DATE: November 11, 2006

MEETING DATE: September 28, 2006

LOCATION: County of Kaua‘i
Pi‘ikoi Building Conference Room B
3:00 PM – 5:00 PM

SUBJECT LĪHU‘E TOWN CORE URBAN DESIGN PLAN
CAC Meeting #6

PRESENT: Wanda Shibata/Advantage Webco Dodge HI
Neil Clendeninn/Doctor, Līhu‘e Scholar
Pat Griffin/KHPRC, Griffin Noyes Assoc.
Morton Yamasaki/Landscape Architect
Cheryl Lovell Obatake/Community Specialist, Nāwiliwili Bay Watershed Council
Laurie Ho/Garden Island Resource Conservation & Development
Stanley Doi/State of Hawaii, DAGS Kaua‘i Branch
Elaine Dunbar/Private Citizen
Puanani Rogers/Ho‘okipa Network
Barbara Pendragon/County Planning Department
Ian Costa/Director, County Planning Department
Keith Nitta/County Planning Department
Myles Hironaka/County of Kaua‘i
Steve Kyono/State Department of Transportation-Kaua‘i
Grant Murakami/PBR HAWAII
Kimi Yuen/PBR HAWAII

DISTRIBUTION: Those listed above, including:
Avery Youn/Architect
Sonia Topenio/Bank of Hawai‘i
Palmer Hafdahl/Palm’s Hawaii
Russell Seacat/Architect
Marc Ventura/Architect
Clyde Kodani/Kodani & Associates

PURPOSE: To collect input on the draft report for the Līhu‘e Town Core Urban Design Plan which was distributed to the CAC and State DAGS-Kaua‘i on September 12, 2006 and to discuss the major issues or concerns with the draft. The next steps for the project were also summarized.
To help focus the discussion on the major concerns/comments, PBR asked the CAC members to write down their comments for each chapter of the report on large sheets of paper posted at the front of the room. The group went through each of the comments and PBR collected additional written comments/markups from those who had them. The CAC was also encouraged to submit other comments and markups including typographical errors and the like to PBR over the next two weeks by October 13, 2006.

The main discussion points, comments and questions from the meeting are summarized below and organized by chapter. Original written comments are provided as italicized text below.

**CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION**

1. *Figure 1-2 Regional Map – Check the zoning maps to make the following corrections to:*
   - Location of Kalapakī Ahupua’a
   - Location of Hanamā’ulu
   - Location of Näwiliwili
   - *(Presently Kalapakī is incorrect/not consistent with Allodiaks L.C. Awards)*

   Cheryl Lovell-Obatake asked if we could check the County zoning maps since they are not consistent with boundary documents such as Land Court Awards. Kalapakī should run up to Līhuʻe. She said according to Keith Nitta legislation is needed to correct the zoning maps. The Planning Department is aware of this problem and should work with John Kruse of the Real Property Division to make sure the ahupuaʻa boundaries are consistent on the County maps. This might be something that could be done with the Planning Department’s update of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance (CZO). PBR will follow up with the Planning Dept. to make sure the report maps are correct and consistent.

2. Pat Griffin asked if we would consider adding a tribute to Mike Furukawa at the beginning of the document. All thought this was a good idea. PBR asked if CAC members would like to submit their ideas for the tribute they will consolidate them and include it somewhere in the beginning of the report.

**CHAPTER 2: VISION & GOALS**

1. *Sugar Mill preservation versus Līhuʻe central focus spot. If not preserved it should remain as a central focus of the town to pull the town together.*
Some CAC members felt that the mill site should remain a major focus and gathering place for Līhuʻe. Other members of the CAC had differing ideas. Some felt the mill site did not need to be a major draw since it might actually compete and detract from the town core, but it should still retain its historic significance. The idea of a cultural or historic feature in a park-like setting was suggested again. This would also keep traffic impacts low. Some felt that if the main building could not be saved, then the height limit should revert to County standard. No one felt the mill stacks were worth preserving. Care should be taken not to create a false sense of preservation by reusing the structure for something completely unrelated or trying to remake a mill-like structure when it is not appropriate. Reconsider an industrial use there as well. Additional discussion in Chapter 5.

2. Encourage urban green spaces and parks (2-5).

3. Demonstration projects for sustainability (2.2.9).

4. Encourage demonstration projects with County and State buildings (2.2.6). Government should take the lead in building sustainable buildings.

5. Clarify “Līhuʻe Gateway” in the vision and goals section. There are several Līhuʻe “gateways” to consider:
   - Buildup visitor experience - Airport/Harbor
   - Historic gateways, Hawaiian gateways
   - Hale Nani – where Queen Liliʻuokalani made her first stop on her historic visit to Kauaʻi. Ms. Lovell-Obatake believes it was in Līhuʻe at Hale Nani (near where Central Pacific Bank is today). Commemorate with a plaque in the sidewalk or some similar marker.
   - Community gateways, there may be others – create distinctions
   - Landscaping project, Līhuʻe Gateway, along Ahukini Road and Kapule Highway

6. County Lawn: Maintain the historic integrity of the County Lawn as a central civic space.

CHAPTER 3: PROJECT SETTING

1. Section 3.1 Ahupuaʻa (zoning maps location/boundaries incorrect)
   - Nāwiliwili
   - Kalapakī
   - Hanamāʻulu
   (Same discussion as in Chapter 1.)
2. Section 3-7 Figure p 3-4: Līhuʻe Post Office the number of mailboxes should be limited by the amount of parking they have. Include in the report the discussion with the landowner of the Līhuʻe Plantation Building to partner with other neighboring businesses and government to build a joint parking structure. Share of parking spaces would be based on pro-rata contribution to the development of the parking structure.

3. With the commercial center moving out, the suggestion was to maintain the center for civic uses and activities.

CHAPTER 4: GENERAL DESIGN GUIDELINES – ALL NEIGHBORHOODS

1. Pedestrian crosswalks (quilt pattern). Maybe not as appropriate to use the Rice Family quilt, or any one family’s crest or design, but something should be used to symbolize Līhuʻe.

2. Līhuʻe I.D. recognition
   - Recommend more detail regarding cohesive identity development for Līhuʻe. Create a separate section in the report rather than putting it under “street furniture” section. Island motifs design which could include tattoo or quilt patterns

3. Upper Rice Street bike route in traffic. This could not be avoided unless traffic lanes are removed or private property condemned since there is not enough space to include separate bike lanes. There simply are not enough east-west streets that connect between Kūhiō and Kapule Highways given the existing road network in Līhuʻe so even with the widening of Ahukini Road to four lanes, either Rice or Hardy Street will also have to have four lanes of traffic. Traffic on Rice Street did come to standstills before the widening to four lanes.

4. Increase access to Mill (4-21) needed from highway
   - Mention in document the need for a mauka access to the Mill because Halekō Street is 2 lanes based on land use.
   - Steve Kyono did not recommend allowing access from Kaumualiʻi Highway. It is too close to the Rice Street intersection.
   - Some also felt that a high-density, heavily trafficked use should not be located at the mill site since this would increase pressure to widen Halekō Road. Therefore, depending on what the future land use is for the mill site, this additional access off the highway might not be necessary.

5. Malae Street might become a more heavily used than Kaʻana Street when they are fully extended
• Figure 4-2 needs to be corrected since the Planning Department and Parks Division decided not to have Malae extend through to Ho’olako based on their recommendations to Grove Farm. They would rather have a larger, single park rather than two smaller parks separated by the Malae Street extension. PBR will correct this in the report.

6. Public parking lots/structures: for the public or for the county or both?
• The sites for parking lots identified in the report in Section 4.3 were meant to be for public parking although some sites would involve partnerships such as cost-sharing with landowners and neighboring businesses and the County which would determine the number of parking spaces available to the public. For those on County property, they would be for public parking. Check the report to clarify this.

7. Pedestrian friendliness and access in general
• Parking lots by the park (see Chapter 5)
• Raised crosswalks in the Līhu’e town center
• Enhanced safety in crosswalks important
• Innovative crosswalk design to integrate north-south, Rice Street
• Median and line of site considerations for trees should be considered in design

8. Building permanent, inhabitable structures are not permitted in the floodway. Flood fringe areas can be built on, if occupied spaces are built above a certain elevation as determined by a detailed flood study and reviewed and approved by the US Army Corps of Engineers or reported on FEMA FIRM maps.

CHAPTER 5: NEIGHBORHOOD SPECIFIC GUIDELINES (WITH FIGURE 5-1)

1. Mixed use in same building all areas except PF
• Clarify that mixed use can be vertical. Encourage 24 hour uses and discourage urban sprawl.
• Mixed use = retail, housing, restaurant, hotel etc.
• Mill site as essential focus of town (5-75)

2. Permitted uses seem almost boiler plate from area to area

3. The entire mill concept/proposal needs review and discussion. Some thought it might be premature to include the mill site in this report or at least the detailed design guidelines section. How does the community want to deal with the Mill site?
• A specialist with historic background or industrial reuse should come in and make suggestions. It is the piko that connects Kukui Grove with the Town Center.
• Retain integrity of the site. Existing building mass is good if the existing building is preserved but if it is demolished, then they should be required to go with existing zoning heights. New buildings should not be high density.

4. Residential character on ‘Akahi/‘Elua Streets: building requirements
• Tighten guidelines up – 60’ is too large- breakup the mass for residential scale. Do not create an artificial environment that mimics historical designs/buildings.

5. Civic center: how to approach “residential” and building regulations in this section? Also, screening loading areas not appropriate.
• “Residential” type standards, boilerplate standards may not be appropriate.

6. Cost of infrastructure improvements should be factored in and considered to accommodate proposed streetscape i.e. new waterline, drainage systems, and utilities.
• ‘Akahi and ‘Elua Streets water meters underground.
• Civic Center: want the state to remain in the civic center, or public service facilities should remain there to help consolidate facilities.

☆☆☆☆

This is our understanding of the topics discussed and the conclusions reached. Please give PBR HAWAII written notification of any errors or omissions within seven calendar days. Otherwise, this report shall be deemed an accurate record of the meeting. Thank you.