crawford: Let’s see, that’s probably in the…that’s a good question is that an RR-10?

Mr. Bukoski: The bottom golf course lot?

Ms. Apisa: The whole thing.

Mr. Bukoski: There’s Resort, there’s Residential R-10, there’s Open, and then there is Special Treatment Open as well. Within that whole parcel…for those two parcels.

Chair Ho: So it’s R-10?

Mr. Bukoski: Depending on the location of what lot you are looking at. So if you are looking at possible lot-10, I believe, what I recall was it was either Open or Special Treatment Open.
Ms. Apisa: Because I see a flood and building set back line.

Mr. Bukoski: Yes.

Chair Ho: How did you get that?

Ms. Apisa: Right here is the set back line, the flood set back.

Chair Ho: Oh. Ok.

Mr. Crawford: Probably the golf course is in the Open Zone and the proposed 10-lets are in R-0 Zone I am assuming.

Chair Ho: And this is for tentative approval?

Mr. Bukoski: Yes.

Chair Ho: Ok.

Ms. Apisa: I move that we accept the Planning Departments recommendation and approve.

Chair Ho: Seconded. The motion on the floor is to approve tentative map Kukui‘ula Development Co., Lodge Hale, LLC. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 2:0.

Subdivision Application No. S-2019-10; Ahe Group, LLC & Kauai Habitat for Humanity; Proposed 38-lot, Subdivision; TMK: (4) 1-6-008:006; Waimea, Kaua‘i

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item I.b., New Business For Action. Tentative subdivision map approval; Subdivision Application No. S-2019-10; Ahe Group, LLC & Kauai Habitat for Humanity; proposed 38-lot subdivision; TMK: (4) 1-6-008: Parcel 006; Waimea, Kaua‘i.

Mr. Bukoski read the Subdivision Report for the record (on file with the Planning Department).

Mr. Bukoski: Now Commissioners, I will begin by reading a Supplemental Report. On December 11th 2018, the Planning Department approved Class IV Zoning Permit Z-4-2019-5, and Product Development Use Permit PDU-2-2019-3, involving the Development containing a total of 67 affordable housing units. Within the project’s Zoning Application, it should be noted that given the Project Development Use Permit Approval, the proposed subdivision shall remain at its original form to reflect the projects overall master plan for affordable housing. Therefore, the applicants request to deviate from the requirements involve in Residential Density, lot size, sidewalks, configuration, and park requirements shall be applicable. As a result Conditions No. 1d. 3, 1g, and 1.j. of the tentative subdivision report shall be removed.

Chair Ho: Once more Chance, what are you going to remove?

Mr. Bukoski: Conditions No. 1d.3, Conditions 1.g, and Condition 1.j.

Chair Ho: 1.g. Is that the one with curbs and gutters?
Mr. Bukoski: Correct.

Chair Ho: You're eliminating that?

Mr. Bukoski: Yes. The original development did not...or it did forecast curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. However, due to the County Housing Agency being sponsoring the development, it would be waved due to sidewalk fees or trying to...

Mr. Kaaina Hull: Aloha Chair members Commission, Subdivision Committee I should say. So what Chance is getting at is that under the Project Development Use Permit that was approved by the Commission, essentially a PDU looks at in order for master planning to eliminate the standards established in the circumference of the Zoning Ordinance as well as other requirements. So under the PDU what was approved was essentially the site as proposed. And that site actually looked at (inaudible) out of some of the sidewalk, curbs, and gutter requirements in order to increase the amount of inventory their providing, and so that's why the Department was ok with that and since we generally we do hold the line at providing pedestrian access on all sides of the streets the project abuts. But given the proposal to I think add additional three units in the spaces that could be provided for sidewalk access, the Department was ok with moving it while having certain pedestrian accesses through the property to address and accommodate the intent of having sidewalks on all streets.

Ms. Apisa: So the need for walking access is provided for?

Mr. Hull: There still is a provision that's not to say that they will not be providing pedestrian improvements. There is a provision, are provisions throughout the proposed project that in the Departments eyes address those access needs.

Chair Ho: What does Public Works say about this?

Mr. Hull: So that's from the Planning Department position as far as Public Works requirements they have to work that out with Public Works prior to final.

Chair Ho: Who does?

Mr. Hull: The applicant

Chair Ho: Very good thank you. Is there anyone in the group here from Ahe please, will you please come forward.

Chair Ho: Who

Ms. Makani Maieva: Hi. I am Makani Maieva. I'm the president of Ahe Group and the Developer of this Affordable Housing Project. We are doing it in conjunction with Habitat for Humanity, I'm sorry but I don't think I see Milani here but that's our partner in it. So your question?

Chair Ho: Yes. We are back to 1.g, or whatever, elimination of sidewalks, curbs, and gutters? I'm sorry is it 1.g?

Ms. Maieva: Yes.
Chair Ho: Yes it is, 1.g.

Ms. Maieva: OK.

Chair Ho: The purpose of eliminating these a... you want to eliminate this Condition is to be you want to have more lot size or more lots available in the subdivision?

Ms. Maieva: No. The purpose 1.g, is curbs and gutters along Carl Fuutani Street Puukai Waimea Canyon and Road Way A. The... I think the fact of the matter is that we are doing rental housing for people who... for people between 30 and 60% median income. Along Carl Fuutani... so we are trying to provide as much affordable housing as is possible. Providing the cost of curbs and gutters and providing all the set back and the improvements will reduce the number of housing units we will be able to provide along that road. The other areas it will summarily reduce the amount of affordable housing developed in the for sale part of the project. What we’ve tried to do is provide as much as financially feasible, there are some conflicting I think goals and interest in the area. For example, there are people who use that park quite a lot and they enjoy some of the parking along the side there. Providing a curb and gutter would mean that we would eliminate some of the potential parking for the park, so we are trying to be aware of how that property is currently used and address some of the neighborhood concerns. It’s always a really fine balance between how much you can afford and then at what point you stop being an affordable housing developer and instead end up being a sidewalk, and curb, and gutter developer. So I don’t you know... we are trying to do as much as possible financially feasible and possible so, what we have designed is really trying to give as much as possible without losing some of the affordable housing we are trying to do.

Chair Ho: The concern also would be for children, for elderly, for even handicap uses of this sidewalk and the protections it affords.

Ms. Maieva: Oh certainly, yes so that’s a part of the balance. I agree with you. And remember in some of these areas there are not going to be... Where we would build it would be potentially along the perimeter of our property but it will died end one block up there is no curb and gutter so sometimes we are building it and its going to end.

Mr. Hull: I would also point Chair that the curb and gutter requirement is primarily aimed at having drainage issues so as long as the meet the drainage issues per Engineering Division the Department would have no objections. And, then again, when the sidewalk components come in with the sidewalk and gutters I think it’s no secret that this Department is very Pro making sure that our towns and communities are walkable and accessible particularly for elderly and children. And so while this project again to the PDU didn’t necessarily have all the abutting sidewalks the Department felt that access issues were adequately addressed in the proposal.

Ms. Apisa: And so it has some (inaudible) all of them?

Mr. Hull: Yes.

Ms. Maieva: Correct.
Chair Ho: Well this is only tentative map approval yet, so before the final comes up, before the final maps is granted. Let me have a word with the attorney, I just want to ask your name. Is it alright if I meet with her after this meeting just to talk to her?

Deputy Attorney Nicholas Courson: I don’t think that would generally be a good idea because you want all the Commissioners to have equal accessed information. I think you would be better off asking the clerk to meet with her and report/relay back anything to the Commission.

Ms. Apisa: Just ask your question now in here.

Chair Ho: So Nick if I wanted to confer with her, the three of us would have to be present you, the clerk, and myself?

Mr. Courson: No. It’s just generally good...yeah that would be a meeting, that would be this so...yeah otherwise if you are wanting a conversation you think would be a bit more delicate then this, having the clerk do it. But ultimately this is a public proceeding and it’s meant to come out in public. I get the need to sometimes to be sensitive but...

Chair Ho: OK. Let’s continue. Thank you for the information, tentative map approval I would like you to submit to Mr. Bukoski I will get with R. Bukoski on this Item and express some concerns...the concerns I have about it. I will leave it at that. That’s the way I shall proceed then, I have concerns about eliminating the sidewalks.

Mr. Hull: If I may interrupt here, the map, we already have the map with the proposal that was approved by the Commission a couple months ago under the PDU. So if you would like to see that map I’m not sure if it’s part of the subdivision application, it’s in there. If you would like to discuss with us the Department offline we can definitely make ourselves available.

Chair Ho: Being that is in there the proposal is to eliminate that?

Mr. Hull: No, no, no. That is what was approved.

Chair Ho: Yes, but it was approved with sidewalks in there?

Mr. Hull: Not. The PDU was approved without the abutting sidewalks, curbs, and gutters. So the...when Chance was doing their original review, and sorry for the confusion, it was a standard to list all these bullet points. But upon further review Chance essentially found that oh wait, this PDU was approved and it was approved as represented therefore the PDU waived some of those requirements. So that’s why the supplement came saying, “It’s not like Makani folks are asking for a waiver now from a previous proposal.” It’s just essentially the Department is saying upon further review, we have recognized that the PDU already approved these improvements as proposed that don’t meet the requirements as set per code.

Ms. Apisa: So it’s a housekeeping measure?

Mr. Hull: Correct.

Chair Ho: Alright, we will proceed that way.

Ms. Apisa: Any other?
Chair Ho: Is there anything else sir? Commissioner? Mr. Bukoski anything else to add?

Mr. Bukoski: Just that the Department recommends tentative approval.

Ms. Apisa: I’m ready to make a motion if you’re ready?

Chair Ho: I’m ready.

Ms. Apisa: I move that we proceed and approve as presented.

Chair Ho: Seconded. The motion on the floor is to approve tentative map Ahe Group LLC. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 2:0.

Final Subdivision Map Approval

Subdivision Application No. S-2015-13; A&B Properties, Inc., McBryde Sugar Co., LLC, & Kukui’ula Development Co., LLC; Proposed 4-lot Subdivision; TMK: (4) 2-6-004:010, 018, 063, & 2-6-015:008; Koloa, Kaua’i

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item I. 2.a., Subdivision Application No. S-2015-13; A&B Properties, Inc., McBryde Sugar Co., LLC, & Kukui’ula Development Co., LLC; proposed 4-lot subdivision; TMK: (4) 2-6-004:010, Parcel 010, 018, 063, & 2-6-015:008; Koloa, Kaua’i.

Mr. Bukoski read the Subdivision Report for the record (on file with the Planning Department).

Mr. Bukoski: Chair and Commissioner, we have received all government agencies comments and we are recommending final approval.

Chair Ho: Is there someone here from Kukui’ula Development Company, Please?

Mr. Tom Shigemoto: Good Morning. For the record Tom Shigemoto, representing A&B Properties and Kukui’ula Development Co., Hawaii, LLC.

Ms. Apisa: Good Morning.

Chair Ho: Good Morning Tom.

Mr. Shigemoto: Good Morning.

Chair Ho: Commissioner, do we have any questions? Mr. Shigemoto?

Ms. Apisa: I guess just a little background on why the reduction from 5-4 lots, just some little history for the record.

Mr. Shigemoto: Well actually this whole application is a for the purpose of settling a title claim.

Ms. Apisa: Submitting what?

Mr. Shigemoto: A Title Claim.
Ms. Apisa: Oh.

Mr. Shigemoto: But it does involve lots that abut this particular property that is the focus of the subdivision. And we decided to consolidate those 4 existing parcel into or 5 existing parcels into 4, and creating in the process, the one 10,000 sq. ft. lot that is proposed to be used for the settlement.

Ms. Apisa: For thee?

Mr. Shigemoto: Settlement of the title claim.

Ms. Apisa: Oh

Mr. Shigemoto: Yes, so that’s basically it, and, in fact the reduction in the total number of parcels that are involved and so that’s really the purpose of the application. And then, we want to thank the Planning Department because it involved some not exemptions but some meeting of the minds to waive some of the sidewalk requirements for now because it does not make sense to just pave just that frontage of the one property being created and then there is nothing from Koloa town all the way down and beyond to Kukui‘ula Store. We have a Memorandum of Agreement to delay the improvements to a future time.

Ms. Apisa: So the improvements are delayed?

Mr. Shigemoto: There delayed. Right.

Chair Ho: Tom. You have some…the Conditions written in there, there’s some pretty strict ones in there, I see that no additionally ADU’s may be built on the property?

Mr. Shigemoto: That’s not a problem

Chair Ho: OK.

Mr. Shigemoto: Yes. We are ok with the Conditions that have been imposed for this application.

Chair Ho: OK. One other thing, this is a tentative map approval.

Mr. Shigemoto: Final.

Chair Ho: Is it final?

Mr. Hull: Correct. Final.

Chair Ho: A the curbs, gutters, and sidewalks issue. Could we put a closing date on that? I mean even if the length or the form of it is not…you going to work that out. But I would like…when it is worked out with the Department, I would like to see a closing date on that, it could be year, 6 months after certain things are done on it Tom, and the reason...

Mr. Shigemoto: What does the condition read right now?
Mr. Bukoski: I know for the intent of the MOA-Memorandum of Agreement was that the lots that are being created now are underdeveloped, I would say, and necessarily rather having the applicant putting the infrastructure now since they don’t know what the development is going to be within a certain amount period. When that happens that’s when the infrastructure is going to be built. So rather than doing it prematurely, we would rather wait to accommodate that.

Ms. Apisa: Until you know what’s going to be on the lots?

Mr. Bukoski: Exactly.

Mr. Shigemoto: Correct me if I am wrong, but isn’t there an ordinance exempts infrastructure improvements for when you don’t create more then 4-lots? You know when your net total lots is 0, there’s an exemption? When you consolidate and resub divide and don’t create anymore lots? Called the Kanashiro Rule or Ordinance?

Mr. Dale Cua: The Kanashiro Rule is applicable to agriculture...Oh, I know what you are talking about, the infrastructure requirements. But in this particular case you know there was a proposal involving a particular parcel and then it was subdivided into those original, I think it was five? And now this proposal reduces the number of lots from 5 to 4-lots. The requirements that were imposed at the time was to require curbs, gutters, and sidewalks along the frontage of the affected property and I believe the Memorandum of Agreement is to defer the requirements until these are further developed at a later time. The Ordinance you are referring to is...there is an ordinance that waives these requirements at the time of tentative approval you know and the applicant would make such a request to defer or eliminate those requirements at the time of tentative approval. In this particular case we are coming in for final.

Ms. Apisa: It makes sense to me that we are not waiving it, it’s just postponing it until we know what’s going to be on the lot. We are deferring it.

Mr. Cua: Yes, we are deferring it until a later date.

Ms. Apisa: Right, we are deferring it. Right until we know what’s going to be on the ... how the property will be developed? So it will just come at a later date.

Mr. Shigemoto: Yes, that’s my understanding but I just thought I’d ask about the ordinance that was adopted you know several years ago.

Mr. Cua: The proper way to apply the ordinance, to ask for those waivers at the time of tentative approval.

Mr. Shigemoto: OK.

Chair Ho: I do want call upon or make it our responsibility then as the project is completed, that someone follow up and make sure that these Conditions are met. I don’t want an embarrassing situation where conditions are not met and we have to call it in later. So Mr. Bukoski I guess it falls on you.

Mr. Bukoski: Severely noted.

Chair Ho: You going to note that? Ok. Will that be in agreement with you Tom?
Mr. Shigemoto: That the Planning Department monitors when that supposed... Yes, sure, that’s their job.

Chair Ho: Thank you. OK. I guess we are ready for a motion.

Ms. Apisa: You ready for a motion? I might need a little help with this but I move that we go along, we approve and we adopt the Planning Departments recommendation to approve this final map as submitted with the Conditions.

Chair Ho: Seconded. The motion on the floor is for final map approval subdivision Kukui’ula Development Co., with an Amendment to I believe just to follow up and make?

Mr. Hull: Yes. Just follow up when the development is completed and all conditions are met.

Chair Ho: Is that?

Ms. Apisa: I think that covered everything, yes. That’s the motion.

Chair Ho: That’s the motion. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 2:0.

Final Subdivision Map Approval

Subdivision Application No. S-2017-10; Medeiros Farm, Inc.; Proposed 3-lot Boundary Adjustment; TMK: (4) 2-3-014.007, 009, & 031; Kalaheo, Kaua’i

Mr. Bukoski: Moving on to Item I. 2.b., Subdivision Application No. S-2017-10; Medeiros Farm, Inc.; proposed 3-lot Boundary Adjustment; TMK: (4) 2-3-014:007, Parcel 009, & 031; Kalaheo, Kaua’i.

Mr. Bukoski read the Subdivision Report for the record (on file with the Planning Department).

Mr. Bukoski: Chair and Commissioner, we have received all various Government agencies comments and we are recommending final approval.

Chair Ho: Is there someone here from Medeiros Farms, Please come forward?

Mr. Roger Caires: Good Morning. Mr. Roger Caires, Surveyor representing the Medeiros family.

Chair Ho: Good Moring Mr. Caires.

Ms. Apisa: Good Morning.

Chair Ho: Commissioner Ahuna, Oh I’m sorry. Commissioner Apisa, would you have any questions for Mr. Caires?

Ms. Apisa: Just to ask him to give a little background or information to start with?
Mr. Caires: Oh background on the property. That’s the Medeiros property in Kalaheo, and they had wanted to adjust the property line to be more fairly distributed amongst the brothers and sister. Oh the brother and sisters.

Ms. Apisa: There is three of them?

Mr. Caires: Yes.

Ms. Apisa: And there is no problem moving that building that is straddling the line.

Mr. Caires: Oh it’s already moved.

Ms. Apisa: I don’t have any other questions.

Chair Ho: Mr. Caires, the Medeiros family are aware that there’s road easements reserves in place, 13 foot and 15 footer? Good.

Mr. Caires: Yes, they understand all that. Yes.

Ms. Apisa: Ready for a motion? I move we accept the Planning Departments recommendation and approve.

Chair Ho: The motion on the floor is final map approval Medeiros Farms. All in favor? Aye. (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 2:0

Subdivision Application No. S-2018-2; Kukui’ula Development Co., LLC; Proposed 13-lot Subdivision; TMK: (4) 2-6-022:021; Koloa, Kaua’i

Mr. Bukoshi: Moving on to Item I. 2.c., Subdivision Application No. S-2018-2; Kukui’ula Development Co., LLC; proposed 13-lot Subdivision; TMK: (4) 2-6-022: portion of parcel 021; Koloa, Kaua’i.

Mr. Bukoshi read the Subdivision Report for the record (on file with the Planning Department).

Mr. Bukoshi: Chair and Commissions, we have received all various Government agencies comments and we are recommending final approval.

Chair Ho: Is there anyone here representing Alexander Baldwin Mcbryde Sugar Kukui’ula Development?

Mr. Linsay Crawford: Good morning again Commissioners. Again for the record, Lindsay Crawford, Kukui’ula Development company.

Ms. Apisa: Again a start with a little history or background?

Mr. Crawford: Sure, the simple history on this is that, this is a 12-lot residential subdivision that is on the way out to the previous subdivision that we just recently completed. A little bit unusual in the fact that we completed all the street improvements, all the infrastructure with the previous subdivision. Therefore, as Chance describes everything has been completed we are now just
chopping up the lots in front of this existing road, existing utilities to be able to sale these additional 12-lots.

Ms. Apisa: So the roads already in?

Mr. Crawford: Already in and everything’s completed.

Ms. Apisa: No further questions.

Chair Ho: I have none.

Ms. Apisa: Motion to accept the Planning Departments recommendations and approve the subdivision for final approval.

Chair Ho: The motion before us is too final map approval Alexander Baldwin Mcbryde Sugar Kukui‘ula Development. All in favor? Aye. (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 2:

Subdivision Application No. S-2018-6; James & Brenda C., Denny & Marshal Nakamatsu; Proposed 2-lot Boundary Adjustment; TMK: (4) 1-3-001:043 & 119; Kekaha, Kaua‘i

Mr. Bukosi: Moving on to Item I. 2.d., Subdivision Application No. S-2018-6; James & Brenda C., Denny & Marshal Nakamatsu; proposed 2-lot Boundary Adjustment; TMK: (4) 1-3-001:043, & 119; Koloa, Kaua‘i.

Mr. Bukosi: read the Subdivision Report for the record (on file with the Planning Department).

Mr. Bukosi: Chair and Commissioners, we have received all various Government agencies comments and we are recommending final approval.

Chair Ho: Is there anybody here representing Nakamatsu family, please?

Mr. Roger Caires: Mr. Roger Caires the land Surveyor representing the applicants.

Ms. Apisa: I guess again I would ask for a background of what’s the purpose for the realignment of lot lines?

Mr. Caires: The purpose of the boundary adjustment was both clients wanted a straight line that separated them it was a Jaggered line. So it was a very minimal type of boundary adjustment.

Ms. Apisa: Straight is always better. I don’t have any questions.

Chair Ho: Did it affect the size of the lot at all?

Mr. Caires: No, the area a little bit but just so the line could be straightened yeah.

Ms. Apisa: I recommend we accept the Planning Departments...I move that we accept the Planning Departments recommendation and approve the lot boundary adjustment.
Chair Ho: The motion before us is for final map approval Nakamatsu Family. All in favor? Aye. (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 2:0.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Bukoski: Thank You Chair. Moving on to Item. J, Adjournment.

Chair Ho: I need a motion.

Ms. Apisa: I motion to adjourn.

Chair Ho: Seconded. Motion on the floor is to Adjourn. All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carries 2:0. We are Adjourned.

Subdivision Committee Chair Ho adjourned the meeting at 9:11 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

[Signature]

Arleen Kuwamura
Commission Support Clerk

( ) Approved as circulated (add date of meeting approval).

( ) Approved as amended. See minutes of ____________ meeting